

## Type 2 Categorical Exclusion Determination

### SR 9 / I-95 AT SR 80 / SOUTHERN BOULEVARD PROJECT DEVELOPMENT & ENVIRONMENT STUDY

(SR 80 MP 19.1 to 20.4 and I-95 MP 24.3 to 25.3)

ETDM No.: 14183/ FAP No.: TBD  
Financial Project ID: 435516-1-22-02  
Palm Beach County



Prepared for:  
FDOT District Four  
3400 W. Commercial Blvd.  
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33309

September 2017

*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.*



## Type 2 Categorical Exclusion Determination Form

### 1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE AND NEED

#### a. Project Information

**Project Name:** SR 9 / I-95 at SR 80 / Southern Boulevard Project Development and Environment Study

**Project Limits:** SR 80 MP 19.1 to 20.4 and I-95 MP 24.3 to 25.3

**County:** Palm Beach County

**ETDM Number (if applicable):** 14183

**Financial Management Number:** 435516-1-22-02

**Federal Aid Project Number:** TBD

**Project Manager:** Anson Sonnett

#### b. Proposed Improvements

Proposed features that are identical in each of the build alternatives include:

- Signalization optimization;
- Gem Lake remains a signalized, full median opening;
- The westbound, directional median opening on SR 80 to access Lang Road is proposed to be closed due to proposed flyover ramps in the median of SR 80;
- The southbound I-95 exit ramp will provide three right turn lanes to westbound SR 80 and two left turn lanes to eastbound SR 80; these movements will be signal controlled;
- The southbound I-95 entrance ramp will provide two right turn lanes from westbound SR 80 and two left turn lanes from the eastbound direction; these movements will be signal controlled;
- The northbound I-95 entrance ramp will retain the existing configuration of a single free-flow, right-turn lane from westbound SR 80;
- The northbound I-95 exit ramp will provide three at-grade, left-turn lanes to westbound SR 80 and two right-turn lanes to the eastbound direction; these movements will be signal controlled;
- At the intersection with Parker Avenue, a dedicated, right-turn lane will be added along eastbound SR 80, and the existing left-turn lane storage will be increased. On the south leg of Parker Avenue, dual left turn lanes are proposed to westbound SR 80 as well as one through lane and one through / right turn lane;
- No right-of-way acquisition is required in the historic Vedado Hillcrest neighborhood or along Parker Avenue;
- In areas where alternatives are proposing reconstruction, seven-foot, buffered bike lanes are planned. Areas of resurfacing propose four-foot bike lanes where possible. The exception is along Parker Avenue, where sharrows are proposed due to right-of-way constraints and consistency with existing conditions. Green painted bike lanes

is also proposed at locations such as turn lane cross overs per the current design standards.

- As requested by the communities, special emphasis markings have been proposed at pedestrian crossings at all cross walks.

### **Summary of Preferred Alternative**

Alternative 4 has been selected as the Recommended Build Alternative based on the results of the evaluation matrix and public input. Alternative 4 is anticipated to be advanced as the Preferred Alternative after the Public Hearing. This alternative provides dual third level flyovers: one from northbound I-95 to westbound SR 80, and one from eastbound SR 80 to northbound I-95. Both flyover ramps consist of a single lane and are at the third level, thereby minimizing visual, aesthetic, and noise impacts, construction cost, and constructability issues. The method in which dual third level flyovers is accomplished is by shifting the SR 80 alignment to the north and braiding the eastbound-to-northbound flyover entrance under the elevated northbound-to-westbound ramp to begin its alignment (at-grade) at Gem Lake Drive. This entrance will essentially align beside the existing westbound slip ramp that provides access to southbound Congress Avenue.

The proposed northbound-to-westbound single lane flyover begins to develop on the east side of I-95 at STA 1303+00 and ascends to the third level. The proposed ramp turns to the west along SR 80, by-passing the intersection of Lang Road (proposed to be closed due to the ramp structure). The flyover crosses over Gem Lake Drive, which will remain open as a full intersection, and continues over the existing, at-grade slip ramp that accesses southbound Australian / Congress Avenue and the proposed eastbound-to-northbound ramp entrance, eventually matching the existing profile east of Australian Boulevard and forming the fourth (inside) lane of westbound SR 80 near SR 80 STA 3185+00.

