

**Florida Department of Transportation
PROJECT REEVALUATION FORM**

I. GENERAL INFORMATION (originally approved document)

- a. Reevaluation Phase: Design Change and Right of Way
- b. Document Type and Date of Approval: Categorical Exclusion Type 2, approved 03/29/2012
- c. Project Numbers:
- | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| Broward Co. PD&E | <u>N/A</u>
State | <u>N/A</u>
Federal Aid | <u>419343-1-22-01</u>
Financial Project | <u>N/A</u>
Work Program |
| Miami-Dade Co. PD&E | <u>N/A</u>
State | <u>N/A</u>
Federal Aid | <u>420669-1-22-01</u>
Financial Project | <u>N/A</u>
Work Program |
- d. Project Local Name, Location and Limits: SR 93/I-75 Express Lanes from NW 170th Street in Miami Dade County to the I-595 interchange in Broward County.
- e. Segments of Highway Being Advanced: Two (2) roadway segments:
- Segment A – SR 93/I-75 Managed Lanes from NW 170th Street to South of Homestead Extension of Florida’s Turnpike (HEFT) (Miami-Dade County) (FAP No: 0754-180-I).
 - Segment B – SR 93/I-75 Managed Lanes from South of HEFT to South of Miramar Parkway (FM: 421707-8-52-01 Miami-Dade County, FAP No: 0754-179-I & 421707-3-52-01 Broward County, FAP No: 0754-178-I).
- f. Project Segment Planning Consistency (see next page)

Currently Adopted CFP-LRTP	421707-2-52-01 COMMENTS				
Y	Planning consistency was shown during the Construction Advertisement and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment reevaluation for Segments A and B, approved on November 4, 2013. However, as part of the Design-Build (D-B) Firm's Alternative Technical Concept, Right-of-Way (R/W) acquisition is required for this segment. Therefore, the R/W phase is needed. The D-B Firm provided FDOT with the money for the R/W acquisition; FDOT did not request any additional funding for the R/W acquisition. In coordination with Office of Policy Planning and Federal-Aid Office it was determined that no State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) amendment was needed for the R/W phase. This phase is funded by local funds (LF).				
PHASE	Currently Approved TIP	Currently Approved STIP	TIP/STIP \$	TIP/STIP FY	COMMENTS
Right of Way	Yes	Yes	2,841,000/---,--- 2,841,000/---,---	2015 Total	An amendment to the TIP was approved by the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) on October 23, 2014 to add funding to the R/W Phase. In coordination with Office of Policy Planning and Federal-Aid Office it was determined that no STIP amendment was needed for the R/W phase. This phase is funded by LF.

Currently Adopted CFP-LRTP	421707-8-52-01 COMMENTS	
Y	Planning consistency was shown during the Construction Advertisement and TIP Amendment reevaluation for Segments A and B, approved on November 4, 2013.	

Currently Adopted CFP-LRTP	421707-3-52-01 COMMENTS	
Y	Planning consistency was shown during the Construction Advertisement and TIP Amendment reevaluation for Segments A and B, approved on November 4, 2013.	

g. Name of Analyst(s): Jamie Patterson-Brady, P.G., Environmental Specialist; Brook Wolfe, Sr. Environmental Scientist, PL&EM Consultant (Stantec)

II. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The above environmental document has been reevaluated as required by 23 CFR 771 or the Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Manual of the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). Through the reevaluation, it was determined that no substantial changes have occurred to the social, economic, or environmental impacts 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 Planning and Environmental Engineer 2/2/2015
Date

III. FHWA (or Lead Federal Agency) CONCURRENCE BLOCK



for Federal Highway Administration, Division Administrator 3/3/2015
Date

IV. CHANGES IN IMPACT STATUS OR DOCUMENT COMPLIANCE

	YES / NO		COMMENTS
A. SOCIAL IMPACTS			
1. Land Use Changes	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
2. Community Cohesion	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
3. Relocation Potential	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
4. Community Services	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
5. Title VI Consideration	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
6. Controversy Potential	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
7. Utilities & Railroads	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
B. CULTURAL IMPACTS			
1. Section 4(f) Lands	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
2. Historic Sites/Districts	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
3. Archaeological Sites	[]	[X]	<u>See Section B.3</u>
4. Recreation Areas	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
5. Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
C. NATURAL ENVIRONMENT			
1. Wetlands	[X]	[]	<u>See Section C.1</u>
2. Aquatic Preserves	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
3. Water Quality	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
4. Outstanding Florida Waters	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
5. Wild and Scenic Rivers	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
6. Floodplains	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
7. Coastal Zone Consistency	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
8. Coastal Barrier Islands	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
9. Wildlife and Habitat	[X]	[]	<u>See Section C.9</u>
10. Essential Fish Habitat	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
11. Farmlands	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
12. Visual/Aesthetics	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
D. PHYSICAL IMPACTS			
1. Noise	[X]	[]	<u>See Section D.1</u>
2. Air	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
3. Construction	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>
4. Contamination	[]	[X]	<u>See Section D.4</u>
5. Navigation	[]	[X]	<u>No Change</u>

V. EVALUATION OF MAJOR DESIGN CHANGES AND REVISED DESIGN CRITERIA (e.g., Typical Section Changes, Alignment Shifts, Right of Way Changes, Bridge to Box Culvert, Drainage Requirements, Revised Design Standards).

The Categorical Exclusion Type 2 (CatEx II) document for this project was approved on March 29, 2012. Completed reevaluations for the corridor or segments of the corridor include:

- March 6, 2013 - original Design Change and Construction Advertisement reevaluation for the PD&E study, advancing Segments B and E;
- April 24, 2013 - reevaluation of the corridor-wide SIMR which operationally removed two loop ramps in the NE quadrant of the I-75 and HEFT interchange. This revision was incorporated into the RFP concept design.
- August 23, 2013 - Construction Advertisement reevaluation for Segment C;
- September 20, 2013 - Construction Advertisement reevaluation for Segment D;
- November 4, 2013 - Construction Advertisement and TIP Amendment reevaluation for Segments A and B.

The overall project will add capacity to an 18-mile (mi) segment of I-75 from SR 826 (Palmetto Expressway) to I-595. This existing section of I-75 currently consists of 10 traffic lanes from north of Royal Palm Boulevard to just south of the I-595 interchange. The remainder of the existing corridor consists of eight (8) traffic lanes. The project will add two (2) traffic lanes in each direction in the median of the existing northbound and southbound lanes. The additional traffic lanes will be variably tolled express lanes within the existing grass center median of the roadway. A center concrete median will be installed between the express lanes to separate all northbound traffic lanes from all southbound traffic lanes.

The purpose of the project is to relieve corridor congestion, improve mobility, accommodate planned future growth and development in the region, and improve system connectivity between I-75, I-595, the Homestead Extension of Florida's Turnpike (HEFT), and SR 826. The project corridor is located in Broward County and Miami-Dade County, Florida (See Project Location Map in **Appendix A**).

