Appendix A: Project Meetings and Correspondence

MEETING SUMMARY

Final: 4/21/10

PROJECT: SR 87 Connector PD&E Study FPIDs: 4167483-22-01; 4167483-22-02; 4167484-22-01; and 4167484-22-02

ETDM: 12597

MEETING: Florida Department of Transportation D-3 (DOT), Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), Office of Greenways and Trails (OGT), Florida Division of State Lands (DSL), and the Florida Division of Forestry (DOF)

DATE/TIME: March 24, 2010; 10:30 AM

LOCATION: FDEP Douglas Building, OIP Conference Room # 953B

ATTENDEES:

FDOT/D3: Peggy Kelley	peggy.kelley@dot.state.fl.us
DEP/OIP: Lauren Milligan	lauren.milligan@dep.state.fl.us
DEP/OIP: Chris Stahl	chris.stahl@dep.state.fl.us
DEP/OGT: Rick Halvorsen	rick.halvorsen@dep.state.fl.us
DEP/OGT: Marsha Connell	marsha.connell@dep.state.fl.us
DOF: John Waldron	waldroj@doacs.state.fl.us
DOF: Dennis Hardin	hardind@doacs.state.fl.us
DSL: Gloria Barber	gloria.barber@dep.state.fl.us
DSL/OES: Marianne Gengenbach	Marianne.gengenbach@dep.state.fl.us
DSL: Tom Butler	tom.butler@dep.state.fl.us
DSL: Kime Landes	kime.landes@dep.state.fl.us
Metric: John Flora	jflora@metriceng.com

Purpose of Meeting: The DOT and Project Team arranged to meet with DEP and the DSL to discuss the environmental issues and the limitations on the State Lands and lands adjacent to the State Lands. It was due to these issues, DEP had red-flagged Corridor 3A, and the Northwest Florida Water Management District (NWFWMD) red-flagged Corridor 4. It was also the intent to familiarize the agencies with the efforts and intent of the Joint Planning Area (JPA) established by Santa Rosa County, the Naval Air Station Whiting Field, and the Nature Conservancy in the area of Corridor 3A.

Corridor 3 Discussion:

Mr. Flora provided and overview of the corridor location. He noted that DEP had red-flagged the corridor because the alignment had passed through one of the Florida Forever lands. He stated the Project Team had since adjusted the alignment to avoid the parcel and the revised alignment no longer went through any of the Florida Forever lands.

Mr. Stahl stated that the red-flagged would remain on the corridor because the alignment was in proximity of the Florida Forever lands, and it was passing through areas planned to be purchased by the State using Florida Forever Funds. He stated the target lands were high on the Programs target list.

Mr. Flora asked if it was possible to red-flag a corridor when the State did not even own the land.

Mr. Stahl stated that it was indeed possible.

Mr. Stahl added that it was possible because of the secondary impacts. He explained that the corridor would isolate, or "orphan" the smaller from the larger preserve areas. He also noted that because of the location, control burns would not be allowed on the smaller parcel, and DEP would consider that as a primary impact.

Ms. Milligan inquired about the Team Santa Rosa Joint Planning Area. She asked what the intent of the County was.

Mr. Flora explained the Joint Planning Area was between the County, Whiting Field Naval Air Station, and the Nature Conservancy. The intent of the JPA was to implement planning controls for the lands surrounding field, and to provide a buffer for Whiting Field. He stated part of the objective of the County was to secure the lands for environmental preservation, and the remainder areas would have land uses that were compatible with Whiting Field. He noted that it was always their intent to have a road up through the area to provide access to the compatible use lands and to the recreation facilities that were part of the Florida Forever lands. Mr. Flora noted that it did seem odd that DEP would not want a road through the area because it was his understanding the DOF desired to use the area as an off-road vehicle recreation area. Without a road, it may be difficult to get access to the property. Mr. Flora also noted that the County was under the impression that an easement conveyance would be part of the new purchase for a roadway to help connect with the new ATV recreational area that the DOF was supportive of. He also noted that the County thought they had an easement through the section of Florida Forever lands that was adjacent to the three parcels near Whiting Field that DEP had flagged in their dispute. The County gave Mr. Flora and Ms. Kelley a map showing the easement area they thought they had. This map was presented at the meeting to the agencies for their review.

