

ATTACHMENT A ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS SUPPORTING INFORMATION

This evaluation was completed in accordance with the FDOT *Project Development and Environment Manual (PD&E Manual)*.

SECTION A – SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC

A1. SOCIAL

This project has been developed without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability, or family status. *Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VI)* states that no person shall, on the grounds of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, marital status, handicap or family status, be excluded from participation in, or be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subject to discrimination under any program of the federal, state or local government.

Documentation of the public involvement undertaken during this study is included in the *Comments and Coordination Report*. A blended public hearing (informal open house format combined with a time-specified formal hearing) for this project was held in two sessions at two locations. The two sessions were held on Tuesday, October 8, 2013 and Thursday October 10, 2013. A copy of the transcript from the 2013 public hearing (sessions 1 & 2) is included in the *Comments and Coordination Report*.

After changes were made to the Recommended Build Alternative presented at the 2013 public hearing, another public hearing was scheduled for October 4 and 6, 2016. Notices were distributed and advertisements were published. However the FDOT decided to postpone this public hearing when question over the bridge width was raised by a local elected official and the general public.

Changes were made to the Recommended Build Alternative. A second public hearing was held in two sessions on November 14 and 16, 2017 with a similar format as the 2013 public hearing. A copy of the transcript from the 2017 public hearing (sessions 1 & 2) is included as Attachment D. With the changes made to the Recommended Build Alternative as presented at the 2017 public hearing, no major opposition to the proposed bridge replacement has been expressed; therefore, there is minimal controversy potential for the replacement of the northbound HFB.

Implementing the Preferred Build Alternative does not result in any disproportionate adverse impacts to any distinct minority, ethnic, elderly, or handicapped groups and/or low-income households. Title VI information was made available at the public hearing for the project. *Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations*, signed by the President of February 11, 1994, directs federal agencies to take appropriate and necessary steps to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse effects of federal projects on the health or environment of minority and low-income populations to the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law. There will be no decrease in the number of general use lanes with the addition of express lanes, thus there will be no

disproportionate adverse impacts. This project is not expected to have any adverse or disproportionate impacts on minority or low-income households. Therefore, this category has been designated as NO.

A2. ECONOMIC

The proposed project would have modest positive economic effects related to the temporary jobs that would be created during the construction phase along with the secondary benefits to service-related businesses. Based on the TIGER 3 FAQ's at the US DOT Application Resources website, the US DOT estimates that there are 13,000 job-years created per \$1 billion dollars of government investment (or \$76,900 per job-year; previous guidance had stated that every \$92,000 of investment is equivalent to one job year). Based on a construction cost of \$785 million, construction of this project could result in approximately 10,200 job years of employment for the local economy. Improvements to I-275 with this proposed project will maintain access to freight activity centers in the area and facilitate the movement of freight in the greater Tampa Bay region. Movement of commuters with the addition of travel capacity through the express lanes will have a positive influence of reducing congestion and travel times. Therefore, this category has been designated as ENHANCED.

A3. LAND USE CHANGES

Existing land use along the project corridor was determined utilizing a variety of resources including the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI), the Natural Resources Conservation Service's (NRCS) Soil Surveys for Pinellas and Hillsborough Counties, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) topographical maps, recent aerial photographs, land use mapping from the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD, 2006), and field verification during site visits conducted within the project corridor. According to the Florida Land Use, Cover and Forms Classification System (FLUCCS) data from SWFWMD (2006), the entire causeway area on either end of the bridge is identified as Transportation (8100) with the exception of a small area on the north end identified as Beaches other than Swimming Beaches (7100). The areas beneath the bridge and adjacent to the causeway are classified as Bays and Estuaries (5400) – Old Tampa Bay. There are also areas classified as Seagrasses (9110). The seagrass areas are separated into two classifications, Seagrass – Patchy (9113) and Seagrass – Continuous (9116).

The project is located within open waters of Old Tampa Bay and FDOT transportation right of way. No changes in land use would occur if the proposed project is implemented. Therefore, this category has been designated as NO.