This project reevaluation documents the two roadway segments (A and B) previously advanced for construction authorization (April 24, 2013) as a Design-Build (D-B) project in FDOT District 4. Planning consistency was shown during the Construction Advertisement and TIP Amendment reevaluation for Segments A and B, approved on November 4, 2013. However, as part of the Design-Build (D-B) Firm's Alternative Technical Concept, Right of Way (R/W) acquisition is required for 432707-2. Therefore, the R/W phase was been opened. The D-B Firm provided FDOT with the money for the R/W acquisition; FDOT did not request any additional funding for the R/W acquisition. In coordination with Office of Policy Planning and Federal-Aid Office it was determined that no STIP amendment was needed for the R/W phase. This phase is funded by local funds (LF). An amendment to the TIP was approved by the MPO on October 23, 2014 to add funding to the R/W Phase. These segments are consistent with the Broward County and Miami-Dade County Metropolitan Planning Organizations' (MPO) 2014/2015 - 2017/2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

This project reevaluation also documents the major design changes and commitment status updates since the originally approved CatEx II. The following section describes the major design changes between the originally approved PD&E study / RFP concept and the Alternative Technical Concept proposed by the D-B Firm. Essentially, all originally proposed traffic movements are provided in the D-B Firm's proposed design but in a different interchange and highway configuration. The project limits remain the same. See **Appendix B** for graphics depicting the design changes.

1. Southbound (SB) HEFT to I-75 Ramp Configurations: Improvements to the system-to-system interchange of I-75 with the HEFT remain intact and all movements as planned in the concept design are provided. All improvements remain within the existing R/W. The arrangement of SB HEFT to I-75 ramps has been revised to include the following modifications:

- a. The RFP concept proposed northbound (NB) ramp system between the SB HEFT and NB I-75 has been modified to remove the Collector-Distributor (C-D) road (RFP concept Ramp H-11) between the HEFT and Miramar Parkway. The modified ramp system combines the movement from SB HEFT to NB I-75 General Purpose (GP) (Ramp H-8) with the existing entrance ramp from NB HEFT to NB I-75 (Ramp H-2) into a 3-lane parallel entrance onto the I-75 mainline. South of this connection, traffic intending to enter the NB I-75 Express Lanes is split off (Ramp H-13) and directed under the existing NB HEFT flyover (Ramp H-2) and the NB I-75 GP Lanes into the median Express Lanes of I-75.
- b. This modification eliminates the NB I-75 braided ramp bridge from the HEFT to the Express Lanes (RFP concept Ramp H-13) by providing the above described underpass. It also eliminates any impacts to the existing Bass Creek Road overpass.
- c. As part of this modification, the SB HEFT to SB I-75 flyover ramp (Ramp H-7) is shifted entirely north of the HEFT mainline. This directs vehicles to a parallel entrance onto SB I-75 just north of the HEFT. Prior to the entrance to I-75, a slip ramp splits from the flyover to direct vehicles onto SB I-75 to Miami Gardens Drive (Ramp MGDUA3).

2. Southbound I-75 to HEFT Ramp Configurations: Improvements to the system-to-system interchange of I-75 with the HEFT remain intact and all movements as planned in the concept design are provided. The arrangement of SB I-75 ramps to the HEFT has been revised to include the following modifications:

- a. The RFP concept proposed SB ramp system and C-D road (RFP concept Ramp H-12) between the HEFT and I-75 have been modified to provide a single-point exit ramp for SB I-75 movements to NB (Ramp H-12) and SB HEFT (Ramp H-9), eliminating the need for a separate SB I-75 GP lanes exit ramp to SB HEFT. All HEFT movements will exit SB I-75 at a dual lane exit ramp (Ramp H-12) just south of Miramar Parkway. The unchanged SB I-75 braided ramp bridge from the Express Lanes (RFP concept Ramp H-4) adds a lane just south of the dual lane exit to form a 3-lane C-D road. The C-D road continues separated from the I-75 mainline until direct access ramps distribute vehicles to either SB HEFT with a slip ramp (Ramp H-9) or NB HEFT with an overpass and loop ramp (Ramp H-12). The movement to NB HEFT (Ramp H-12) is split off from the C-D system and directed to a proposed ramp bridge over the HEFT mainline followed by a loop ramp in the southwest quadrant of the I-75 and HEFT interchange. Ramp H-12 then passes under the I-75 mainline bridges to a parallel entrance onto NB HEFT.

- b. This modification eliminates the RFP concept design flyover bridge by adding a ramp bridge over the HEFT mainline (Ramp H-12); extending the I-75 mainline bridges over HEFT; and widening the existing SB I-75 mainline bridge over the HEFT.
- c. This modification eliminates the need for future additional construction for the SB I-75 Express Lanes connection to SB HEFT GP lanes (RFP concept Ramp HBD-12, by others). As part of the proposed C-D geometry, this movement will be constructed as a part of this proposed design.
- d. The loop ramp modification requires the acquisition of 4.016 acres of R/W in the southwest quadrant to accommodate the loop ramp. This R/W was included in the original RFP concept design and evaluated during the PD&E Study. The originally planned R/W acquisition included additional lands required for the future, western extension of Miami Gardens Drive, which is currently not programmed for design or construction. The R/W required for the loop ramp is undeveloped property adjacent to the existing limited access R/W for I-75. No businesses or residential units are being affected or displaced by this acquisition. Please see "Right of Way Comparison Map" in **Appendix C**.

3. Southbound I-75 at Miami Gardens Drive Ramp Configurations: Improvements to the service interchange of I-75 with Miami Gardens Drive remain intact and all movements as planned in the concept design are provided. The arrangement of I-75 ramps to Miami Gardens Drive has been adjusted to include the following modifications:

- a. The RFP concept proposed SB ramp system has been modified to resemble an urban, diamond interchange. Both exit (Ramp MGDUA3) and entrance (Ramp MGDUA1) ramps terminate at an elevated, signalized intersection just west of the Miami Gardens Drive bridge over the I-75 mainline.
- b. The SB I-75 exit to Miami Gardens Drive (Ramp MGDUA3) has been shifted to begin just north of the HEFT. SB I-75 to Miami Gardens Drive combines with vehicles from the SB HEFT (Ramp H-7) and continues to a proposed ramp bridge over the HEFT and a signalized intersection at Miami Gardens Drive (Ramp H-7 to MGDUA3). The expanded intersection provides three left turn lanes to eastbound (EB) Miami Gardens Drive and a single right turn lane to westbound (WB) Miami Gardens Drive on the ramp approach.
- c. The SB I-75 entrance from Miami Gardens Drive (MGDUA1) begins at the same signalized intersection. Three left turn lanes from WB Miami Gardens Drive and a single right turn lane from EB Miami Gardens Drive direct vehicles onto the 3-lane ramp typical section. Just south of the intersection, the ramp typical reduces to two lanes before reaching the dual lane, parallel entrance onto SB I-75. This movement is no longer combined with the SB HEFT to SB I-75 movement as in the RFP concept. In this design, the movements are two separate entrances with approximately 4,000 feet between gores.
- d. This modification eliminates the need for the RFP concept design for the ½ mile long, divided, western roadway extension of Miami Gardens Drive that accommodated the movements to and from I-75 and from the HEFT.
- e. This modification requires the acquisition of 2.564 acres of R/W in the southwest quadrant to accommodate Ramp MGDUA 1. This R/W was included in the original RFP concept design and evaluated during the PD&E Study. The originally planned R/W acquisition included additional lands required for the future, western extension of Miami Gardens

Drive, which is currently not programmed for design or construction. The R/W required for this ramp is undeveloped property adjacent to the existing limited access right of way for I-75. No businesses or residential units are being affected or displaced by this acquisition. Please see “Right of Way Comparison Map” in **Appendix C**.