Motorists destined for SR 80 westbound that wish to access the County property or the Towns of Glen Ridge and Cloud Lake will utilize the three at-grade, left-turn lanes proposed at the I-95 northbound exit ramp location. Due to the closure of the Lang Road directional median opening, southbound access from SR 80 to the Town Cloud Lake, formerly by way of Lang Road and Gem Lake Drive, is now accessed strictly via the Gem Lake Drive intersection. Travelers may turn left from westbound SR 80 to southbound Gem Lake Drive or perform a U-turn maneuver and travel east to Lang Road, where a right turn may be executed.

Along eastbound SR 80, two at-grade left turn lanes are proposed to access the northbound I-95 entrance ramp. The southbound I-95 entrance and exit ramps, as well as the eastern portion of SR 80 and Parker Avenue, are proposed as listed in the common elements above.

The Alternative 4 northbound-to-westbound flyover is located such that the north side retaining wall coincides with the center of the access road along the south side of the County office building in the northwest quadrant of the interchange. With this configuration, the proposed limited access right-of-way line is essentially concurrent with the north edge of pavement of the access road. This alignment substantially reduces right-of-way impacts to the south side of SR 80, where residences are present.

The second flyover proposed in Alternative 4 consists of a single lane flyover ramp from eastbound SR 80 to northbound I-95. The proposed ramp braids under the northbound-to-westbound flyover and develops on the north side of the median of SR 80, east of the Gem Lake Drive intersection at STA 3199+00 and ascends to the third level, crosses over I-95 while turning to the north and connects with the existing entrance ramp at I-95 STA 1340+00, prior to the braided ramps to the north of the interchange. For eastbound vehicles east of the Gem Lake Drive area (i.e., Town of Cloud Lake) or motorists not wishing to utilize the flyover, two at-grade left turn lanes are proposed to access the northbound I-95 entrance ramp at the existing entrance ramp location. The southbound I-95 entrance and exit ramps, the northbound I-95 exit ramp and the eastern portion of SR 80 and Parker Avenue, are proposed as listed in the common elements above.

Alternative 4 requires additional right-of-way along both the north and south sides of SR 80 to the west of I-95. On the north side of SR 80, in the area of the County-owned parcel, approximately 0 to 56 feet of right-of-way would be required to accommodate the improvements. Right-of-way in this area consists of mostly underutilized parking areas for the County offices and existing hotel. On the south side of SR 80, between Gem Lake Drive and Lang Road, approximately 12 to 28 feet of additional right-of-way is needed. Parcels affected include one commercial property and three vacant parcels. Between Lang Road and the I-95 west ramp intersection, approximately 0 to 7 feet of right-of-way is required from two residential properties but would not result in any relocations.

### **c. Purpose and Need**

The purpose of this study is to enhance overall traffic operations at the existing interchange of I-95 and SR 80 by providing improvements to achieve acceptable Levels of Service (LOS) at the interchange in the future condition (2040 Design Year). Conditions along SR 80 are anticipated to deteriorate below acceptable LOS standards if no improvements occur by 2040; the interchange will have insufficient capacity to accommodate the projected travel demand.

The need for the project is based on the need to improve operational capacity, improve overall traffic operations in order to accommodate future growth and development, improve safety conditions, and enhance emergency evacuation and response times.

This project is anticipated to improve traffic operations at the I-95 and SR 80 interchange and study area roadways / intersections by implementing operational and capacity improvements to meet the future travel demand projected as a result of Palm Beach County population and employment growth.