A4. MOBILITY

The project will include the addition of express lanes and a shared use path adjacent to the roadway and along the bridge within the I-275 right of way. The shared use path will enhance mobility by providing a new non-motorized vehicle connection between Pinellas and Hillsborough Counties. This will link travelers without motorized vehicles a way to access those areas on either side of Tampa Bay. Transit buses may use the express lanes. The express lanes will provide transit agencies a more reliable travel time for bus vehicles to use during all times, including peak periods. The express lanes are intended to

be congestion-priced toll lanes with the intention that they operate at a level of service C during peak commuter periods. Providing a more reliable travel time for transit vehicles, will provide an enhancement to the mobility of transit. Therefore, this category has been designated as ENHANCED.

SECTION B – CULTURAL

B1. SECTION 4(f)

The following evaluation was conducted pursuant to *23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 774*, Parks, Recreational Areas, Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuges, and Historic Sites.

The construction and maintenance of the proposed project including staging will occur within the existing interstate limited access ROW. Therefore, this project would not involve or have any adverse impacts on any Section 4(f) uses or resources. On February 20, 2014, the FHWA made the determination that the project will not impact Section 4(f) resources. Therefore, this category has been designated as NO.

B2. HISTORIC SITES / DISTRICTS

The following evaluation was conducted pursuant to *36 CFR Part 800, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act*.

A *Cultural Resources Assessment Survey (CRAS) Report* was prepared for the study and approved by FHWA on September 10, 2012, and concurred with by the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) on October 4, 2012. The SHPO concurrence letter is included in **Attachment E**. No archaeological field survey was conducted because the project Area of Potential Effect (APE) is comprised of manmade land and the bridge proper; however, a predictive model for underwater archaeological sites was prepared as part of this effort.

The historical field survey, conducted in January 2012, focused on the historical significance of Bridge No. 150107. Background research indicated an absence of previously recorded historic resources within the project APE, defined as the 800-foot wide existing limited access right-of-way, plus the immediate viewshed in the case of historical resources. Historical/architectural field survey resulted in the identification and evaluation of the Northbound Howard Frankland Bridge (No. 150107; FMSF No. 8PI12006/8HI11663). Built in 1959 and opened in 1960, the Howard Frankland Bridge was the last of three bridges built to span Tampa Bay and connect Pinellas and Hillsborough Counties. It is neither distinguished by its significant historical associations nor by its engineering or architectural design. As a result, 8PI12006/8HI11663 is considered ineligible for listing in the *National Register of Historic Places* (NRHP).

Thus, project development will have no involvement with any archaeological sites or historic resources which are listed, determined eligible, or considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. Therefore, this category has been designated as NO.

B3. ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

(See Section B2 above for more information.) This category has been designated as NO.

B4. RECREATION AREAS

There are no officially designated or delineated recreational areas on either the bridge or on the causeway approaches. Therefore, this category has been designated as NO.

SECTION C – NATURAL

C1. WETLANDS AND OTHER SURFACE WATERS

The following evaluation was conducted pursuant to the *Presidential Executive Order 11990* of 1977 as amended, entitled “Protection of Wetlands” and *the USDOT Order 5660.1A*, Preservation of the Nation's Wetlands.

GIS data from the ETDM screen summary report indicates there are 0.4 acres of continuous seagrass within the 100-foot buffer distance and 32.6 acres of continuous and 7.8 acres of discontinuous seagrass within the 200-foot buffer distance. Seagrasses were identified in shallow water adjacent to the existing causeway. No seagrasses or submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) was identified in the deep water habitat under or between the existing Howard Frankland Bridges. Vegetation along the causeways consists of mangroves, seagrapes, buttonwood, shoreline seapurslane, and seaside oxeeye.