As stated above, two loop ramps were removed during redesign efforts as a part of the SIMR reevaluation performed in April of 2013. The current design provides system to system direct connections for the proposed Express Lanes on I-75 and the HEFT and eliminates two loop ramps that provided connections from Miami Gardens Drive to and from the HEFT. The movements to and from Miami Gardens Drive carry relatively low volumes (240 – 500 vehicles in the peak hour) and have the lowest demand among all movements in the interchange. These movements primarily service traffic to and from Miami Gardens Drive and can be provided through other planned network improvements; namely the Gratigny Parkway West Extension to the HEFT and the future, proposed interchange at NW 170th Street and the HEFT. The potential interchange at NW 170th Street and the HEFT is not currently programmed.

VI. MITIGATION STATUS AND COMMITMENT COMPLIANCE

Mitigation Status

District 4 conducted an Invitation to Bid (ITB) to purchase freshwater wetland mitigation and wood stork Core Foraging Area (CFA) credits to offset impacts on the entire I-75 corridor including Segments A and B within District 6. To enable the wetland mitigation banks to provide competitive bids for impacts, the United States Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) and FDOT had agreed to a 0.3 WATER and M-WRAP functional assessment for all existing I-75 storm water management system wetlands. Only one mitigation bank, Loxahatchee Mitigation Bank, submitted a bid that was suitable to the project corridor impacts. The Department awarded the contract to the Loxahatchee Mitigation Bank for 65.22 freshwater herbaceous credits, which provides 78.26 kg of wood stork forage biomass. However Loxahatchee's Service Area covered only impacts on the northern portion of the corridor (Broward County). To address the remainder of the corridor, FDOT District 4 coordinated with the regulatory agencies and developed a second ITB using the linear rule to allow for a larger service area and therefore facilitating additional bank participation. The second ITB was awarded to Panther Island Mitigation Bank (17.32 freshwater herbaceous credits) and Bluefield Ranch Mitigation Bank (39.77 freshwater herbaceous credits). Purchase of the mitigation credits was finalized by October 2013 and allocated to the project segments. The purchase of any additional mitigation credits beyond what was anticipated by the Department for each segment is the responsibility of the D-B contractor.

Based on an evaluation of the design changes proposed by the D-B Firm, no additional mitigation is required for Segments A and B at this time. Summaries of the wetland and wood stork impact changes resulting from the design changes are included in **Sections VIII. Changes in Impact Status or Document Compliance C.1 Wetlands and C.2 Wildlife and Habitat.**

A teleconference was held on January 22, 2015 with FDOT, USACE, and USFWS. During this teleconference, USFWS confirmed that no further action is required at this time, as long as impacts remain below the thresholds provided in the Biological Opinion (BO) issued by USFWS. The USACE confirmed that a permit modification would be required. The USACE further requested that the permit modification be initiated at the end of the project to document all changes in one permit modification, rather than the potential for multiple permit modifications throughout the duration of the project. Please see **Appendix F** for the teleconference meeting minutes.

Commitment Compliance

The following commitments are listed in the March 2012 Project Development Summary Report (PDSR):

Traffic and Transportation

1. The sequence of construction will be planned in such a way that will minimize traffic delays along the corridor. This will be addressed as part of a traffic management plan that will be developed by FDOT and implemented by the contractor during construction. The plan will include traffic management and signage, access to local businesses and residences, detour routes, public notification and alternate routes, emergency services coordination, and project scheduling.

Status: As stated in the RFP, the D-B Firm procured for each project segment is responsible for developing and implementing a traffic management plan which minimizes traffic delays along the corridor. The plan must include traffic management and signage, access to local businesses and residences, detour routes, public notification and alternate routes, emergency services coordination, and project schedule.

The D-B Firm is in the process of preparing the traffic management plan for Segments A and B. However, it should be noted that Segments A and B will have no effects to businesses or residences, due to the nature of the project and the existing limited access R/W.

2. FDOT is committed to holding additional workshops, if necessary, to discuss tolling and potential changes in ingress/egress points to the express lane system.

Status: FDOT is committed to holding public information meetings on the express lane system ingress/egress points prior to construction activities concluding and toll specific information prior to setting toll rates for the project. Coordination is in progress with agencies and stakeholders for Segments A and B.

3. If FDOT advances the managed lane component, every effort will be made to facilitate an I-75 express bus service within the managed lane system.

Status: No change to this commitment.

4. Access to business, residents, institutions, and through traffic will be maintained to the maximum extent possible during project implementations.

Status: As stated in the RFP, the Design-Build Firm procured for each project segment is responsible for developing and implementing a traffic management plan which maintains access to businesses, residences, and institutions, and maintains through traffic to the maximum extent possible.

The D-B Firm is in the process of preparing the traffic management plan for Segments A and B. However, it should be noted that Segments A and B will have no effects to businesses or residences, due to the nature of the project and the existing limited access R/W.

5. FDOT will continue coordination meetings between FDOT District 4, FDOT District 6, the Florida Turnpike Enterprise and other entities as necessary during design and construction.

Status: FDOT maintains the commitment to coordinate with other entities as necessary, and continues to coordinate with FDOT District 4, FDOT District 6, the Florida Turnpike Enterprise, and other appropriate partners on the following topics, but not limited to:

- Incident management provisions,
- HEFT interchange design,
- System Interchange Modification Report (SIMR) operational analysis,

- **D-B segmentation and constructability,**
- **Tolling protocol for express lanes, and**
- **Reevaluation documentation.**

Traffic and Transportation - Broward County

6. FDOT will continue to coordinate with Broward County, City of Miramar, and City of Pembroke Pines, regarding the evaluation of the Pembroke Road overpass.

Status: During the I-75 PD&E process, the design of the proposed Pembroke Road Overpass was coordinated to ensure the necessary envelope for the ultimate I-75 improvements was accommodated. FDOT continues to coordinate on the implementation and schedule of the separate Pembroke Road Overpass and I-75 projects. FDOT and FHWA have approved an Air Rights Agreement with Broward County to allow the overpass construction. The Pembroke Road Overpass has independent utility from the I-75 Express Lanes project. FDOT has incorporated the portion of the overpass project that spans the I-75 limited access R/W into the Segment C project to avoid potential construction conflicts between the two projects. Roadway construction for the adjoining road to the overpass outside of FDOT R/W remains the responsibility of Broward County. The Pembroke Rd Overpass was not included as part of the I-75 PD&E Study CatEx II; however, a separate Programmatic Categorical Exclusion checklist was prepared to support the Air Rights Agreement.

