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I. GENERAL INFORMATION (originally approved document)
   a. Reevaluation Phase: ___Design Change___
   b. Document Type and Date of Approval: ___EA/FONSI July 13, 1988___
   c. Project Numbers: __256243 1__ __1851-108__
      (If applicable)  Financial Project  Federal Aid
   d. Project Local Name, Location and Limits: ___SR 52 from US 19 to I-75, Pasco County, FL___
   e. Segments of Highway Being Advanced: ___From the Suncoast Parkway to I-75___
   f. Name of Analyst(s): ___Gabor Farkasfalvy___

II. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The above environmental document has been reevaluated as required by 23 CFR 771 or the Project Development and Environment Manual of the FDOT, and it was determined that no substantial changes have occurred in the social, economic, or environmental effects of the proposed action that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment. Therefore, the original Administrative Action remains valid.

It is recommended that the project identified herein be advanced to the next phase of project development.

REVIEWER SIGNATURE BLOCK

_________________________________________  ___/___/___
District Environmental Manager  Date

III. FHWA CONCURRENCE BLOCK

_________________________________________  ___/___/___
Federal Highway Administration, Division Administrator  Date
IV. CHANGES IN IMPACT STATUS OR DOCUMENT COMPLIANCE

A. SOCIAL IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Land Use Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relocation Potential</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Attachment A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Community Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Title VI Considerations</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Controversy Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Utilities and Railroads</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Attachment A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. CULTURAL IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Section 4(f) Lands</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Historic Sites / Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Archaeological Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Recreation Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pedestrian / Bicycle Facilities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Attachment A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Wetlands</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Attachment A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aquatic Preserves</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Outstanding Florida Waters</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Wild and Scenic Rivers</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Floodplains</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Attachment A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Coastal Zone Consistency</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Coastal Barrier Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Wildlife and Habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Farmlands</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Visual / Aesthetics</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. PHYSICAL IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Noise</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Air</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Construction</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Contamination</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Navigation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CORRIDOR PROJECTS STATUS UPDATE

The approved EA/FONSI was divided into the following projects:

1. Financial Project Number: 256316 1
   Federal Aid Project Number: 1851-108
   Project Limits: US 19 to Hicks Road, Hicks Road to Moon Lake Road
   Current Status: Roadway was upgraded from a two-lane to a six-lane facility.

2. Financial Project Number: 256322 1
   Federal Aid Project Number: 1851-108
   Project Limits: From Moon Lake Road to the Suncoast Parkway
   Current Status: Roadway is currently under construction from a two-lane to a six-lane facility.

3. Financial Project Number: 256243 1
   Federal Aid Project Number: 1851-108
   Project Limits: From the Suncoast Parkway to US 41.
   Current Status: This segment is the first of two segments being studied by this reevaluation, currently under design.

4. Financial Project Number: 256243 1N
   Federal Aid Project Number: 1851-108
   Project Limits: From US 41 to I-75
   Current Status: Design and Right-of-way acquisition in 5-year tentative work program

V. EVALUATION OF MAJOR DESIGN CHANGES AND REVISED DESIGN CRITERIA

Need for Project
Due to an increase in projected traffic and changes in future land use, a six-lane typical section is now required. This typical section will also ensure consistency with the proposed 2025 Long Range Transportation Plan. Existing traffic volumes range from, 14,450 Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) from US 41 to Bellamy Brothers Road, to 21,905 from the Suncoast Parkway to Shady Hills Road. By 2030, traffic is projected to increase to 23,790 AADT from Bellamy Brothers Road to Old Pasco Road and to 36,120 AADT between Shady Hills Road and US 41. Traffic volumes indicate the need for six lanes.