Mr. Waldron did confirm that was the intent of DOF to provide a recreation area for ATVs on the protected Florida Forever lands.

Ms. Milligan asked if the County was unaware of the limitations on lands when purchased with Florida Forever funds.

Mr. Flora stated perhaps not, but on the other hand they may have understood but believed they were getting an easement through the area for a road.

Mr. Stahl stated that, given DEP's intent to provide a contiguous environmental belt that extended from Whiting Field to the Blackwater River State Forest through the proposed Wolfe Creek Forest Florida Forever lands, DEP would be opposed to a road traversing the area.

Ms. Milligan stated that she still felt it was necessary to meet with the County to see if they would be able to coordinate their intentions. She stated that it was extremely important that the County meet with Deborah Poppell and the DSL staff.

Ms. Barber agreed and stated that she would arrange for such a meeting.

Mr. Halvorsen stated that regardless of the corridor, he wanted to meet with the Project Team to see how coordination with the Blackwater River Heritage Trail would be accomplished.

Mr. Flora stated that the Project Team has a great deal experience in trail design and they would incorporate OGT in the design development process. He also noted, that with Corridor 3 the trail could be extended all the way north of Whiting Field to SR 87N, and would also help in completing the trail that is planned to circle Whiting Field.

Corridor 4 (The Southern Corridor) Discussion:

Mr. Flora explained that like Corridor 3, Corridor 4 had also been red-flagged. He noted that it had been red-flagged by the North West Florida Water Management District. Where the corridor crosses the river, it hits lands owned by the Water Management District, and those lands had been purchased with CARL funds, As such, similar limitations and restrictions associated with Florida Forever funds are apparently applicable.

Ms. Barber explained that was not always the case. She stated that it really depended on which set of funds were used, the timing of the purchase, and sometimes whether or not the bonds had been paid off. She stated that she would have her office look into the funding sources for these purchases. She did note, however, that DSL would still be opposed to the use of the lands, as the whole intent in the purchase was to protect the Blackwater River.

Mr. Flora asked that since the lands were barrier islands and linear in nature, might it be possible to develop a design that would clear span the islands.

Ms. Barber expressed concern that would only lead to putting more structure in the waterway itself, which would be discouraged, and to eliminate shadowing on the islands, the structure would have to be rather high. She said then you will be getting into aesthetics and community impact issues.

Ms. Milligan stated that though the Water Management District red-flagged Corridor 4, DEP also had considerable concerns about the corridor location.

Other Items:

Mr. Flora stated that he recognized the concerns associated with both red-flagged corridors. He stated the area is an area of unique concern because so much of the area was environmentally sensitive. He stated the Project Team was very deliberate is seeking the least invasive corridors for considerations. Mr. Flora stated that beyond these kinds of issues was the river crossing itself, which would be of significant concern.

Mr. Stahl stated that yes the river is a concern, but he said in looking at the Project Team's strategy it was apparent they you were looking at all the right things. He stated that the crossing selected for Corridors 1, 2, 3 was the best possible location. Mr. Stahl stated that the DEP was pretty comfortable with the location and would not have many issues. He said he understood the dire need for the

roadway, especially in light of the conditions at the US 90 bridge, and felt the new bridge location was very viable.

Follow-up Items:

Ms. Milligan stated that another meeting would be needed where the County could attend. She said that it was of critical importance that the County staff met with DSL and Deborah Poppell to get a better understanding of what the Florida Forever funds are about.

Ms. Barber stated she would work on getting the meeting set up for both DSL and DEP.

Mr. Stahl stated that it would probably not be possible to meet until early May because the Legislature had just gone into session. He noted that there was very little time for staff while session is going on.

Ms. Milligan and Ms. Barber requested that in the meantime, the Project Team put together a list of questions for DEP and DSL. They said that way they can be researching the answers in preparation of the next meeting.

Mr. Flora concurred.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:35 PM.

Metric Engineering will rely on these notes as the approved record of matters discussed and conclusions reached during this meeting unless you send the author written notice to the contrary within seven calendar days of receipt date of this meeting record.

Submitted by: John Flora, R.A., AICP
Transportation Planning/PD&E Regional Manager
Metric Engineering, Inc.