The project involves open waters of Old Tampa Bay in Pinellas and Hillsborough Counties. No freshwater wetlands were identified within the project limits. Qualitative seagrass surveys were conducted in June 2011 and July 2013, to field verify the presence/absence of previously mapped seagrass beds as provided by the SWFWMD's 2010 and 2012 seagrass data. Qualitative and quantitative field surveys for seagrasses were conducted in September 2016 to the west of the existing southbound bridge. These surveys were conducted as part of the early permit coordination that is ongoing with the SWFWMD and USACE. Approximately 9.5 acres of seagrasses are anticipated to be impacted by implementation of the Preferred Build Alternative. Mitigation for impacts to seagrasses is anticipated using credits from the Old Tampa Bay Water Quality Improvement Project. If any changes are made during project implementation that may result in other mitigation options being utilized for proposed impacts to seagrasses, mitigation options will be further coordinated with the NMFS, USFWS and other appropriate agencies. Approximately 23.1 acres of fill impacts, including the approximately 9.5 acres of seagrass identified above, will result to waters of Old Tampa Bay by expansion of the existing causeway to accommodate the new bridge. Temporary water quality impacts from construction may occur to waters of Old Tampa Bay; however, best management practices (BMPs) will be utilized during construction. The permit submittal and approval process will be conducted with the U.S. Army Corps of

Engineers, Southwest Florida Water Management District and Tampa Port Authority during implementation of the project.

Wetlands Finding: Based upon the above considerations, it is determined that there is no practicable alternative to the proposed construction in wetlands and that the proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands which may result from such use.

Mitigation Statement: Wetland impacts which will result from the construction of this project will be mitigated pursuant to *Section 373.4137, F.S.*, to satisfy all mitigation requirements of Part IV of *Chapter 373, F.S.*, and *33 U.S.C. §1344*.

Therefore, this category has been designated as NO.

C2. AQUATIC PRESERVES AND OUTSTANDING FLORIDA WATERS

The project is located adjacent to portions of the Pinellas County Aquatic Preserve which is also an Outstanding Florida Water (OFW). This project will have no significant impact to the Aquatic Preserve. The FDOT will implement proper BMPs during construction to ensure there are no violations to water quality standards. Approximately 13.7 acres of fill will be placed within the Pinellas County side of Old Tampa Bay; however, the project will be located within the existing FDOT right-of-way. Therefore, this category has been designated as NO.

C3. WATER QUALITY AND WATER QUANTITY

The project is located adjacent to portions of the Pinellas County Aquatic Preserve which is also an OFW. The current list of 303(d) Verified List of Impaired Waters states that surrounding waters are listed for nutrients, fecal coliforms/bacteria, and mercury in fish.

Old Tampa Bay is designated as a Category 4b waterbody (impaired, but no TMDL required), based on the Integrated Reporting Classification of waterbodies. Old Tampa Bay does not currently meet water quality standards. The new bridge will be constructed to the west of the existing southbound bridge; however, the bridge will be wider to meet current standards and accommodate two express lanes in each direction.

The FDOT will implement proper BMPs during construction to ensure there are no violations to water quality standards. The project will utilize the Old Tampa Bay Water Quality Improvement Project to provide for water quality treatment. The permit submittal and approval process will be conducted with the Southwest Florida Water Management District during implementation of the project. Therefore, this category has been designated as NO.

C5. FLOODPLAINS

The following evaluation was conducted pursuant to *Executive Order 11988* of 1977, Floodplain Management.

This bridge replacement project is located in FEMA flood zone areas Zone A and Zone VE, a special flood hazard area inundated by 100-year flooding with velocity hazard (wave action) and where the base flood elevation has been determined to be 9 feet North American Vertical Datum (NAVD-1988). The only flooding that occurs now is due to infrequent tropical storms and hurricanes, due to the low elevation of the causeway approaches to the bridge. Based on the FDOT's floodplain categories, this project falls under Category 5: "projects on existing alignment involving replacement of drainage structures in heavily urbanized floodplains."

Floodplains Finding: Replacement drainage structures for this project are limited to hydraulically equivalent structures. The limitations to the hydraulic equivalency being proposed are basically due to restrictions imposed by geometrics of design, existing development, cost feasibility or practicability. An alternative encroachment location is not feasible since it defeats the project purpose or is economically unfeasible. Since flooding conditions in the project area are inherent in the topography, or are a result of other outside contributing sources, and there is no practical alternative to totally eradicating flood impacts or even reduce them in any significant amount, existing flooding will continue, but not be increased.

The proposed structure will be hydraulically equivalent or greater than the existing structure, and backwater surface elevations are not expected to increase. Thus, the project will not affect existing flood heights or floodplain limits. There will be no significant change in the potential for interruption or termination of emergency service or emergency evacuation routes.