7. During the final design phase, FDOT will evaluate the need for signal control for the eastbound to southbound right turn movement for the Griffin Road at I-75 entrance ramp, as requested by the Town of Southwest Ranches. If this movement can remain as a rural type movement (i.e., no signal control), then FDOT will make that change.

Status: The Griffin Road interchange is not located within Segments A or B, the subject of this reevaluation.

8. If Alternative B for express lane access (from future Pembroke Road overpass) is reconsidered at any point during the final design phase, FDOT will provide all interested stakeholders, including all municipalities, the opportunity to comment.

Status: The Pembroke Road overpass is not located within Segments A or B, the subject of this reevaluation.

9. FDOT will continue to work with the City of Pembroke Pines as it relates to the SW 145th Avenue alternative park-and-ride configuration for the southeast quadrant of I-75 at Pines Blvd.

Status: The park-and-ride at the southeast quadrant of I-75 at Pines Blvd is not located within Segments A or B, the subject of this reevaluation.

Noise

10. FDOT is committed to reevaluating all recommended noise barrier locations and limits (begin/end limits) 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 analysis during the final design process supports 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.

Status: FDOT has reevaluated the recommended noise barrier locations, begin/end limits, and feasible noise abatement measures for the segments being advanced. See Appendix D for a detailed status of each recommended noise barrier location.

11. FDOT is committed to constructing noise walls first to the extent possible.

Status: The D-B Firm for Segments A and B will be constructing the ground-mounted noise walls in the first phase of construction.

Wetlands – Broward County

12. FDOT will complete a final determination of impacts and assessment of mitigation requirements during the permitting and final design phase and will coordinate with the appropriate agencies as needed.

Status: FDOT submitted an Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) on July 10, 2012 to the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) which contains wetland impacts and mitigation requirements for the proposed conceptual corridor. The USACE and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) were both commenting agencies for the permit. Wetland impacts and mitigation requirements were finalized with permit approval which was issued on November 4, 2013.

Any changes to wetland impacts are reevaluated on an individual basis during the final design of each project segment. Based on an evaluation of the design changes proposed by the D-B Firm, no additional mitigation is required for Segments A and B. Summaries of the wetland and wood stork impact changes resulting from the design changes are included in Sections VIII. Changes in Impact Status or Document Compliance C.1 Wetlands and C.2 Wildlife and Habitat.

13. FDOT will compensate for wetland impacts either through the purchase of mitigation credits at the Florida Power and Light Everglades Mitigation Bank and/or through the creation of new stormwater facilities within the right-of-way of the I-75 project corridor.

STATUS: District 4 conducted an ITB to purchase freshwater wetland mitigation and wood stork CFA credits to offset impacts on the entire I-75 corridor including Segments A and B within District 6. To enable the mitigation banks to provide

competitive bids for impacts, the USACE and FDOT had agreed to a 0.3 WATER and M-WRAP functional assessment for all existing I-75 stormwater management system wetlands. Only one mitigation bank, Loxahatchee Mitigation Bank, submitted a bid that was suitable to the project corridor impacts. The Department awarded the contract to the Loxahatchee Mitigation Bank for 65.22 freshwater herbaceous credits, which provides 78.26 kg of wood stork forage biomass. However Loxahatchee's Service Area covered only impacts on the northern portion of the corridor (Broward County). To address this the remainder of the corridor, FDOT District 4 coordinated with the regulatory agencies and developed a second ITB using the linear rule to allow for a larger service area and therefore facilitating additional bank participation. The second ITB was awarded to Panther Island Mitigation Bank (17.32 freshwater herbaceous credits) and Bluefield Ranch Mitigation Bank (39.77 freshwater herbaceous credits). Purchase of the mitigation credits for the I-75 corridor was finalized by October 2013 and allocated to the project segments. Purchase of any additional credits needed above what was anticipated by the Department for each of the segments is the responsibility of the D-B Firm.

Based on an evaluation of the design changes proposed by the D-B Firm, no additional mitigation is required for Segments A and B. Summaries of the wetland and wood stork impact changes resulting from the design changes are included in Sections VIII. Changes in Impact Status or Document Compliance C.1 Wetlands and C.2 Wildlife and Habitat.

Wetlands - Miami-Dade County

14. FDOT will compensate for direct and secondary wetland impacts either through the purchase of mitigation credits at the Florida Power and Light Everglades Mitigation Bank and/or in the form of restoration projects on State and/or Federal lands and through the creation of new stormwater swales throughout the project areas.

Status: District 6 conducted an ITB for wetland and wood stork impacts and awarded to Everglades Mitigation Bank (4.26 freshwater herbaceous credits).

Relocations

15. If required, FDOT will carry out a R/W and relocation program in accordance with the Florida Statute 339-09 and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-646 as amended by Public Law 100-17).

Status: No relocations are required for this project.

Cultural Resources

16. The FDOT will inform FHWA, who will notify the federally recognized Tribes, if cultural resources that are potentially ancestral or historically relevant to the Tribes are inadvertently discovered during the construction process.

Status: No change to this commitment. The RFP specifies that the D-B Firm is required to notify the District 4 Cultural Resources Contract Manager if any potential

cultural resources are encountered. No additional impacts have been identified at this time.

Cultural Resources – Broward County

17. In regards to site 8BD3163 the following protection measures will be implemented:

- Fill will be placed over the existing ground surface within the boundaries of and in proximity to the site. The only proposed subsurface excavation will consist of the installation of a narrow retaining wall that will measure approximately 3 feet in width and will include the wall and associated footer. The retaining wall will extend to a maximum depth of 2 feet below the existing grade and will be within the previous fill area of the original I-75 construction.
- Prior to the initiation of the improvements, an Unanticipated Find Plan will be developed that outlines the procedures to be implemented in the event that cultural material or human remains are identified during the construction.
- A professional archaeologist will monitor the filling related activities within and adjacent to site 8BD3163 and the installation of the retaining wall. FDOT will notify the Seminole Tribe of Florida if cultural resources that are potentially ancestral or historically relevant to the Seminole Tribe are inadvertently discovered during the construction process.

Status: This commitment relates to archaeological sites that are not located within Segments A and B.

Cultural Resources – Miami-Dade County

18. In regards to site 8DA75 (located in the vicinity of the SR 826/Gratigny Parkway interchange), the following protection measures will be implemented:

FDOT shall also define an archaeological sensitive area around 8DA75 and implement the following conditions:

- Include this archaeological sensitive area on the construction plans and in the construction plan notes.
- The archaeological sensitive area will consist of a 25-foot buffer around the recorded location of site 8DA75, within which a professional archaeologist will monitor all subsurface activities.