C: All attendees
Leigh Brooks, West Florida Water Management District
Nancy Model, Santa Rosa County
Randy Roy, Whiting Field Naval Air Station

MEETING SUMMARY

Final: 4/22/10

PROJECT: SR 87 Connector PD&E Study FPIDs: 4167483-22-01; 4167483-22-02; 4167484-22-01; and 4167484-22-02

ETDM: 12597

MEETING: Florida Department of Transportation D-3 (DOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)

DATE/TIME: March 25, 2010; 9:30 AM

LOCATION: FHWA, 545 John Knox Road, Suite 200,Tallahassee, FL 32303

ATTENDEES:

FHWA: George Hadley	george.hadley@fhwa.dot.gov
FHWA: Cathy Kendall	cathy.kendall@fhwa.dot.gov
FDOT: Brandon Bruner	joseph.bruner@dot.state.fl.us
FDOT: Peggy Kelley	peggy.kelley@dot.state.fl.us
Metric: John Flora	jflora@metriceng.com

Purpose of Meeting: For FHWA to make a determination on the projects Class of Action, and to review comments that were submitted by the ETAT members.

Ms. Kelley started the discussion by providing an overview of the project kick-off meetings that had been conducted. She noted meetings had been held with the Santa Rosa County Commission, the Milton City Council, and the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization. Ms. Kelley stated the public kick-off meeting had been held on Tuesday, March 23rd in the City of Milton. She stated that there was a strong turnout for the meeting and people expressed a lot of interest.

Mr. Flora provided and overview of the corridor locations. He noted that two of the corridors had been red-flagged. DEP had red-flagged the Corridor 3A because the alignment had passed through one of the Florida Forever lands. He stated the Project Team had since adjusted the alignment to avoid the parcel and the revised alignment no longer went through any of the Florida Forever lands. He explained that DEP stated that the red-flagged would remain on the corridor because the alignment was in proximity of the Florida Forever lands, and it was passing through areas planned to be purchased by the State using Florida Forever Funds. He stated the target lands were high on the Programs target list.

Mr. Flora explained that like Corridor 3, Corridor 4 had also been red-flagged. He noted that it had been red-flagged by the Northwest Florida Water Management District. Where the corridor crosses the river, it hits lands owned by the Water Management District, and those lands had been purchased with CARL Funds, As such, similar limitations and restrictions associated with Florida Forever Funds are apparently applicable.

Mr. Hadley requested that we continue working with the agencies as part of the ETDM process. He stated that these two corridors may fall out as part of the ETDM screening, and that was how the ETDM process was suppose to work. Mr. Hadley outlined to include the meeting dates as part of the Summary Report.

Ms. Kendall concurred that it would be good to continue to have joint planning meetings with the agencies.

There was a general discussion about the project's logical termini. Mr. Hadley reiterated that the way it had been set up made sense, and he was comfortable with the logical termini. It was discussed that for Corridor 4, SR 89 might be a better link through Milton than SR 87N because it was a more improved roadway with a better level of service.

Mr. Flora stated the assumed Class of Action for the project was an EIS. He said part of the objective of the meeting today was to get confirmation that the Class of Action would in fact be an EIS.

Mr. Hadley noted that if Corridors 3 and 4 were to be eliminated as part of the ETDM process, the project might be considered to be an EA. Upon further consideration, Mr. Hadley stated that to be safe he felt the project should remain as an EIS. He also noted, the analysis should be relative to the full right-of-way build out.

Mr. Flora inquired if they would be receiving the determination in writing.

Ms. Kendall stated that it would be provided in writing, and was part of the ETDM process.

Mr. Flora stated that he would need the determination in order for the NOI be processed.

Mr. Hadley requested a schedule be provided listing the activities from the NOI to the Record of Decision. He noted to include future phases like right-of-way and construction.

Mr. Bruner stated he knew which schedule he was talking about. He stated he had just done one for the EIS portion of CR 388.

Mr. Flora pointed out that all of the Corridors either crossed the Blackwater River Heritage Trail, or would need to incorporate the trail into the roadway right-of-way. He asked if this would constitute Section 4(f).

Mr. Hadley stated that a crossing would not create a Section 4(f) issue. He noted, however, if the trail had to be relocated for some distance as part of the new roadway, it might. He said he would need to look into that issue.

Mr. Flora asked if the same would hold true for the Old Highway 90 Historic Trail. Mr. Flora noted that the Highway 90Trail seemed to be viewed a bit differently by DEP and OGT. He

said it seemed to be more of an issue for the State Historic Preservation Office since it was a historic site.