Typical Section
From the Suncoast Parkway to Shady Hills Road, the urban typical section provides a 46-foot median separating three 12-foot lanes for each direction of travel. Four-foot bike lanes will also be provided on each side of the facility. A 5-foot sidewalk will be provided along the south side of the roadway and a 12-foot multi-use path will be provided on the north side of the roadway. From Shady Hills Road to I-75, the rural typical section will provide a 46-foot median separating three 12-foot lanes for each direction of travel. Ten-foot shoulders of which five feet will be paved will be provided along each side of the facility would accommodate bicyclists. A 12-foot multi-use path will be provided on the north side of the roadway. The proposed typical sections are provided in Figure 1.
6-LANE URBAN - Suncoast Parkway to Shady Hills Road

6-LANE RURAL - Shady Hills Road to I-75
Alignment
The recommended alignment for the SR 52 project corridor was evaluated and compared to the 1988 PD&E Study alignment. Subsequent to the previous study, the current recommended alignment for the segment from the Suncoast Parkway to US 41 was adjusted or shifted in certain areas from the alignment proposed in that study. In the vicinity of the CSX Railroad, the alignment shifts to the south to avoid a potential contamination site. The original 1988 PD&E alignment was to the north. From approximately 3,400 feet west of Ehren Cutoff to I-75, the proposed alignment is shifted to the north. This keeps the proposed multi-use path on the north side of the roadway and prevents the path from having to cross SR 52 if the southerly shifted alignment from the 1988 PD&E was used. The proposed alignment is depicted on the concept plans provided in Appendix A.
VI. MITIGATION STATUS AND COMMITMENT COMPLIANCE

COMMITMENTS

1. Community Impacts—Sensitive Wildlife Species

Gopher tortoises occupy xeric community types with well drained soils within the proposed right-of-way. To lessen the impact to the tortoises in the area, a thorough field survey will be conducted prior to clearing activities. If numerous active burrows are found within the proposed right-of-way, a coordinated effort with the Florida Game and Freshwater Fish Commission (FGFWFC) (now known as the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FFWCC) will be made to relocate tortoises.

The Florida pine snake and short-tailed snake live in xeric communities and possibly within the project corridor. To lessen the impacts on the pine snake and the short-tailed snake, the contractor will be advised on the State of Florida’s listed status and the legal protection of these snakes. The contractor will be instructed prior to construction activities that any snakes encountered during construction must be relocated unharmed.

Status: This commitment is still valid and will be adhered to by the contractor during construction activities.

2. To minimize total wetland loss, selective clearing and grubbing will be implemented during construction.

Status: This commitment will be addressed in the project’s construction related contract and plans.

3. FDOT will continue to coordinate with the Southwest District office of DER and SWFWMD throughout the development of the project’s stormwater management plan to ensure that the final drainage design will be in compliance with Chapter 17-25, FAC, the Stormwater Rule.

Status: This commitment is still valid. The FDOT will continue its coordination with DEP (formally DER) and SWFWMD.

4. Drainage structures along SR 52 will be reevaluated during final drainage design.

Status: This commitment is still valid.

5. To minimize the unavoidable effects of right-of-way acquisition and displacement of people, FDOT will carry out a right-of-way and relocation program in accordance with Chapter 339.09, FS and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-646).

Status: This commitment is still valid.

6. All hazardous waste sites identified, as well as any additional sites, which become established or are discovered in the interim, will be assessed at each of the reevaluation phases. Prior to right-of-way acquisition, appropriate action will be taken to initiate resolution of contamination problems.
Status: Potential contamination sites were evaluated during this reevaluation. Contamination concerns will be addressed and are anticipated to be resolved prior to right-of-way acquisition.

7. Traffic flow will be maintained on the existing facility during construction. Access to all businesses and residences will be maintained.

Status: This commitment is still valid.

8. A copy of the final noise report will be sent to appropriate local officials for their use in zoning and set-back requirements.

Status: This commitment is still valid.

9. Early and close coordination will be initiated with utility companies prior to construction of relocated/renovated facilities.

Status: This commitment is still valid.

10. Accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians will be incorporated into the proposed SR 52 design. In the rural section (Moon Lake Road to I-75), 4 feet of the proposed 10-foot outside shoulder will be paved to accommodate bicycle traffic. Since the rural section is generally undeveloped, sidewalks were not included in this section.

Status: Accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians will be incorporated into the proposed SR 52 design. In the urban section, 4-foot bicycle lanes for each direction of travel, a 5-foot sidewalk on the south side of road and a 12-foot multi-use trail on the north side of the roadway are being provided. In the rural section, 5-foot paved shoulders will accommodate bicyclists and on each side of the roadway. The 12-foot multi-use trail on the north side of the roadway would continue through the rural section.

VI. PERMITS STATUS

All required permits will be obtained prior to the construction phase of the SR 52 six-lane widening.
ATTACHMENT “A”
Reevaluation of SR 52, from the Suncoast Parkway to I-75, Pasco County

A  SOCIAL IMPACTS

1. Land Use: No effect.

   Status: There has been no change in status.

2. Community Cohesion: No effect.

   Status: There has been no change in status.

3. Relocation Potential: The originally approved EA/FONSI listed four residential and six business relocations within the segment covered by this reevaluation.

   Status: The number of residential relocations would increase to 34. The number of business relocations would decrease to 5. The change in the number of estimated relocations was due to the amount of right-of-way needed for the additional travel lanes and corresponding wider right-of-way width.

4. Community Services: No churches, schools or other community services were listed as being affected in the EA/FONSI by the proposed improvements.

   Status: There has been no change in status.

5. Title VI Consideration: The approved EA/FONSI stated that this project has been developed in accordance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended by the Civil Rights Act of 1968.

   Status: There has been no change in status.

6. Controversy Potential: Minimal impacts. The approved EA/FONSI stated that a public involvement plan was developed as an integral part of this project. A public information workshop was held on June 19, 1986 and was attended by 156 people, including nine public officials. Participants were generally in favor of the upgrading. No controversial comments were received. A public hearing was held on Tuesday, December 15, 1987 at which time representatives from local, county, and state agencies, along with residents were asked to review and comment on the proposed improvements. Approximately 138 persons attended the Hearing. No substantial objections were voiced by the general public at the public hearing.

   Status: A formal Public Hearing will be held for this project.
7. **Utilities and Railroads**: The approved EA/FONSI indicated that there are numerous utilities within the project corridor. A CSX railroad line crosses SR 52 approximately 1 mile west of US 41. The Withlacoochee River Electrical Cooperative (WREC) operates an electrical transmission line along the south side of SR 52 from just east of US 41 to Bellamy Brothers Road.

**Status**: There have been no changes to the railroad. In the segment from the Suncoast Parkway to Kent Grove Drive, a new, major gas line has been constructed on the south side of the roadway. The alignment will not impact the gas line. The proposed alignment of SR 52 would require that the WREC electrical transmission line be relocated from its beginning to the vicinity of Ehren Cutoff.

B. **CULTURAL IMPACTS**

1. **Section 4(f) Lands**: No effect.

**Status**: There has been no change in status.

2. **Historic Sites/Districts**: A Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS) was performed to locate and identify any cultural resources within the project Area of Potential Effect (APE) and to assess their significance in terms of eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The CRAS was sent to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) of the Department of Historical Resources for review and comment. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), after consultation with the SHPO, has determined that no resources are listed, or eligible for listing on the NRHP.

**Status**: Background research and historical/architectural field survey indicated that 18 historic resources, including 14 previously recorded buildings and four newly recorded resources (8PA2406-2408), are located within the historical APE. Of the previously recorded resources, one historic residence (8PA1716) has been demolished, and five (8PA1349-1353) have already been determined not eligible for listing in the NRHP by the SHPO. None of the previously or newly recorded resources appear to be potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP, given the lack of significant historical associations and commonality of type for the region. There has been no change in status.