Based upon the traffic operations analysis conducted for the I-95 at SR 80 interchange and adjacent signalized intersections [documented in the *I-95 (SR 9) Interchange at Southern Boulevard (SR 80) in Palm Beach County Interchange Concept Development Report*], the existing AM and PM peak hour traffic conditions for the four study intersections along SR 80 range from LOS A to D in the AM peak hour, and from LOS B to D in the PM peak hour. Without interchange improvements, the future year (2040) AM peak LOS will decline and range from B to F. PM peak hour LOS will range from C to F. Although all of the intersections along SR 80 operate at LOS D or better under existing conditions, it should be noted that several of the individual through and turning movements at the intersections (which include the I-95 on / off-ramp approaches) operate at LOS F during both the AM and PM peak periods. Without the proposed improvements, the intersections are projected to experience excessive delays and queuing, and operate below acceptable LOS standards by the 2040 Design Year.

Commercial retail / office, hotel and residential land uses are located adjacent to the interchange. Residential, hotel and commercial office uses are located along SR 80 west of I-95. Predominantly residential and industrial uses are located to the west of Gem Lake Drive, while residential and commercial uses are located to the east of I-95. According to the Future Land Use Maps for Palm Beach County, the project area is to remain relatively unchanged.

Population within the vicinity of the interchange is anticipated to increase by approximately 12% from 2005 to 2035 with the majority of the growth occurring southeast of the I-95 at SR 80 interchange. Employment is expected to increase by approximately 784% from 2005 to 2035 with major increases in the areas located and northeast and southwest of the interchange. These projections are based on data derived from the enhanced Southeast Regional Planning Model (SERPM) version 6.5, Managed Lanes Model (upgraded to include specific subarea improvements for the I-95 Interchange Master Plan). As such, the proposed improvements will be critical in supporting growth within the vicinity of the interchange and the overall vision of Palm Beach County.

The *I-95 (SR 9) Interchange at Southern Boulevard (SR 80) in Palm Beach County Interchange Concept Development Report* (ICDR), dated February 2014, included a safety analysis of the project area. The total number of crashes in the three-year period 2010 through 2012 was 119, with 31% of those being rear-end type crashes, the predominant type of incident. FDOT's high crash location reports, for the period 2010 through 2012, provide locations that have a higher crash rate as compared to crash rates

for similar statewide roadways. Based on FDOT’s 2011 high crash location report, the I-95 at SR 80 interchange is considered a high crash location.

The proposed improvements are anticipated to provide additional through and turn lanes, as well as interchange ramp improvements, to help reduce conflict points and the potential occurrence of collisions at the interchange.

I-95 and SR 80 serve as part of the emergency evacuation route network designated by the Florida Division of Emergency Management. Also designated by Palm Beach County as evacuation facilities, I-95 and SR 80 are critical in facilitating traffic flows during emergency evacuation periods as they connect other major arterials and highways of the state evacuation route network. This project is anticipated to improve emergency evacuation capabilities by enhancing connectivity and accessibility to I-95 and other major arterials designated on the state evacuation route network from the west and east, and increase the operational capacity of traffic that can be evacuated during an emergency event.

**d. Project Planning Consistency**

The proposed project is included in the Palm Beach County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) 2017 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) and the 2016 State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP). Funding for subsequent phases of project development, design, right-of-way and construction, are included in the Palm Beach MPO 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) under the Cost Feasible plan. This project is also listed as one of the County’s regionally significant projects. The FDOT has included this project on the list of SIS Cost Feasible improvements with funding identified for future phases of project development in the years 2021 through 2025.

Currently Adopted CFP-LRTP	COMMENTS				
Y	This project is included in the 2040 Palm Beach MPO LRTP, 2040 Cost Feasible Plan (CFP H-46).				
PHASE	Currently Approved TIP	Currently Approved STIP	TIP/STIP \$	TIP/STIP FY	COMMENTS*
Identify phase(s) being authorized (e.g., PE, ROW, and/or Construction)	Y	Y	\$116.1 mil / \$111.8 mil	<2017, 2017, >2020	Includes PD&E, Preliminary Engineering, Right-of-Way, Railroads & Utilities, and Construction