Mr. Hadley concurred the issues were different, and that trail would need to be dealt with as a historic site.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:30 PM.

Metric Engineering will rely on these notes as the approved record of matters discussed and conclusions reached during this meeting unless you send the author written notice to the contrary within seven calendar days of receipt date of this meeting record.

Submitted by: John Flora, R.A., AICP
Transportation Planning/PD&E Regional Manager
Metric Engineering, Inc.

C: All attendees

MEETING SUMMARY

Final: 6/4/10

PROJECT: SR 87 Connector PD&E Study

FPIDs: 4167483-22-01; 4167483-22-02; 4167484-22-01; and 4167484-22-02

ETDM: 12597

MEETING: Florida Department of Transportation D-3 (DOT), Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), Office of Greenways and Trails (OGT), Florida Division of State Lands (DSL), the Florida Division of Forestry (DOF), Northwest Florida Water Management District (NWFWMD), Santa Rosa County (SRC), and Naval Air Station Whiting Field (NASWF)

DATE/TIME: May 21, 2010; 1:30 PM

LOCATION: FDEP Carr Building, DSL Conference Room # 301G

ATTENDEES:

FDOT/D3: Peggy Kelley	peggy.kelley@dot.state.fl.us
DEP/OIP: Lauren Milligan	lauren.milligan@dep.state.fl.us
DEP/OIP: Chris Stahl	chris.stahl@dep.state.fl.us
DEP: Amy Phillips	amy.phillips@dep.state.fl.us
DEP/OGT: Rick Halvorsen	rick.halvorsen@dep.state.fl.us
DEP/OGT: Jim Wood	jim.m.wood@dep.state.fl.us
DEP/OGT: Gerard Greco	gerard.greco@dep.state.fl.us (via teleconference)
DOF: Dennis Hardin	hardind@doacs.state.fl.us
DOF: Corinne Hermle	hermlec@doacs.state.fl.us
DSL: Deborah Poppell	debrorah.poppell@dep.state.fl.us
DSL: Gloria Barber	gloria.barber@dep.state.fl.us
DSL/OES: Marianne Gengenbach	Marianne.gengenbach@dep.state.fl.us
DSL: Tom Butler	tom.butler@dep.state.fl.us
DSL: Kime Landes	kime.landes@dep.state.fl.us
NWFWMD: Paul Thorpe	paul.thorpe@nwfwmd.state.fl.us
Santa Rosa County: Nancy Model	nancym@santarosa.fl.gov
Santa Rosa County: Mary Ann Vance	maryv@santarosa.fl.gov
Metric: John Flora	jflora@metriceng.com
ERC: Dan Van Nostrand	dvannostrand@ecoresource.com

Purpose of Meeting: The purpose of the meeting was to continue mitigation discussions regarding the disputes that had been placed on two of the four Corridor Alternatives for the SR 87 Connector. Specifically, the two primary objectives of the meeting were to:

1. At the March 24th mitigation meeting, DEP and DSL had tasked FDOT with assimilating a list of questions associated with the dispute. The discussions at this meeting were to review the answers provided by DEP and DSL regarding both Alternative 3a, and Alternative 4, and
2. It was the intent to afford both Santa Rosa County staff, and a representative from the Naval Air Station Whiting Field, the opportunity to discuss the intent of the Team Santa Rosa initiative, and the intent behind the Joint Planning Agreement that enabled the purchase of the conservation lands northeast of Whiting Field that were the cause of the dispute issued on Alternative 3A.

Mr. Flora (Metric) stated that since the Project Team had not had an opportunity to review the answers to the questions, they could be perhaps reviewed as part of the discussion about the Alternatives.

Corridor 3 Discussion:

Mr. Flora gave an overview of Alternative 3A, and outlined the issues of concern noted by both DEP and DSL.

Ms. Milligan (DEP) stated that Whiting Field also had concerns with Alternative 3A.

Mr. Roy (NASWF) stated he had done the ETDM review and provided the comments on behalf of Whiting Field. He stated that there was no opposition to Alternative 3A. He noted the Alternative did go through the Accident Potential Zones (APZ-1) of one of their runways. He stated that roads are not a restricted use, but there would need to be special attention provided to not have retention ponds, transmission lines, and excessively high roadway lighting in the area. He stated that it had always been the intent to have a four-lane road north of Whiting Field, but it was intended to be further northeast in the conservation land they helped secure for DEP.

