

STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
**WATER QUALITY IMPACT EVALUATION CHECKLIST**

650-050-37  
ENVIRONMENTAL  
MANAGEMENT  
10/17

**PART 1: PROJECT INFORMATION**

Project Name:	US 301 PD&E Study from south of US 98 to SR 50
County:	Pasco & Hernando
FM Number:	447536-1-22-01
Federal Aid Project No:	TBD
Brief Project Description:	Widening of US 301 from 2 to 4 lanes including intersection improvements, sidewalk and off-site stormwater treatment and floodplain compensation sites

**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(s) names: Withlacoochee River

Water Management District: Southwest Florida

Environmental Look Around meeting date: [Click here to enter a date.](#)  
*Attach meeting minutes/notes to the checklist.*

Water Control District Name (list all that apply): None

**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 \_\_\_\_\_

Springs vents?  Yes  No  
Name \_\_\_\_\_

Well head protection area?  Yes  No

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Groundwater recharge?  Yes  No  
Name \_\_\_\_\_

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: [Click here to enter a date.](#)

#### 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:

ELA process initiated into stormwater management program and sites identified to meet the project's stormwater treatment, attenuation and floodplain compensation requirements as converting open space land from agricultural use to open land highway use to help achieve additional nutrient removal credits. Meetings held December 2020 and March 2021 with SWFWMD to discuss ELA criteria and potential ELA sites under consideration.

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

If yes, describe:

All floodplain impacts will be mitigated through addition of floodplain compensation sites.

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

Projects discharging directly into Outstanding Florida Waters (OFW) shall be required to provide treatment for a volume 50 percent more than required for the selected treatment system (wet detention, detention with effluent filtration, on-line retention, or off-line retention). This requirement will apply to basins for this project that discharge directly into the Withlacoochee River.

#### 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): Chris Salicco	
Title: Senior Environmental Scientist	
Signature: 	Date: 7/26/2021



**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
Long Lake Outlet	4	1388	n/a	n/a	n/a	No	No	None	-
Lake Elizabeth Outlet	4	1390	n/a	n/a	n/a	No	No	None	-
Withlacoochee River	4	1329F	n/a	OFW	n/a	No	No	None	-

\* 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
Entire Project	ETDM coordinators for US EPA, SWFWMD, FDEP	Dec 2020	No	Early coordination initiated during ETDM Programming Screen published 2/26/2021
Entire Project	SWFWMD	Dec 22, 2020	No	Initial Pre-application meeting to discuss project, ELA selection criteria and potential ELA sites
Entire Project	SWFWMD	Mar 19, 2021	No	Follow-up to Pre-application meeting to discuss clarification of criteria and ELA site specifics

<b>Meeting Name:</b> FDOT US 98 widening from SR 54 to SR 50 - Pre App Meeting #3 (Alignment change in Segments 3 and 4)	<b>Date:</b> 12/22
	<b>Location:</b> Online Teams Meeting
	<b>Compile By:</b> Osiris 9 Consulting

Attendees		
Name:	Organization:	Project Role:
Monte Ritter, P.E.	SWFWMD	ERP Reviewer
Anthony Celani, P.E.	FDOT D7	D7 Drainage Department
Tech Wells, P.E.	Arcadis	Evaluating ELAs for Segment 1
Christian Gyle, P.E.	Osiris 9	Evaluating ELAs for Segment 2,3, and 4
Walter Nemecek, P.E.	Osiris 9	TWO Manager for ELAs in Segments 2, 3, and 4
Kyle Morgan, E.I.	Osiris 9	Evaluating ELAs for Segments 2, 3, 4,
Not Attending		
Abdul Waris	FDOT D7	D7 Project PM

## Meeting Minutes:

### Refresh from Previous Meetings:

- 2-4 Lane Widening of 4 Segments of US98/US301
- Segments 3 and 4 have changed from US 98 to US 301.
- ELA Selection Criteria:
  1. Nutrient Removal
  2. Attenuation
  3. Wetland
  4. Floodplain

### Talking Points:

#### Presumptive Treatment vs. ELAs:

- An ELA will be a dry or wet pond sized to meet or exceed presumptive criteria for the portion of the roadway that discharges to the ELA location. Regional compensatory treatment will be calculated using nutrient removal efficiency defined by BMPTrains.
- An ELA can compensate for and replace presumptive wet ponds that are sized to benefit the same receiving waters. To do so, the ELA must meet or exceed the total nutrient removal efficiency of those replaced ponds sized for presumptive criteria.