*\*See below for excerpts from current TIP/STIP/LRTP*



Palm Beach MPO Transportation Improvement Program - FY 2017 - 2021

Phase	Fund Source	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total	
I-95/SR-9 @ PGA BOULEVARD/CENTRAL BOULEVARD - Proj# 4132651					Length: 2.010 MI		*SIS*	
Type of Work: INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES					Lead Agency: FDOT			
Description: IMR - INTERCHANGE MODIFICATION REPORT IJR - INTERCHANGE JUSTIFICATION REPORT					LRTP#: Pages 112-116			
ROW	DIH	0	0	0	0	180,000	180,000	
ROW	DDR	0	0	0	0	10,337,067	10,337,067	
Total		0	0	0	0	10,517,067	10,517,067	
Prior Years Cost		4,159,053	Future Years Cost		91,246,136	Total Project Cost		105,922,256
I-95/SR-9 @ SOUTHERN BLVD/SR-80. INTERCHG. ULTIM. IMPRVMT. - Proj# 4355161					Length: 4.293 MI		*SIS*	
Type of Work: INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES					Lead Agency: FDOT			
					LRTP#: Pages 112-116			
PE	ACNP	0	0	0	0	7,625,000	7,625,000	
Total		0	0	0	0	7,625,000	7,625,000	
Prior Years Cost		2,521,465	Future Years Cost		105,914,902	Total Project Cost		116,061,367



=====

HIGHWAYS

=====

-----  
 ITEM NUMBER:435516 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SR-9/I-95 @ SR-80/SOUTHERN BLVD. INTERCHG. ULTIM. IMPRVMT. \*SIS\*  
 DISTRICT:04 COUNTY:PALM BEACH TYPE OF WORK:INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES  
 PROJECT LENGTH: 4.293MI

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2017	2017	2018	2019	2020	GREATER THAN 2020	ALL YEARS
FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER: <N/A>							
PHASE: P D & E / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT							
DI	2,501,949	0	0	0	0	0	2,501,949
DIH	20,425	9,090	0	0	0	0	29,515
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT							
ACNP	0	0	0	0	0	7,625,000	7,625,000
PHASE: RIGHT OF WAY / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT							
ACNP	0	0	0	0	0	7,648,322	7,648,322
PHASE: RAILROAD & UTILITIES / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT							
DI	0	0	0	0	0	14,375,000	14,375,000
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT							
ACNP	0	0	0	0	0	79,572,709	79,572,709
TOTAL <N/A>	2,522,374	9,090	0	0	0	109,221,031	111,752,495
TOTAL 435516 1	2,522,374	9,090	0	0	0	109,221,031	111,752,495
TOTAL Project:	2,522,374	9,090	0	0	0	109,221,031	111,752,495





**YEAR 2040 PALM BEACH LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN  
YEAR 2040 COST FEASIBLE PLAN - HIGHWAY AND TRANSIT/FREIGHT  
Adopted Palm Beach SIS and Turnpike Projects by Phase (In Millions of Dollars) - Phases I and II**