Mr. Roy stated the planning initiative between Whiting Field, the County, and the Nature Conservancy has served as a model for bases across the Country. He stated that a lot of time and effort had been put into developing the plan for the area.

Ms. Model (SRC) concurred with Mr. Roy and stated that there had also been considerable efforts made by area leaders to secure three Congressional earmarks to fund the SR 87 Connector. She stated the overall intent, was to provide a continuous four-lane route from I-65 to the Gulf. She stated that it was thought that northeast Corridor such as Alternative 3A met that need best, and that is why it was included in the Study.

Ms. Model asked how the dispute was triggered in the ETDM.

Ms. Milligan explained NWFWMD and DEP had triggered the dispute for the two Alternatives. She noted the dispute for Alternative 3A was due to the possible impacts to state lands and the potential impacts to the three parcels north of Whiting Field, since DEP has the parcels on their “to be purchased list” that was part of their Clear Creek/Whiting Field Florida Forever project.

Ms. Vance (SRC) stated that she was aware of the proposed purchases as the County itself facilitated the plan for the area, but it was always intended that a road be allowed to serve the *Aviation Industrial Park*, and have an evacuation route.

Ms. Gengenbach (DSL) stated that State Lands only had issue with the northern portion of Alternative 3A. She stated that it was of great concern due to the habitat fragmentation a four-lane road would cause. She stated that it was contrary to the “conservation vision”. Ms. Gengenbach also

noted that the DSL is not opposed to a spur road that would provide improved access to the industrial park.

Ms. Model stated the County looks at a much bigger picture and has been very active in conserving lands throughout the entire County. She stated that if however, the conservation interest for this small stretch "trumps" economic development, she believed the County Commissioners would have never agreed to the conservation in the corridor.

Ms. Gengenbach asked if the County was opposed to Corridors 1 and 2.

Ms. Model stated the County had no issues with either of them. She stated the Commissioners were going into the Study with an open mind. They were more concern with eliminating a potentially viable Alternative without necessary justification.

Ms. Model stated that if Alternative 3A was denied, the County would still need to improve the existing Whiting Circle to serve the industrial park. She asked if such an improvement go under similar scrutiny.

Mr. Stahl (DEP) stated that it would not. He noted that it would not have to go through this process because Federal funds would not be involved.

Mr. Butler (DSL) noted that the development of a spur road on the lower part of the proposed Alternative 3 could intersect with SR 191, and such improvements may also enhance hurricane evacuations.

Mr. Hardin (DOF) stated that a four-lane road with moderate to high speed roads have significant and measurable negative effects on prescribed burning. These effects can be detected for as much as a mile on either side of the highway, and include deterioration of ecosystems that must be maintained with prescribed fire, e.g., longleaf pine sandhills and clayhills, loss of wildlife habitat, and accumulation of fuels. These accumulations of fuels create conditions that promote wildfires that can destroy wildlife habitat and forests, and create adverse safety conditions on the highway and for firefighters. These wildfires also constitute a health threat to the surrounding population and can destroy human facilities if they escape control. Prescribed fires will prevent forest and habitat loss and greatly decrease the impacts of wildfire, but they are dangerous and tricky to conduct around four-lane roads. In addition, the presence of highways restricts the window and conditions within which prescribed fires can be safely implemented.

It was asked how a use as intensive as an OHV Park is consistent with the conservation.

Mr. Hardin noted they are noisy. However, studies have found that wildlife will tolerate the use and Parks can be designed to facilitate wildlife movement and to provide buffers for noise abatement.

Mr. Wood (DEP/OGT) asked about the co-location of the Blackwater Heritage State Trail with respect to Alternative 3A.

Mr. Flora stated that it would be the intent to co-locate the trail in the overall section of the corridor. He stated that he understood a landscaped barrier from the roadway would be desired. He noted with adequate landscaping the trail could be enhanced from what it is now, plus the intent would be to extend the trail all the way to SR 87N. In addition with the extension, connection could be made for the trail proposed on the west side of Whiting Field.

Mr. Wood said if the intent was to use part of the trail right-of-way, the Governor and Federal Lands people in charge of the parks programs would need to get involved.