FDOT also developed an avoidance alternative for the Miami Gardens Drive interchange, which relocates the proposed new ramps away from the defined boundaries of the National Register eligible archaeological sites (8DA1075, 8DA1080 and 8DA11875) located in proximity to the proposed interchange improvements. Drainage in the vicinity of the sites will be designed to divert water away from the sites in order to reduce the potential for inundation. Not only does this alternative avoid any direct impacts to any of the sites, indirect impacts are avoided by creating a buffer and restricting access to these sites. Additionally, new right-of-way that may be acquired will surround the boundaries of all three sites making them less vulnerable to vandalism and development by placing them on state owned land. This would afford a measure of protection not available for sites on private land, which are not necessarily subject to the same historic preservation regulatory requirements. In addition, the following protection measures will be implemented:

- FDOT shall coordinate with the State Archaeologist and Miami-Dade County Historic Preservation Office prior to the commencement of any activity within the area of the Miami Gardens Drive interchange Area of Potential Effect to develop a monitoring plan. The monitoring plan shall be submitted to the State Archaeologist for approval prior to any activity;
- Once a final design is completed, and prior to construction, FDOT shall develop a project-specific Unanticipated Finds Plan in the event that any archaeological remains are encountered. This will be included within the monitoring plan discussed above;
- Determinations made under the State of Florida Chapter 872 process will be integrated with the Section 106 process and requirements, under which FHWA is the lead agency. The provision of Chapter 872, F.S. shall apply in the event that human remains are identified;
- FDOT shall notify the construction contractor and work crew of these conditions prior to the commencement of any work. This notification shall take the form of contractor training by a professional archaeologist;
- FDOT shall ensure that no subsurface disturbance of any type takes place within the restricted areas. FDOT shall demarcate the sites and associated buffers by a chain link fence to be installed prior to construction commencement and marked with a "Restricted Area, No Access" sign. FDOT shall ensure that topography and elevation of the restricted areas is not altered;
- FDOT shall ensure that no parking, laydown, construction, work space, or storage takes place within the Restricted Areas;
- FDOT shall work with an archaeological monitor and the Contractor regarding the placement and storage of equipment and parking locations adjacent to the Restricted Areas;
- FDOT shall ensure that an archaeological monitor is present when any equipment within the storage and parking locations is initially set up, moved, or taken down adjacent to the Restricted Areas. The archaeological monitor shall work with the Department to monitor on a periodic basis and make recommendations for required activities, as may be warranted.
- FDOT shall notify the Florida Division of Historical Resources and Miami-Dade County Historic Preservation Office when work commences and ends;
- FDOT shall develop a permanent maintenance plan and coordinate maintenance activities on the property (associated with the Miami Gardens Drive Interchange) with the District Environmental Management Office to ensure that any such activities do not impact the Restricted Areas; and
- The State Archaeologist must review and approve any proposed plans that may impact the National Register eligible archaeological sites now or in the future, and the results of this review must be transferred with the property in the event of a sale or transfer of the property associated with the Miami Gardens Interchange.

Status: The initial part of this commitment, regarding 8DA75, relates to improvements that will not be constructed as part of Segments A and B. This part of the commitment was developed to ensure there would be no impact to cultural resources in the vicinity of the proposed work at the SR 826/Gratigny Parkway Interchange.

The remainder of the commitment was developed to ensure there would be no impact to National-eligible resources in the vicinity of the proposed connection to Miami Gardens Drive in the vicinity of archaeological sites 8DA1075, 8DA1080 and 8DA11875. It should be noted that, due to the D-B Firms' revised ramp geometry, these sites are located outside of the R/W and no impacts are anticipated. An Archaeological Monitoring and Unanticipated Finds Plan was prepared by the FDOT District 4 to recommend requirements for archaeological monitoring during construction activities associated with Segment A. Please refer to Appendix E for a copy of the plan and transmittal letter.

The plan defines the protocol for archaeological monitoring prior to and during construction activities within the project area to protect the previously recorded sites and outlines the procedures to follow in the event that human remains or significant archaeological deposits are encountered during project activities. All work will be conducted in compliance with Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966* (Public Law 89-655, as amended), as implemented by 36 CFR Part 800 (*Protection of Historic Properties*, as amended); Chapter 267, *Florida Statutes (F.S.)*; and Chapter 872.05, *F.S.* All work will be conducted by a professional archaeologist who meets the *Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards* (48 FR 44716).

A copy of the Archaeological Monitoring and Unanticipated Finds Plan was submitted to the FHWA, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and the Florida Division of Historical Resources (FDHR) for review in December 2014. Minor comments on the Monitoring Plan were received on January 28, 2015. Revisions addressing the comments are being processed at this time.

No National Register-eligible archaeological sites or historic resources were identified within Segment B.

Public Services and Utilities

19. FDOT will coordinate with all service providers, including emergency services, and utility providers during final design to ensure that access is maintained and alternate routes are developed.

Status: FDOT is coordinating with appropriate public and utility services to maintain services and minimize impacts to services. The following table summarizes coordination meetings on ITS, emergency and incident management coordination conducted to date.

Date	Stakeholders	Remarks
11/7/2011	Broward Traffic Incident Management (TIM) Meeting	Project presented and requested help from incident responders

Date	Stakeholders	Remarks
11/28/2011	FDOT D6 /Miami-Dade Fire Rescue and Hialeah Fire-Rescue	FDOT D6 initiated with Fire-Rescue on FDOT D6 project
11/30/2011	FDOT D4 Working group - All Incident Responders along project corridor	Davie, BSO, Pembroke Pines, Miramar, Miami-Dade Fire Rescue, towing company provided feedback for Design team to consider
1/4/2012	Broward TIM Meeting	Brief update and Coordination for overall project
3/7/2012	FDOT D4 / D6 TIM Meeting	Brief update and Coordination for overall project
6/27/2012	Broward TIM Meeting	Brief update and Coordination for overall project
6/29/2012	FDOT D6 SIRV / Sunguide	Coordination on possible staging and accident investigation for the system
7/13/2012	FDOT D4 SIRV / Road Rangers / Sunguide	Coordination on possible staging and accident investigation for the system
7/17/2012	FDOT D6 / MD Fire Rescue	Coordination on access on SR-826/I-75 bend
9/5/2012	FDOT D6 / D4 TIM Meeting	Brief update and Coordination for overall project
5/18/2012	Utility Kickoff Meeting	Project overview and roles/responsibilities presented to utility agency owners (UAO's) within the corridor
9/28/12	Utility Workshop	Discussion/confirmation of existing UAO facility locations and potential utility conflicts

The D-B Firm is currently coordinating with all involved public agencies and utilities on a regular basis to keep them aware of upcoming project activities.

Land Use

20. 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.

Status: No change to this commitment.

Wildlife and Habitat

FDOT is committed to the following measures in order to avoid and/or minimize impacts to federally listed species including the following:

21. FDOT will employ the most current version of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) *Standard Protection Measures for the Eastern Indigo Snake* to ensure that this species is not harmed during construction;

Status: No change to this commitment.

22. FDOT will employ the most current version of the USFWS special provisions for the protection of manatees during construction to ensure that no manatees are harmed;

Status: No change to this commitment.