No.	Facility Name	From	To	Improvement	Interim Phase I Year 2020 Cost					Interim Phase II Year 2021-2025 Cost				
					Design Cost (\$YOE)	ROW Cost (\$YOE)	Construct Cost (\$YOE)	Vehicle Purchase (\$YOE)	Total Capital Cost (\$YOE)	Design Cost (\$YOE)	ROW Cost (\$YOE)	Construct Cost (\$YOE)	Vehicle Purchase (\$YOE)	Total Capital Cost (\$YOE)
<b>Proposed FDOT Funded Strategic Intermodal System Projects</b>														
H-9	I-95	@ Donald Ross Rd		Interchange Improvement										
H-25	I-95	@ Blue Heron Blvd		Interchange Improvement										
H-65	I-95	@ Linton Blvd		Interchange Improvement										
H-63	I-95	@ Atlantic Ave		Interchange Improvement										
H-69	I-95	@ Spanish River Blvd		New Interchange										
H-44	Southern Blvd/SR 80	W of Lion Country Safari	Crestwood/Forest Hill Blvd	Widen 4L to 6L										
H-6	SR 710	Martin/PBC Line	W of Indiantown Rd	Widen 2L to 4L										
H-1	SR 710	W of Indiantown Rd	W of Pratt Whitney Rd	Widen 2L to 4L										
H-29	SR 710	W of Congress Ave	W of Australian Ave	Widen 2L to 4L										
	SR 710	Australian Ave	Old Dixie Hwy	Widen 2L to 4L										
H-67	I-95	Broward/PBC Line	Linton Blvd	Add Managed Lanes			\$36,000		\$36,000					\$0,000
H-57	I-95	@ Gateway Blvd		Interchange Improvement		\$6,000			\$6,000	\$1,000		\$80,843		\$81,843
H-46	I-95	@ SR 80		Interchange Improvement					\$0,000	\$7,645	\$5,828	\$103,205		\$116,678
H-20	SR 710	Northlake Blvd	Blue Heron Blvd	Widen 4L to 6L					\$0,000		\$5,530	\$29,770		\$35,300
H-15	SR 710	PGA Blvd	Northlake Blvd	Widen 4L to 6L					\$0,000			\$63,291		\$63,291
H-14	I-95	@ Central Blvd or PGA Blvd		Interchange Improvement					\$0,000		\$55,441			\$55,441
H-58	I-95	@ Boynton Beach Blvd		Interchange Improvement					\$0,000		\$5,530			\$5,530
H-42	I-95	@ Palm Beach Lakes Blvd		Interchange Improvement					\$0,000	\$0,619				\$0,619
H-48	I-95	@ 10th Ave N		Interchange Improvement					\$0,000	\$0,619				\$0,619
H-52	I-95	@ 6th Ave S		Interchange Improvement					\$0,000	\$0,619				\$0,619
H-56	I-95	@ Hypoluxo Rd		Interchange Improvement					\$0,000	\$0,619				\$0,619
H-54	I-95	@ Lantana Rd		Interchange Improvement					\$0,000		\$0,619			\$0,619
H-4	I-95 Managed Lanes	Indiantown Rd	Martin/PBC Line	Add Managed Lanes					\$0,000	\$4,083				\$4,083
H-11	SR 710	W of Seminole Pratt Whitney Rd	PGA Blvd	Widen 4L to 6L					\$0,000	\$4,010				\$4,010
<b>Proposed Toll Funded Turnpike Projects</b>														
H-27	Turnpike Mainline	Okeechobee Blvd/Jag Rd (Mile Post 98)	PGA Blvd (Mile Post 109)	Widen 4L to 6L					\$0,000	\$29,624		\$266,614		\$296,238
H-45	Turnpike Mainline	Boynton Bch Blvd (Mile Post 86)	Okeechobee Blvd/Jag Rd (Mile Post 98)	Widen 4L to 6L					\$0,000	\$27,489		\$247,401		\$274,890
H-59	Turnpike Mainline	Broward/PBC Line (Mile Post 73)	Boynton Bch Blvd (Mile Post 86)	Widen 6L to 8L					\$0,000	\$29,780		\$268,018		\$297,798
H-55	Turnpike	@ Hypoluxo Rd		New Interchange					\$0,000					\$0,000
									<b>\$42,020</b>					
									<b>\$0,000</b>					
										<b>\$369,271</b>				
										<b>\$868,926</b>				