Permitting will be conducted with the Southwest Florida Water Management District during the design-build phase. Therefore, this category has been designated as NO.

C6. COASTAL ZONE CONSISTENCY

As noted in the *ETDM Summary Report*, on April 6, 2012, the State of Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) determined that this project is consistent with the Florida Coastal Zone Management Program (FCMP). Based on the information contained in the AN and associated state agency comments, the state has no objections to allocation of federal funds for the subject project and, therefore, the funding award is consistent with the FCMP. The state's continued concurrence will be based on the activity's compliance with FCMP authorities, including federal and state monitoring of the activity to ensure its continued conformance, and the adequate resolution of any issues identified during subsequent regulatory reviews. Furthermore, the state's final concurrence of the project's consistency with the FCMP will be determined during the environmental permitting process in accordance with Section 373.428, Florida Statutes. Therefore, this category has been designated as NO.

C8. PROTECTED SPECIES AND HABITAT

The following evaluation was conducted pursuant to Section 7 of the *Endangered Species Act of 1973* as amended as well as other applicable federal and state laws protecting wildlife and habitat.

The project is not located within USFWS Critical Habitat for the manatee; however, waters just east of the project are located within a manatee protection area, categorized as a “slow speed” zone as per 68C-22.013(2)(d)3.b., F.A.C. The project is also located within the USFWS Consultation Area for the piping plover and within the core foraging area for three wood stork colonies. The majority of the bridge construction will occur over open salt water, which is providing habitat and feeding areas for several birds and aquatic life forms.

Federally-designated listed species assessed for this project include the following: Gulf sturgeon, smalltooth sawfish, West Indian manatee, swimming sea turtles (loggerhead, green turtle and Kemp’s Ridley), piping plover, wood stork, and red knot. State-designated listed species assessed for this project include the snowy plover, American oystercatcher, black skimmer, brown pelican, least tern, little blue heron, reddish egret, roseate spoonbill, snowy egret, tricolored heron, white ibis, and osprey. Additionally, review for the bald eagle, protected by the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668-668c) as amended, was also conducted. Since the start of the study, the following species are no longer listed: brown pelican, snowy egret, white ibis and osprey.

Field reviews for protected species and their suitable habitat were conducted within the project study limits. Field reviews were conducted in June 2011, July 2013, and September 2016, as well as other times throughout the project as new data suggested a need for field verification. Based on the findings obtained during the field survey efforts, four protected faunal species and no protected floral species were observed.

Agency coordination was conducted early as part of the ETDM final programming screen and Advance Notification review processes initiated in February 2012. The ETDM process was used to become aware of any issues noted by the commenting agencies. ETDM coordination was conducted with the USFWS, NMFS, FWC, and SWFWMD, amongst other agencies. Much of the coordination for potential species occurrence was conducted electronically utilizing databases from USFWS, FWC, SWFWMD and FNAI. In addition to comments received as part of the ETDM process, agency comments were received based on the initial findings provided in the Draft *Wetlands Evaluation and Biological Assessment Report* (WEBAR) [now known as a *Natural Resource Evaluation* (NRE)] and coordination was conducted throughout the PD&E study process. Comments were received for the 2013 Recommended Build Alternative from NMFS on October 11, 2013, USFWS on December 16, 2013, and FWC on October 30, 2013. Additional concurrence letters approving Draft WEBAR updates were received from USFWS and NMFS on September 30, 2015, and November 3, 2015, respectively.

After further evaluation in late 2015/early 2016, as documented in the *Preliminary Engineering Report*, it was determined that the west alignment was preferred since it would decrease complexity of construction, reduce construction time and reduce potential lane closures associated with maintenance of traffic compared to the previously proposed alignment. The west alignment was also chosen due to lower seagrass quality located on the west side of the HFB within Old Tampa Bay. The acreage of seagrass impacts was about the same for the west and east alignments (approximately 3 acres). An updated Draft WEBAR was sent to agencies for review through ETDM on September 13, 2016.

Correspondence/concurrence for this document update was received from USFWS, NMFS and FWC on October 13, 2016, September 22, 2016, and October 3, 2016, respectively.