23. Within one year from the date the original Biological Opinion (BO) was issued (March 23, 2012), the FDOT will provide the USFWS with a letter from a wetland mitigation bank acceptable to the Service confirming that at least 122.04 short-hydroperiod credits and 0.16 hydroperiod credits have been purchased;

Status: Modifications have been made to the project design since the original BO was issued by USFWS, resulting in a reduction of USACE permanent wetland impacts. A conservative estimate of 122.20 Suitable Foraging Habitat (SFH) credits needed to offset impacts associated with the project was initially provided to USFWS for the BO. This amount of SFH credits needed was based on the total wetland impacts calculated in the PD&E Wetland Evaluation Reports and was not based on the amount of kilograms of SFH biomass loss. The reduction of SFH credits is a result of using SFH biomass loss to calculate SFH credits needed for mitigation and is also due to the amount of wetland impacts that have been reduced by the replacement of storm water management systems within FDOT R/W. The BO was subsequently amended to require at least 58.17 kg of wood stork forage biomass from short-hydroperiod wetlands and 0.06 kg of wood stork forage biomass from long-hydroperiod wetlands from a wetland mitigation bank acceptable to the Service. In June 2013, FDOT finalized purchase of 65.22 federal freshwater herbaceous credits from the Loxahatchee Mitigation Bank. Consultation with USFWS continued throughout the purchasing process. The 65.22 Loxahatchee Mitigation Bank wetland credits equate to 78.26 kg of wood stork forage biomass, approximately 20.09 kg more than required by the amended BO.

A teleconference was held on January 22, 2015 with FDOT, USACE, and USFWS. During this teleconference, USFWS confirmed that no further action is required at this time, as long as impacts remain below the thresholds provided in the BO issued by USFWS. The USACE confirmed that a permit modification would be required. The USACE further requested that the permit modification be initiated at the end of the project to document all project changes in one permit modification, rather than the potential for multiple permit modifications throughout the duration of the project. Please see Appendix F for the teleconference meeting minutes.

24. Upon locating a dead wood stork specimen, initial immediate notification will be made to the nearest Service Law Enforcement Office (10426 Northwest 31 Terrace, Miami, Florida 33172; 305-526-2610). Secondary notification will be made to the FWC; South Region (8535 Northlake Boulevard, West Palm Beach, Florida 33412; 1-800-282-8002). 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 Act. 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.

Status: No change to this commitment.

25. FDOT will continue coordination with the USFWS for the wood stork during the final design/permitting phases of the project.

Status: On January 11, 2012, FHWA entered into Formal Section 7 Consultation with the USFWS regarding the wood stork. At the time this Formal Section 7 Consultation was conducted, the final impacts to the wood stork SFH within the existing stormwater management systems were unknown, as was the total area of wood stork SFH that would be replaced (offset) in the constructed stormwater management systems. On March 23, 2012, the USFWS issued a BO, and amended it on January 9, 2013 (see Appendix F) to specify that FDOT must purchase wetland credits from a USFWS-approved mitigation bank that would provide at least 58.17 kg of wood stork forage biomass from short-hydroperiod wetlands and 0.06 kg of wood stork forage biomass from long-hydroperiod. In June 2013, FDOT finalized purchase of 65.22 federal freshwater herbaceous credits from the Loxahatchee Mitigation Bank. These credits equate to 78.26 kg of wood stork forage biomass, approximately 20.09 kg more than required by the amended BO. Since the mitigation required to offset net impacts to the areas claimed as jurisdictional wetlands by the USACE exceeds the mitigation required to offset the final net impacts to wood stork SFH, no additional mitigation is required.

Based on an evaluation of the design changes proposed by the D-B Firm, no further coordination or additional mitigation is required for Segments A and B. Summaries of the wetland and wood stork impact changes resulting from the design changes are included in Sections VIII. Changes in Impact Status or Document Compliance C.1 Wetlands and C.2 Wildlife and Habitat.

A teleconference was held on January 22, 2015 with FDOT, USACE, and USFWS. During this teleconference, USFWS confirmed that no further action is required at this time, as long as impacts remain below the thresholds provided in the BO issued by USFWS. Please see Appendix F for the teleconference meeting minutes.

Contamination – Broward County

26. FDOT is committed to maintaining the following commitments in order to avoid and/or minimize impacts to contaminated sites:

- During the design phase, the need for Level II testing will be evaluated for all sites ranked as Medium or High risk.

Status: Level II contamination testing has been conducted at all Medium & High risk sites along the corridor with no significant impacts anticipated from the project construction.

- Sites ranked as Low Risk due to absence of any existing contamination and current regulatory compliance status regulatory records will be reassessed during the final design phase for potential contamination due to the type of facility and/or the presence of underground storage tanks.

Status: All Low Risk sites were reassessed with no impacts anticipated from the project construction.

- During final design, FDOT will survey existing bridges for asbestos containing materials;

Status: All bridges have been tested for asbestos containing materials.

- FDOT will adhere to the procedures set forth in FDOT's *Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction*, specifying the contractor's responsibilities in regard to encountering petroleum-contaminated soil and/or groundwater.

Status: There is no change to this commitment. FDOT will continue to evaluate the potential contamination impacts along the project corridor during the Design phase and develop remediation and management alternatives if the project design is unable to avoid any identified contaminated areas.

Contamination - Miami-Dade County

27. During final design, FDOT will survey existing bridges for asbestos containing materials.

Status: All bridges within the project with work which requires testing for ACMs have been tested.

28. FDOT will adhere to the procedures set forth in FDOT's *Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction*, specifying the contractor's responsibilities in regard to encountering petroleum-contaminated soil and/or groundwater.

Status: No change to this commitment

Reevaluation

In the event of a reevaluation, FDOT is committed to the following:

29. If the project advances through a Public-Private Partnership (P3), FDOT will take the lead in preparing the reevaluation for any P3 driven changes to the Recommended Alternative.

Status: FDOT will implement the Express Lanes using D-B procurement. As with this reevaluation, FDOT will take the lead in any National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) reevaluation, including reevaluations resulting from any D-B team's Alternate Technical Concepts to the Recommended Alternative. This is stated in the RFP.

VII. PERMITS STATUS

The project will require multiple permits from the federal, state, and local jurisdictional regulatory agencies. FDOT has identified a number of major regulatory permits that will be required for the project, including:

- USACE Section 404 and 408 Permits
Status: FDOT submitted the permit application for the Section 404 (Dredge and Fill) Permit and Section 408 Permit in July 2012. USACE issued Permit SAJ-2012-02239 (SP-GGL) on October 28, 2013. In the event that the D-B Firm modifies the permit design concept and the environmental impacts and mitigation requirements, the D-B

Firms procured for each segment will be responsible for modifying this permit under FDOT oversight.

A permit modification is in process for the design changes associated with Segments A and B.

- **FDEP NPDES Permit**
Status: The D-B Firm procured for each segment will be responsible for complying with the conditions of this permit under FDOT oversight, including but not limited to preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, Erosion Control Plan, and filing of a Notice of Intent.
- **SFWMD Individual (Conceptual) Environmental Resource Permit (ERP)**
Status: FDOT submitted the permit application for the conceptual permit to SFWMD in July 2012. SFWMD issued Permit No. 06-06776-P on November 4, 2013.
- **SFWMD Standard General ERP Modification(s)**
Status: The D-B Firm procured for each segment will be responsible for obtaining the applicable construction phase permits under FDOT oversight. In the event that the D-B Firm modifies the permit design concept and the environmental impacts and mitigation requirements, the D-B Firms procured for each segment will be responsible for modifying this permit under FDOT oversight.