COST FEASIBLE PLAN STRATEGIC INTERMODAL SYSTEM & TURNPIKE						2020-2040 Total Capital Cost (Million\$)	2015-2019	2020	2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2040
Map No.	Facility Name	From	To	Improvement							
<b>Proposed Strategic Intermodal System Improvements</b>											
H-9	I-95	@ Donald Ross Rd		Interchange Improvement	Fully Funded <sup>1</sup>	✓*					
H-25	I-95	@ Blue Heron Blvd		Interchange Improvement	Fully Funded <sup>1</sup>	✓					
H-65	I-95	@ Linton Blvd		Interchange Improvement	Fully Funded <sup>1</sup>	✓					
H-64	I-95	@ Atlantic Ave		Interchange Improvement	Fully Funded <sup>1</sup>	✓					
H-69	I-95	@ Spanish River Blvd		New Interchange	Fully Funded <sup>1</sup>	✓+					
H-44	Southern Blvd/SR 80	L-8 Canal	Crestwood/Forest Hill Blvd	Widen 4L to 6L	Fully Funded <sup>1</sup>	✓					
H-1	SR 710	Martin/PBC Line	W of Indiantown Rd	Widen 2L to 4L	Fully Funded <sup>1</sup>	✓*					
H-6	SR 710	W of Indiantown Rd	W of Pratt Whitney Rd	Widen 2L to 4L	Fully Funded <sup>1</sup>	✓*					
H-29	SR-710	W of Congress Ave	W of Australian Ave	Widen 2L to 4L	Fully Funded <sup>1</sup>	✓					
	SR 710	Australian Ave	Old Dixie Hwy	Widen 2L to 4L	Fully Funded <sup>1</sup>	✓					
H-67	I-95 Managed Lanes	Broward/PBC Line	Linton Blvd	Add Managed Lanes	\$36.1	✓	✓	✓			
H-57	I-95	@ Gateway Blvd		Interchange Improvement	\$87.9		✓	✓			
H-46	I-95	@ SR 80		Interchange Improvement	\$116.7			✓			
H-20	SR 710	Northlake Blvd	Blue Heron Blvd	Widen 4L to 6L	\$35.3	✓		✓			
H-15	SR 710	PGA Blvd	Northlake Blvd	Widen 4L to 6L	\$63.3			✓			
H-14	I-95	@ Central Blvd or PGA Blvd		Interchange Improvement	\$86.7					✓	
H-58	I-95	@ Boynton Beach Blvd		Interchange Improvement	\$97.7					✓	
H-42	I-95	@ Palm Beach Lakes Blvd		Interchange Improvement	\$150.1					✓	
H-48	I-95	@ 10th Ave N		Interchange Improvement	\$53.3					✓	
H-52	I-95	@ 6th Ave S		Interchange Improvement	\$71.4					✓	
H-56	I-95	@ Hypoluxo Rd		Interchange Improvement	\$73.9					✓	
H-54	I-95	@ Lantana Rd		Interchange Improvement	\$86.7					✓	✓
H-4	I-95 Managed Lanes	Indiantown Rd	Martin/PBC Line	Add Managed Lanes	\$56.4						✓
H-11	SR 710	W of Seminole Pratt Whitney Rd	PGA Blvd	Widen 4L to 6L	\$59.6						✓
<b>Proposed Turnpike Improvements</b>											
H-27	Turnpike Mainline	Okeechobee Blvd/Jog Rd (Mile Post 98)	PGA Blvd (Mile Post 109)	Widen 4L to 6L	\$296.2			✓			
H-45	Turnpike Mainline	Boynton Bch Blvd (Mile Post 86)	Okeechobee Blvd/Jog Rd (Mile Post 98)	Widen 4L to 6L	\$274.9			✓			
H-59	Turnpike Mainline	Broward/PBC Line (Mile Post 73)	Boynton Bch Blvd (Mile Post 86)	Widen 6L to 8L	\$297.8			✓			
H-55	Turnpike	@ Hypoluxo Rd		New Interchange	\$113.1						✓

Note: Capital Cost includes Design, ROW, and Construction costs    † Construction commenced in FY 2014    \* Design Build contract awarded in FY 2014  
<sup>1</sup> Refer to the adopted 2015-2019 TIP for total project cost