Based on public response and comments in October 2016, it was decided to reconsider the proposed bridge replacement concept. The January 2017 Recommended Build Alternative included four 12-foot general use lanes (same as the existing bridges) and one 12-foot tolled express lane in each direction. The overall width of the bridge would be 131 feet. Demolition of the existing northbound bridge was still included as part of the new bridge construction. A coordination meeting was held with NMFS on June 19, 2017, and with USFWS on August 9, 2017, to discuss this proposed bridge alternative and typical section.

In October 2017, the bridge concept was changed, based on coordination with agencies and continued public outreach, to provide an additional express lane in each direction as well as the addition of a shared-use trail. A coordination meeting was held with NMFS on October 3, 2017 to discuss this proposed bridge alternative and typical section. The NRE was submitted to the agencies via ETDM in November 2017. The Department made an effect determination of No Involvement for designated Critical Habitat. The Department made a May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect determination for the Gulf sturgeon, smalltooth sawfish, West Indian manatee, swimming sea turtles (loggerhead, green turtle and Kemp's Ridley), piping plover, wood stork, and red knot. The Department made a May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect determination for the snowy plover, American oystercatcher, black skimmer, least tern, little blue heron, reddish egret, roseate spoonbill, and tricolored heron. The Department made a No Effect determination for the bald eagle.

Concurrence was received from USFWS on November 30, 2017 and from FWC through ETDM on December 12, 2017. Comments were received from NMFS in December 2017, and a coordination meeting was held on January 12, 2018. Based on the meeting, a response email was sent to NMFS on January 17, 2018, with a response received on January 18, 2018 agreeing to consult with NMFS during design as stated in the Commitments section. Based on coordination with NMFS, a contingency plan for the loss of seagrass will be needed in case the success of the Old Tampa Bay Water Quality Improvement Project is not achieved. All agency coordination can be found in **Attachment E**. Therefore, this category has been designated as NO.

C9. ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT

The following evaluation was conducted pursuant to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976.

Estuarine and marine habitats of Old Tampa Bay exist within and adjacent to the project corridor on the east and west side of the Causeway and below the existing bridges. These habitats include seagrasses located at various areas on the east and west side of the Causeway on both the south and north end of the Howard Frankland Bridge. It is anticipated the Preferred Build Alternative will result in approximately 9.5 acres of impacts to seagrasses. Mitigation proposed includes use of the Old Tampa Bay Water Quality Improvement Project. A contingency plan for the loss of seagrass will be needed in

case the success of the Old Tampa Bay Water Quality Improvement Project is not achieved. If any changes are made during project implementation that may result in other mitigation options being utilized for proposed impacts to seagrasses, mitigation options will be further coordinated with the NMFS, USFWS and other appropriate agencies. Therefore, this category has been designated as NO.

Consultation will be re-initiated during the design phase once pile driving requirements are known (quantity, size, location, etc.). The potential need for blasting associated with the removal of the existing northbound bridge will be determined by the contractor selected to construct the design-build project and this is addressed in the commitments included earlier. No blasting is proposed at this time. Additional surveys would be conducted during the seagrass growing season prior to construction to establish seagrass limits and determine the extent of seagrass impacts.

SECTION D – PHYSICAL

D2. AIR QUALITY

The following evaluation was conducted in accordance with the *Clean Air Act* of 1967.

The project is located in areas which are designated as attainment for all of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards under the criteria provided in the Clean Air Act. Therefore, the Clean Air Act conformity requirements do not apply to the project.

The project is expected to improve traffic flow through the addition of two express lanes in each direction of travel, which should reduce operational greenhouse gas emissions.

Therefore, this category has been designated as NO.

D3. CONTAMINATION

After reviewing data obtained from Environmental Data Resources (EDR), regulatory site lists, land uses and an on-site field review conducted within the project area, there were no facilities of concern identified within 500 feet of the proposed project, which includes Brownfield locations, Hazardous Waste Facilities, Petroleum Contamination Monitoring Sites, Storage Tank Contamination Monitoring, Superfund Act Risk Sources, Super Act Wells and Toxic Release Inventory Sites.