A permit modification is in process for the design changes associated with Segments A and B.

- **SFWMD Standard General R/W Occupancy Permit(s)**
Status: FDOT submitted the permit applications to SFWMD in July 2012 to modify the existing Standard General R/W Occupancy Permits, for works within the SFWMD C-9 and C-11 canal rights-of-way. SFWMD approved these permits on January 8, 2013. In the event that the D-B Firm modifies the permit design concept, the D-B Firms procured for each segment will be responsible for modifying these permits under FDOT oversight.

A permit modification is in process for the design changes associated with Segments A and B.

- **SFWMD Water Use Permit for Dewatering**
Status: Master Dewatering Permit 06-06340-W was issued on September 12, 2011 for dewatering activities within District 4, as well as any dewatering activities in District 6 for Segments A and B. The D-B Firm procured for each segment is responsible for complying with the special conditions of the Master Dewatering Permit under FDOT oversight.
- **Local Drainage District Permits**
Status: In addition to the permits above, District 4 obtained conceptual permits with the local drainage districts (South Broward Drainage District (SBDD) and Central Broward Water Control District (CDWCD)). SBDD issued a Conceptual Permit on December 18, 2012. CBWCD issued a conceptual permit in 2013. The D-B Firm procured for each segment will be responsible for obtaining the applicable construction phase permits under FDOT oversight.

VIII. CHANGES IN IMPACT STATUS OR DOCUMENT COMPLIANCE

B.3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

Based on the original Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS) conducted in 2011, FHWA had determined that no archaeological sites listed or eligible for listing on the National Register would be adversely affected by the project and the SHPO concurred with this determination. The SHPO concurrence letter, dated May 10, 2011, is included within the Memo dated November 21, 2014 outlining the Archaeological Monitoring and Unanticipated Finds Plan for Segment A, in **Appendix E**.

The PD&E assessment revealed the presence of three previously recorded archaeological sites (8DA1075, 8DA1080, and 8DA11875) located within the APE, and within the proposed Miami Gardens Drive Interchange project (currently separate from Segment A and not included in this reevaluation), which are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

As part of the PD&E, FDOT committed to developing an Unanticipated Finds Plan that outlines the procedures to be implemented in the event that cultural material or human remains are identified during construction. An Archaeological Monitoring and Unanticipated Finds Plan was prepared, which recommend requirements for archaeological monitoring during construction activities associated with Segment A of the SR 93/I-75 Project in Miami-Dade County (FM 421707-2). The Plan is included in **Appendix E**.

As part of the 2015 DC/R/W Reevaluation process, FDOT conducted a cultural resource analysis of the D-B Firm's proposed design for the I-75 Express Lanes Segments A and B: Miami Gardens Interchange, Miami-Dade County, Florida. The objective was to identify any areas in the I-75 Express Lanes Segments A and B that were not covered within the APE of the *Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS) of the I-75 Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study from SR 826 (Palmetto Expressway) to North of Florida's Turnpike (HEFT)*, which was completed in 2010. A review of the APE established for the 2010 CRAS and the concept plans for Segments A and B indicated that a portion of the area to the northwest of Florida's Turnpike and east of I-75 is located outside of the 2010 APE (**see Appendix E, I-75 Express Lanes Segments A and B: Miami Gardens Interchange Cultural Resource Addendum, Figure 1**). A desktop analysis and archaeological reconnaissance survey of this area was conducted to identify and evaluate archaeological and historic resources in this area.

Background research identified no potential historic resources within the APE, which was confirmed by the field survey. No previously recorded archaeological sites were identified during the background research but the analysis of historic aerials identified a potential tree island within the project APE. Therefore, subsurface testing was conducted to determine whether any archaeological sites were present. Five shovel tests were excavated at 25-meter (82-foot) intervals in the location of the possible tree island. The soils identified in the shovel tests consisted of a black peat underlain by a dark brown peat or muck. Water was encountered at approximately 50 to 60 cm below the ground surface. No archaeological material was identified during the archaeological reconnaissance survey. The desktop analysis and archaeological reconnaissance survey were documented in an addendum to the CRAS of the I-75 PD&E Study from SR 826 (Palmetto Expressway) to North of Florida's Turnpike (HEFT), which is included in **Appendix E**.

During analysis for a separate project within District 6, the Miami-Dade County archaeologist provided the Department with new information regarding the potential location of 8DA1079 which suggested it was intersected by the ramp from I-75 NB to Miami Gardens Drive EB - adjacent to Pond MD5-2. A sedimentation pond is currently present in the location of MD5-2: there is a five-foot berm along the ramp and the USGS Opa-Locka Quad shows the area as a depression with a 5 foot contour. The Department and our cultural resource consultants reviewed the 1983 plans for I-75 showing the Miami Gardens Drive Interchange and revisited the historic aerials. The plans indicate that the area was low and wet and that that the area would have been harrowed, disked, or leveled during construction. The historic aerial review did not indicate any potential tree island in the location of Pond MD5-2. Based on this analysis, there does not appear to be any potential site within the location of Pond MD5-2.

C.1 WETLANDS

The I-75 project was anticipated to impact 381.79 acres of wetlands and swales within Miami Dade and Broward Counties at the time of the PD&E Study. Anticipated wetland impacts for Segments A through E were reduced during the conceptual permitting process to 308.49 acres. Approximately 127.28 acres of impacts were within Segments A and B, but these were offset by storm water management areas, resulting in a total impact area within Segments A and B of 110.64 acres. Wetland mitigation for Segments A through E of the I-75 corridor was addressed in 2013 by the purchase of 65.22 federal freshwater herbaceous credits from Loxahatchee Mitigation Bank and 39.77 federal freshwater herbaceous credits from Bluefield Ranch Mitigation Bank.

The D-B Firm's proposed design changes result in an initial total wetland impact area of 129.86 acres. However, these impacts are offset by the D-B Firm's proposed increase in storm water management systems. The D-B Firm's final design proposes two (2) dry retention ponds and a large wet detention pond, which offset 22.99 acres of impacts. The proposed wetland offset/creation reduces the D-B Firm's net wetland impact from 129.86 acres to 106.87 acres, which is a decrease of 3.77 acres from the conceptual net wetland impact of 110.64 acres. Please refer to **Appendix G** for a Wetland Impacts Summary Table and maps showing the locations of wetland impact changes.

In summary, the design changes in the Alternative Technical Concept proposed by the D-B Firm results in a 3.77 acre decrease in wetland impacts. Therefore, no additional mitigation is anticipated to be required in association with the D-B Firm's Alternative Technical Concept.

A teleconference was held on January 22, 2015 with FDOT, USACE, and USFWS. During this teleconference, USACE confirmed that a permit modification would be required. The USACE further requested that the permit modification be initiated at the end of the project to document all project segments in one permit modification, rather than the potential for multiple permit modifications throughout the duration of the project. Please see **Appendix F** for the teleconference meeting minutes.