**2. COOPERATING AGENCIES**

USACE    USCG    USFWS    EPA    NMFS    NONE

**3. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

Issues / Resources	Significant Impacts? *				Supporting Information**
	Y e s	N o	E n h a n c e	N o I m p a c t	
<b>A. SOCIAL &amp; ECONOMIC</b>					
1. Social	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>See PER Section 1.3.3, 2.19.11 &amp; 2.19.2 &amp; 6.19.7</u>
2. Economic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>See PER Sections 2.19.12 &amp; 7.4</u>
3. Land Use Changes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>N/A</u>
4. Mobility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>See PER Sections 1.3.4 &amp; 1.3.7</u>
5. Aesthetic Effects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>See PER Section 7.12</u>
6. Relocation Potential	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>See PER Section 7.4</u>
7. Farmland	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>N/A</u>
<b>B. CULTURAL</b>					
1. Section 4(f)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>See PER Section 2.19.1 &amp; 6.19.3</u>
2. Historic Sites/District	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>See PER Section 2.19.9 &amp; 6.19.4 &amp; CRAS</u>
3. Archeological Sites	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>N/A</u>
4. Recreational Areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>N/A</u>
<b>C. NATURAL</b>					
1. Wetlands and Other Surface Waters	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>See PER Section 2.19.4 &amp; NRE</u>
2. Aquatic Preserves and Outstanding FL Waters	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>N/A</u>
3. Water Quality and Water Quantity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>N/A</u>
5. Wild and Scenic Rivers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>N/A</u>
6. Floodplains	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>N/A</u>
7. Coastal Zone Consistency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>N/A</u>
8. Coastal Barrier Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>N/A</u>
9. Protected Species and Habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>See PER Section 2.19.5 &amp; NRE</u>
10. Essential Fish Habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>N/A</u>
<b>D. PHYSICAL</b>					
1. Highway Traffic Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>See PER Section 2.19.2 &amp; 7.14 &amp; NSR</u>
2. Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>See PER Section 7.15 &amp; AQM</u>
3. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>See PER Section 2.19.10 &amp; 6.19.5 &amp; CSER</u>



- |    |                          |                          |                                     |                          |                                     |   |
|----|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 4. | Utilities and Railroads  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <u>See PER Section 2.12 &amp; 2.14 &amp; 6.18 &amp; 7.8</u> |
| 5. | Construction             | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <u>See PER Section 6.19.6 &amp; 7.9</u>                     |
| 6. | Bicycles and Pedestrians | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <u>See PER Section 6.16 &amp; 7.7</u>                       |
| 7. | Navigation               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>N/A</u>  |
- a.  A USCG Permit IS NOT required.  
b.  A USCG Permit IS required.

- \* Significant Impacts?: Yes = Significant Impact; No = No Significant Impact; Enhance = Enhancement; NoInv = Issue absent, no involvement;
- \* Supporting information is documented in the referenced attachment(s).

**E. ANTICIPATED PERMITS**

- South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) - Environmental Resource Permit
- SFWMD Water Use Permit (construction dewatering)
- USACE – Section 404 Dredge and Fill (Standard or Nationwide)

**4. COMMITMENTS**

**Commitments**

The following text describes the commitments that the FDOT has made during the course of this PD&E Study.

1. Minor roadway improvements in front of the northern access point to Dreher Park on SR 80 consist of milling and resurfacing in front of the entrance. Every effort will be made to avoid any temporary closure of the entrance during construction. Should temporary impacts be unavoidable, the other access locations to the park will remain open, including the main access point on Summit Boulevard to the south and the pedestrian access location on the east side of the park.
2. FDOT is committed to reevaluate noise barrier locations and feasible noise abatement measures during the final design process. A commitment to construct feasible and reasonable noise barriers will be contingent upon the following conditions:
  - Detailed noise reevaluation during the final design process establishes the need for abatement;
  - Detailed noise barrier analysis indicates that the cost of the barriers will not exceed the cost reasonableness criteria;
  - Community input regarding desires, types, heights, and locations of barriers is received by the FDOT and supports the construction of noise barriers;
  - Preferences regarding compatibility with adjacent land uses, particularly as expressed by officials having jurisdiction over such lands, have been addressed;
  - Safety and engineering aspects related to roadway users and adjacent property owners have been reviewed and any conflicts or issues resolved; and