- Since Withlacoochee is an OFW, post-development nutrient load must be equal to or less than pre-development. Within an OFW, for an ELA to replace presumptive wet ponds the ELA must meet or exceed the nutrient removal efficiency those ponds designed to meet presumptive criteria for direct discharges into an OFW.
- Discharge of untreated water onto offsite property not owned by FDOT will need to be routed through some form of BMP before being discharged. We cannot discharge untreated water onto private property even if there is an overall improvement in the watershed.
- If the discharge is into state owned land, an agreement could be reached (if the owner concurs) to discharge untreated water if the same receiving water sees improvement from ELA (see if this can be applied in Segment 1).

**Floodplains:**

- Cup for Cup compensation is SWFWMD preference when it is adjacent (same side) to the widening where the encroachment occurs and involves no conveyance impacts.
- For floodplain compensation not directly connected to impacts, consultants can use their own drainage models
- FDOT stated: compensation will be based on FEMA elevations
- SWFWMD added: if the FEMA elevations are considered the most accurate information available
- FDOT stated: a FEMA model can be used if modeling is required and a FEMA model is present
- SWFWMD added: if the FEMA model elevations are considered the most accurate information available

**ELA Sites:**

- FDOT Floodplain Site:
  - Offsite development to be collected
  - Floodplain compensation
- Decandido:
  - Pastureland land use change: improve discharge onto private property from pre-condition
  - Floodplain Compensation
- Tree Farm:
  - Huge nutrient load reduction
  - Farm is in a watershed that connects to the Withlacoochee almost immediately downstream of US 98 untreated discharge
  - ELA can compensate for US 98 widening if property receiving the untreated discharge immediately downstream is state owned entity and approves

**Action Items:**

Osiris 9:

1. Add presumptive treatment ponds for each basin into a post-nutrient loading model and compare results to ELA nutrient improvement
2. Identify solutions for areas that discharge offsite through private property.

Arcadis:

1. Check who owns property to the north/east of US98 widening in segment 1 that would receive untreated water from the widening project. Could we come up with a similar permit to SR 50 widening through the State Forest?



<b>Meeting Name:</b> FDOT US 301 Widening from SR 700 to SR 50 – Pond Design Review	<b>Date:</b> 3-19-2021
	<b>Location:</b> Online Teams Meeting
	<b>Compile By:</b> Osiris 9 Consulting

<b>Attendees</b>		
<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organization:</b>	<b>Project Role:</b>
Monte Ritter, P.E.	SWFWMD	ERP Reviewer
Anthony Celani, P.E.	FDOT D7	D7 Drainage Department
Christian Gyle, P.E.	Osiris 9	Evaluating ELAs for Segments 3 and 4
<b>Not Attending</b>		

## Meeting Minutes:

### Refresh from Previous Meetings:

- 2-4 Lane Widening from SR 700 to SR 50
- An ELA can compensate for and replace presumptive wet ponds that are sized to benefit the same receiving waters. To do so, the ELA must meet or exceed the total nutrient removal efficiency of those replaced ponds sized for presumptive criteria.
- Since Withlacoochee is an OFW, post-development nutrient load must be equal to or less than pre-development. Within an OFW, for an ELA to replace presumptive wet ponds the ELA must meet or exceed the nutrient removal efficiency those ponds designed to meet presumptive criteria for direct discharges into an OFW.
- Discharge of untreated water onto offsite property not owned by FDOT will need to be routed through some form of BMP before being discharged. We cannot discharge untreated water onto private property even if there is an overall improvement in the watershed.
- Christian showed calculations demonstrating that the two ELAs provided more nutrient removal in their respective watersheds than all the presumptive ponds in those same watersheds
  - This was largely influenced by the addition of directly connected impervious area and the nutrient removal limitations of wet ponds

**Clarification:**

- Monte stated the previous intent of the comment for ELA's to meet or exceed the removal efficiency of ponds sized for presumptive criteria was to demonstrate equivalent treatment at points of direct discharge into lands not owned or controlled by the FDOT
- This is to be accomplished by some form of BMP upstream of the discharge point so that no outfall point receives higher pollutant runoff from the project than from a presumptive pond.
- Monte wanted verification that the presumptive ponds for comparison are sized for OFW criteria
- Alternately, roadway runoff that remains in FDOT R/W does not need to show equivalent treatment

**ELA changes from previous Pre-App Meeting:**

- Christian presented SMF 1 for the ELA on the Decandido parcel and two new SMFs (SMF 2 and 3) to cover attenuation at two unique outfalls from SMF 1
- Monte stated that SMF 2 and SMF 3 will need to demonstrate equivalent treatment compared to presumptive treatment at those outfalls based on clarification above
- Christian presented the ELA on the FDOT parcel near SR 50 and two new SMFs to cover attenuation at two unique outfalls from the SMF on the FDOT parcel

**Action Items:**

## Osiris 9:

1. Demonstrate that the widening of US 301 does not produce a higher level of pollutant runoff into lands not owned by the state. This will be demonstrated at each outfall point from the FDOT R/W.
2. Calculations will demonstrate presumptive ponds are sized for OFW for basis of comparison