C.9 WILDLIFE & HABITAT

On January 11, 2012, the Federal Highway Administration entered into Formal Section 7 Consultation with USFWS regarding the wood stork. At the time the Formal Section 7 Consultation was being conducted, the final impacts to the wood stork Suitable Foraging Habitat

(SFH) within the existing storm water management systems were unknown, as was the total area of wood stork SFH that would be replaced (offset) in the constructed storm water management systems. A conservative estimate of net SFH loss was provided to USFWS, with the intent of reducing the amount of net SFH loss as much as possible during the final design of the storm water management systems. On March 23, 2012, the USFWS issued a BO. In response to additional coordination, USFWS amended the BO on January 9, 2013 (**see Appendix F**). The amended BO specified that at least 58.17 kg of wood stork forage biomass from short-hydroperiod wetlands and 0.06 kg of wood stork forage biomass from long-hydroperiod wetlands from a wetland mitigation bank acceptable to the Service. In June 2013, FDOT finalized purchase of 65.22 federal freshwater herbaceous credits from the Loxahatchee Mitigation Bank. Consultation with USFWS continued throughout the purchasing process. The 65.22 wetland credits purchased from Loxahatchee Mitigation Bank equate to 78.26 kg of wood stork forage biomass, approximately 20.09 kg more than required by the amended BO and 27.00 kg more than conceptually permitted.

The D-B Firm's proposed design changes for Segments A and B were evaluated for changes in impacts to the wood stork. The D-B Firm's proposed design has a net wetland impact of 106.87 acres. However, this number calculates a 6.87 acre reduction for littoral shelves at a proposed wet detention pond. The USFWS does not consider created littoral zones as an offset to impacts to wood stork SFH. Therefore, the 6.87 acres of littoral zone created in the D-B Firm's proposed wet detention pond within wetland IW95 cannot be considered in the calculations of final impacts to wood stork SFH. The result is a net impact to wood stork SFH of 113.74 acres, which is an increase of 3.10 acres compared to the conceptually permitted impacts. An increase of 3.10 acres of impacts to wood stork SFH equates to an increase in forage biomass loss of 0.81 kg. Subtracting the D-B Firm's additional biomass loss (0.81 kg) from the Loxahatchee Mitigation Bank surplus (27.00 kg) already purchased, leaves a biomass surplus of 26.19 kg. Please refer to **Appendix F** for a Wood Stork Impacts Summary Table.

In summary, the design changes in the Alternative Technical Concept proposed by the D-B Firm increases wood stork SFH impacts by 3.10 acres/0.81 kg. The additional 0.81 kg of wood stork biomass loss brings the total biomass loss for the full I-75 project to 52.07 kg, which is both below the threshold of the amended BO (58.23 kg) and below the mitigation credits already purchased by FDOT (65.22 credits from Loxahatchee Mitigation Bank, which equates to 78.26 kg of biomass). Therefore, no additional mitigation or wood stork consultation is required in association with the D-B Firm's Alternative Technical Concept.

A teleconference was held on January 22, 2015 with FDOT, USACE, and USFWS. During this teleconference, USFWS confirmed that no further action is required at this time, as long as impacts remain below the thresholds provided in the BO issued by USFWS. Please see **Appendix F** for the teleconference meeting minutes.

D.1 NOISE

Five of the 17 locations where noise barriers were recommended for further consideration in the I-75 PD&E Study occur within Segments A and B. The five locations recommended for noise barriers are identified by Common Noise Environment (CNE) and include CNEs E4, I75-E5, I75-E6, HEFT-E1, and HEFT-W1. In addition, Segment B includes two existing shoulder mounted noise barriers (i.e., CNEs E1 and E2) that will be impacted by the project improvements and will be replaced with shoulder mounted noise barriers. These seven CNEs are located in the vicinity of the HEFT / I-75 interchange and the Miami Gardens Drive / I-75 interchange. The CNEs and

the associated community names are presented in the Sound Wall Revisions Table in **Appendix D**.

As part of the commitments made during the PD&E Study and the subsequent Reevaluations, the seven recommended noise barrier locations within Segments A and B were reevaluated during the final design process. The reevaluations of the reasonableness and feasibility of noise barriers at these locations were based on the latest design concepts which include all design changes since the March 6, 2013 Design Change and Construction Advertisement Reevaluation for the PD&E Study, advancing Segments B and E, and the November 4, 2013 Construction Advertisement and TIP Amendment Reevaluation for Segments A and B. As described in Section V, the current design provides system to system direct connections for the proposed Express Lanes on I-75 and the HEFT and eliminates two loop ramps that provided connections from Miami Gardens Drive to and from the HEFT. These loop ramps were operationally eliminated during the SIMR Reevaluation dated April 24, 2013. Consequently, the horizontal and vertical geometry of the I-75 ramps to / from the HEFT, Miami Gardens Drive, and the Express Lane Access points were modified. The results of this noise reevaluation indicate that the proposed design changes do not substantially affect the noise impacts, the cost, or effectiveness of the recommended noise barriers. Therefore, the project's impact determination of minimal, or non-significant, for the noise evaluation documented in the Categorical Exclusion Type 2 document, dated March 29, 2012, has not changed and remains valid. Noise barriers at these seven locations are all recommended for design and construction. However, as presented in Sound Wall Revisions Table (**see Appendix D**), the begin/end limits for five of the recommended noise barriers were modified to account for the current design concept. FDOT continues to be committed to the design and construction of feasible and reasonable noise abatement measures at these seven locations as identified during the PD&E Study and specified in the RFP Design and Construction Criteria for Segments A and B.

If necessary, during the design refinement process, FDOT will reevaluate the recommended noise barriers based on any proposed major design changes or substantial changes in land uses. In addition, as warranted, FDOT will solicit community input regarding desires, types, heights, and locations of any additional recommended noise barriers based on these changes.

D.4 CONTAMINATION

Level II contamination testing has been conducted at all sites along the corridor identified within the Contamination Screening Evaluation Report (CSER) as having a Medium or High risk rating, as well as drainage areas. Additionally, the corridor was re-assessed to identify any new Medium or High risk sites not identified during the PD&E Study, and to re-evaluate all sites listed as having a Low risk.

Level II testing has revealed contamination-impacted soil zones in the vicinity of Segment A and the northern portion of Segment B. The areas are identified, and recommendations for addressing the minor contamination have been provided to the Contractor in the Construction Reports and Soil Management Plans for Segments A and B. These areas are not anticipated to impact the project. However, special precautions for those working with potentially contaminated materials have been specified to the Contractor in a report including a Soil Management Plan, a set of contamination maps identifying the soil management areas and the no-dewatering areas on the project, and appropriate handling and disposal of any arsenic impacted soils.

All bridges within District 4 project limits have been tested for Asbestos Containing Materials

(ACM). No ACM was found on bridges within Segment A. ACM was identified in the Class V finishes on bridges 860320, 860327, and 860328 within Segment B. All bridges were concrete and did not merit testing for lead-based paint.