The existing northbound Howard Frankland Bridge was constructed in the late 1950's and was open to traffic in early 1960. The original bridge plans indicate the beams were to be set on resilient pads, but the plans did not indicate that the resilient pads included asbestos-containing materials (ACMs); however, based on the date the bridge was constructed, it is likely that ACMs were used. Many of the bearing pads have been replaced with non-ACM products as part of previous rehabilitation projects. The ACM survey report from 2005 indicated no ACM was identified on the existing northbound bridge. Therefore, this category has been designated as NO.

D4. UTILITIES AND RAILROADS

The only utilities found to be on or near (within 1,000 feet) of the bridge include buried electric power and the FDOT's existing/planned Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) facilities. In addition to buried electric lines, a small house-like electric load center is located on the south side of the causeway, near each end of the bridge. These load centers provide power for the street lighting on the existing bridges. The ITS facilities include dynamic message signs (DMS), closed-circuit television (CCTV) and detectors, in addition to related conduit, fiber and power. CCTV's are installed at approximately one-mile intervals, DMS as required, usually before every interchange and detectors at ½-mile intervals. Additional ITS projects are planned near the Kennedy/Airport off ramp and the Memorial on-ramp and on I-275 southbound from Ashley (approximately) to the Airport interchange. In addition, Highway advisory radio (HAR) facilities are being installed.

Implementation of the project will require adjustment of these facilities. Since the project will require the relocation of some utilities, the project is expected to have minimal involvement with utilities. Therefore, this category has been designated as NO.

D5. CONSTRUCTION

The Preferred Build Alternative for the planned northbound Howard Frankland Bridge replacement is located west of the existing southbound bridge. A previously proposed build alternative was shown at the project's prior public hearing held on October 8, 2013 and on October 10, 2013. It included constructing the revised bridge between the two existing bridges. After further evaluation, it was determined that the revised Preferred Build Alternative would decrease complexity of construction, reduce construction time and decrease potential lane closures associated with maintenance of traffic over the previously proposed build alternative.

A U.S. Coast Guard permit is required for construction of the new bridge structure which will address construction activities related to Tampa Bay boaters. During the ETDM programming screen review, the Coast Guard noted that a bridge permit would be required. Navigational access is anticipated to remain available at all times during the project's construction phase. Further coordination will be conducted with the USFWS and NMFS during the permit submittal and review process to determine specific requirements for protection of marine species during construction. Therefore, this category has been designated as NO.

D6. BICYCLES AND PEDESTRIANS

The Preferred Alternative includes adding a 12 foot wide shared use path on the new bridge and along the causeway on either ends of the new bridge within the project limits. This path will be separated from the travel lanes by barrier wall for safety of the bicyclists and pedestrians so they will not have direct access to the highway. The FDOT is in coordination with local agencies on both sides of Tampa Bay on the connection of this shared use path to existing or future facilities. The FDOT will also coordinate with these local agencies on any other feature of the shared use path. By adding this path to

the project, mobility and connectivity for pedestrians and bicycles is enhanced throughout the Tampa Bay Region. Therefore, this category has been designated as ENHANCED.

D7. NAVIGATION

The project is located within waters that are considered to be navigable, tidal waters of the United States. The project is located within Old Tampa Bay which is a navigable waterway that is bridged by the Howard Frankland Bridge. The project is located within tidal waters accessible by commercial and recreational vessels. At a minimum, the new bridge will be constructed to meet or exceed the vertical clearance of the existing southbound bridge, which is approximately 49 feet above MHW. The existing horizontal clearance at the channel span of 75 feet will be maintained with the construction of the planned northbound bridge. In a September 23, 2016 letter, the USCG indicated they will be a cooperating agency on the project in accordance with 40 CFR 1501.6. Coordination was conducted with USCG during the development of the project. The USCG concurred with the vertical clearance of the proposed bridge in an email dated August 24, 2015, and again through ETDM on December 4, 2017, as documented in **Attachment E**. The horizontal placement of the piers/pile bents for the proposed northbound bridge will be aligned with the existing southbound bridge, to the maximum extent practicable, to avoid a potential increased hazard to navigation. A USCG permit is required for construction of the bridge structure which will address construction activities related to Tampa Bay boaters. Navigational access is anticipated to remain open at all times during the project's construction phase. Further coordination will be conducted with the USCG during the future project implementation phases. Therefore, this category has been designated as NO.