3. **Archaeological Sites**: The CRAS also identified any archaeological sites within the project impact zone and assessed their significance in terms of eligibility for listing in the NRHP. The CRAS was sent to the SHPO for review and comment. FHWA, after consultation with the SHPO, has determined that no resources are listed, or eligible for listing on the NRHP.

**Status**: The archaeological survey resulted in the discovery of one new lithic scatter type site (8PA2409). No evidence of previously recorded sites 8PA1344 and 8PA1345 was found within the existing and proposed right-of-way. The newly recorded Lake Pierce Site (8PA2409), evidenced by a small amount of lithic debitage, is a common type for the region. No diagnostic tool forms nor buried features or distinctive concentrations of cultural materials were found. The site is viewed as a limited activity campsite, and the period of site use/occupation is unknown. While this site has yielded locational information of importance to regional settlement patterns studies, continued investigation is not believed to have the potential to yield additional data of significance to regional or state prehistory or history. Thus, 8PA2409 is not considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP, and no additional work is recommended. Previously recorded site 8PA2069, the Old Pasco Road, also is located, in part, within the SR 52 project APE. It was evaluated by the SHPO as ineligible for listing in the NRHP. There has been no change in status.
4. **Recreation Areas**: No effect.

**Status**: There has been no change in status.

5. **Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities**: The proposed rural typical section in the FONSI would not provide for pedestrians. Four feet of the 10-foot shoulder would be paved to accommodate bicyclists.

**Status**: Accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians will be incorporated into the proposed SR 52 design. In the urban section, 4-foot bicycle lanes for each direction of travel and a 5-foot sidewalk on the south side of road are being provided as well as a 12-foot multi-use trail on the north side of the roadway. In the rural section, 5-foot shoulders would accommodate bicyclists and on each side of the roadway. The 12-foot multi-use trail would continue through the rural section on the north side of the roadway. The current design provides an improvement in the pedestrian and bicycle facilities proposed by the original study.

C. **NATURAL ENVIRONMENT**

1. **Wetland Impacts**: In accordance with Executive Order 11990, a Wetland Evaluation Technique (WET 2.1) analysis was conducted to assess wetland functions and values. The project will be designed to minimize wetland impacts to the greatest degree possible. Also, in accordance with FDOT’s Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction, all Best Management Practices (BMP) will be adhered to during the construction phase of the project. Since the EA/FONSI did not divide the project into segments, a comparison of wetland impacts between the original proposed action and that currently being proposed cannot be accomplished.

**Status**: Wetlands will be impacted by the proposed SR 52 improvements. Impacts will occur to freshwater marshes, isolated freshwater swamps, and forested sloughs. The estimated wetland impacts resulting from the improvements will be roughly 57.58 acres. These numbers were generated from the conceptual aerials. Assuming the project is mitigated through F.S. 373.4137, the 2006/2007 mitigation cost per acre of wetland impact is $90,219.

2. **Aquatic Preserves**: No effect.

**Status**: There has been no change in status.

3. **Water Quality**: The approved EA/FONSI indicated that a stormwater facility would include, at a minimum, the water quality requirements for water quality impacts as required by the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) Rules 40D-4 and 40D-40. Therefore no further mitigation will be required. Stormwater will be treated as required by the SWFWMD.

**Status**: There has been no change in status.
4. **Outstanding Florida Waters:** No effect.

**Status:** There has been no change in status.

5. **Wild and Scenic Rivers:** No effect.

**Status:** There has been no change in status.

6. **Floodplains Impacts:** Floodplains delineated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) within the project corridor were evaluated in accordance with Executive Order 11988, FHWA Program Manual (FHPM) 6-7-3(2), Paragraph 7, as well as Chapter 24 of the FDOT PD&E Manual. It was determined that there is no practical alternative to construction within the floodplain. There will be no longitudinal encroachments of involvement with any designated floodways.

**Status:** The increase in right-of-way required will increase floodplain impacts. Impacts to the 100-year floodplain will be mitigated using the construction of floodplain compensation areas.