- Any other mitigating circumstances revealed during final design have been analyzed and resolved.
- 3. Prior to the advancement of future project phases, FDOT will coordinate with the county and municipalities to ensure the project is consistent with each local government's comprehensive plan.
- 4. FDOT agrees to follow the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) *Standard Protection Measures for the Eastern Indigo Snake* (the current version at the time of construction) during implementation of the project, and Technical Special Provisions will be incorporated into the contractor's bid documents.
- 5. FDOT will determine if there are any active wood stork breeding colonies within a determined distance of the proposed improvements at the time the Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) application is submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). If the proposed improvements are determined to be within the core foraging area of any active wood stork breeding colony, any wetlands impacted will be replaced within the core foraging area of the active wood stork breeding colony. If the replacement of wetlands within the core foraging area is not practicable, the FDOT will coordinate with the USFWS to identify acceptable wetland compensation outside the core foraging area, such as purchasing wetland credits from a "USFWS Approved" mitigation bank or permittee-responsible mitigation area.
- 6. Upon locating a dead wood stork specimen, initial immediate notification will be made to the nearest Service Law Enforcement Office (Address: 10426 NW 31st Terrace, Miami, FL 33172, 305-526-2695). Secondary notification will be made to the FFWCC; South Region (Address: 8535 Northlake Boulevard, West Palm Beach, FL 33412, 561-625-5122). Care will be taken in handling any dead specimens of proposed or listed species found in the project area to preserve the specimen or its remains in the best possible state. In conjunction with the preservation of any dead specimens, the finder has the responsibility to ensure evidence intrinsic to determining the cause of death of the specimen is not unnecessarily disturbed. The finding of dead specimens does not imply enforcement proceedings pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 as amended. The reporting of dead specimens is required to enable the Service to determine if take is reached or exceeded and to ensure the terms and conditions are appropriate and effective.
- 7. A preconstruction survey for gopher tortoises and burrowing owls will be performed prior to construction. If tortoises, burrowing owls and/or their burrows are found within proposed impact areas, coordination with the FFWCC will be initiated.
- 8. Modifications to the existing drainage systems are sufficient to accommodate the stormwater treatment and attenuation volumes associated with the additional impervious area from the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 4). Existing drainage systems shall be modified in substantial conformance with the Conceptual Drainage Report to avoid new ponds or right-of-way.

9. During final design, further refinements will be evaluated to minimize visual obstruction of the outdoor advertising sign located in the SW quadrant of the interchange in the Town of Cloud Lake.

### **Recommendation**

Based on the analysis of the environmental impacts, the engineering considerations, and public input received during the course of this study, the FDOT Preferred Alternative will be included in Appendix B of the Preliminary Engineering Report (PER) and is further detailed in Chapter 7 of that report.

## **5. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

1.  A public hearing is not required.
2.  A public hearing will be held on October 19, 2017. This draft document is publically available, and comments can be submitted to FDOT until Monday, October 30, 2017.

District Contact Information:      Mr. Anson Sonnett, P.E.  
Project Manager  
Florida Department of Transportation  
3400 West Commercial Boulevard  
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33309  
Phone: (954) 777-4474  
[anson.sonnett@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:anson.sonnett@dot.state.fl.us)

3.  A public hearing was held on (insert data of the hearing), and a transcript is available.
4.  An opportunity for a public hearing was afforded and was documented on (insert date).

**6. DISTRICT DETERMINATION**

*This project has been conducted without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability, or family status.*

\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_  
 FDOT Project Manager Date

\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_  
 FDOT Environmental Manager Date

**7. OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT CONCURRENCE**

Signature below constitutes Location and Design Concept Acceptance:

*The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by 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.*

\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_  
 Director of the Office of Environmental Management or Designee Date

**8. SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

The following table lists the technical reports that have been prepared for this PD&E Study.

Report Title	Abbreviation	Date	Comment
Efficient Transportation Decision Making Summary Report	ETDM	October 2016	Final
Interchange Modification Report	IMR	June 2017	Final
Contamination Screening Evaluation Report	CSER	June 2017	Final
Cultural Resources Assessment Summary	CRAS	March 2017	Final
Natural Resources Evaluation	NRE	May 2017	Final
Preliminary Drainage Report	PDR	June 2017	Final
Air Quality Technical Memorandum	AQTM	June 2017	Final
Noise Study Report	NSR	June 2017	Final
Value Engineering Report	VE Report	June 2017	Draft
Preliminary Engineering Report	PER	June 2017	Draft