7. **Coastal Zone Consistency:** No impact

**Status:** In their response letter to the Advance Notification for the project the Department of Community Affairs stated that the Department of Environmental Protection notes that the project appears to be consistent with its authorities in the Florida Coastal Management Program.

8. **Coastal Barrier Islands:** No effect.

**Status:** There has been no change in status.

9. **Wildlife and Habitat:** In compliance with the Endangered Species Act of 1973 and amendments thereto, the proposed improvements were evaluated for impacts of floral and faunal species classified by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) as threatened or endangered. It was determined by FHWA, after consultation with FWS, that the project as proposed would have no effect on any threatened or endangered species.

**Status:** The project corridor was surveyed for the presence of listed threatened or endangered species by staff biologists. Appropriate survey methodologies were employed in the various habitats present along the study corridor. The results of the surveys indicated that no federally protected threatened or endangered species would be adversely affected by the proposed improvements. Coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will be initiated prior to the permitting phase and a no effect determination is anticipated.

10. **Farmlands:** No effect.

**Status:** There has been no change in status.
11. **Visual/Aesthetics**: No impact

**Status**: There has been no change in status.

**D. PHYSICAL IMPACTS**

1. **Noise Impacts**: The build alternative noise levels were predicted to approach or exceed the FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) at 10 residences situated south of SR 52, from west of Kent Grove Road to west of US 41. It was determined that the placement of a noise barrier was not cost reasonable.

**Status**: The design year (2030) Build Alternative noise levels are predicted to approach or exceed the FHWA NAC at 10 residences adjacent to SR 52 from Kent Grove Drive to US 41. The feasibility and reasonableness of noise barriers were evaluated for these residences. Results from the noise barrier analyses indicate that barriers would not provide the minimum required reduction in traffic noise at a cost below the cost reasonableness criteria. Therefore, there appears to be no apparent solutions available to mitigate the traffic noise at the 10 residences.

2. **Air Quality**: In accordance with 23 CFR 770, an assessment of the probable impact of the proposed action on local air quality was conducted. The results of the air quality analysis indicated that the proposed action will not result in a violation of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

**Status**: In accordance with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 and Part 2, Chapter 16 of the FDOT PD&E Manual, an air quality analysis was conducted to determine whether project-related motor vehicle emissions will cause or contribute to an exceedance of National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for carbon monoxide (CO). Based on the FDOT’s air quality screening test, CO Screening Model 2.0.5 (August 2004), the proposed improvements will not cause the NAAQS for CO to be exceeded. Therefore, the proposed action will have a minimal effect on air quality. There has been no change in status.

3. **Construction**: The approved document addressed air, noise, water quality, maintenance of traffic, and community considerations associated with construction activity. The Department has agreed to minimize possible construction impacts by following BMP during the construction phase.

**Status**: There has been no change in status.

4. **Contamination**: The project was evaluated for potential hazardous waste involvement in the area where additional right-of-way will be taken. No large regionally important sites were found. Two sites were identified within the reevaluation segment with underground fuel tanks or other areas of known or possible contamination within the proposed right-of-way.

**Status**: The contamination screening reevaluation identified 21 sites within the study limits as possible having the potential for contamination. Of the 21, three were ranked high, and six were ranked medium. The Department will conduct further environmental assessments prior to the construction phase for these sites. There has been no change in status.

5. **Navigation**: No effect.

**Status**: There has been no change in status.
APPENDIX A

CONCEPT PLANS
- CURVE NO. 7
  D = 3° 00' 00"
  L = 505.13'
  R = 910.00'
  # = 0.077
  Design Speed = 60 MPH
EXIST R/W

CURVE NO. 12
D= 3° 30' 00"
L= 634.75'
R= 1637.00'
e= 0.087
Design Speed= 60 MPH

CONNERTON
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CONCEPT PLAN SHEET
SR 52 PD8E REEVALUATION
(Suncoast Pkwy to I-75)

PRELIMINARY