Mr. Flora stated that in preliminary discussions with FHWA it was noted a co-location would probably constitute Section 4(f), and a Determination of Applicability would need to be done. He noted that if it merely crossing the trail, FHWA indicated that it would not constitute Section 4(f).

Mr. Wood stated that for any crossing, OGT would be looking for grade separation. He suggested separate box culverts for each of the two lanes of traffic.

Mr. Stahl asked if it would be possible to include a spur from Alternative 1 or 2 as part of the PD&E to serve the aviation industrial park.
Mr. Flora stated that it might be possible, but would need to get confirmation from FHWA.

Mr. Flora stated that given the discussion with the County and Whiting Field, was it still the intent for DEP to maintain the dispute on Alternative 3A.

Ms. Milligan and **Ms. Gengenbach** concurred that it was.

Ms. Kelley stated that she still did not understand how they could dispute on property they did not own.

Ms. Milligan explained that it was because the lands were part of the adopted DEP Clear Creek Master Plan, and due to the direct impacts it would have on the adjacent Stated owned lands.

Mr. Flora requested DEP to provide any documentation that may exist, i.e. Florida Statues, policies, etc., that enable DEP and DSL the governing authority over property that are planned purchases, or effects caused on adjacent lands. He stated that it would help document justification for the Alternatives elimination.

Corridor 4 (The Southern Corridor) Discussion:
Mr. Flora noted that in a quick review of the questions, none had been answered.

Ms. Gengenbach stated the questions had been assigned to the NWFWMD because they lands in question were not part of the Division of State Lands Program.

Mr. Thorpe (NWFWMD) stated they had not had a chance to work on the questions, but noted they had researched the purchase of the barrier island directly impacted by Alternative 4, and had found

that it had in fact been purchased with Florida Forever funds. He said any request for use of the lands would have to go before their governing board.

Ms. Gengenbach explained that as long as there are other viable Alternatives, the governing board could not easily approve giving up the land for private use, noting a roadway is viewed as a private use, due to the tax codes and tax penalties that would come into to play. It simply would not be cost viable.

Mr. Flora requested that Mr. Thorpe provide him with the purchase documentation and the associated restrictions with the Florida Forever funds, and Alternative 4 would be eliminated as part of the ETDM process.

Mr. Thorpe agreed.

Other Items:

Ms. Kelley asked the agencies if they had any concerns regarding Alternatives 1 or 2.

Ms. Milligan stated they had no concerns with Alternative 1. She said DEP was also fine with Alternative 2, but noted it did impact parcels planned to also be purchased as part of the Clear Creek project. She stated the concerns were nothing like the one northeast of Whiting Field. She said at least these were on the outside edge, and that would not be a problem.

Mr. Stahl suggested exploring modifications to Alternative 2 pulling it further west to reduce the impacts on the planned purchase parcels. He suggested taking it up through an adjacent neighborhood.

Mr. Flora said they could look at such a route, but in addition to the environmental impacts, they would now be dealing with social impacts, and relocations. He noted the pros and cons, as well as cost, would have to be evaluated.

Ms. Model stated that it would probably be the County's desire to get the connection as far north as possible to more effectively serve emergency evacuations.

Ms. Vance asked how the DEP/DSL could work better with the County so that they are more aware of planned acquisitions, and what would be the associated limitations on those lands.

Ms. Gengenbach stated she would send the County links to planned acquisitions posted on the internet.

Follow-up Items:

Ms. Milligan to provide any documentation that may exist, i.e. Florida Statues, policies, etc., that enable DEP and DSL the governing authority over properties that are planned purchases, or affects caused on adjacent lands.

Mr. Thorpe to provide purchase documentation and the associated restrictions with the Florida Forever funds for the parcel impacted by Alternative 4 to substantiate the Alternatives elimination as part of the ETDM process.

Ms. Gengenbach is to send the County links to planned acquisitions posted on the internet.

Mr. Flora asked for DEP to send the electronic version of the Questions and Answers so they could be incorporated into the project's electronic files.

Ms. Gengenbach stated that she would send an electronic copy of the answers.

Ms. Kelley requested the information be provided no later than three to four weeks from today's date.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:45 PM.

Metric Engineering will rely on these notes as the approved record of matters discussed and conclusions reached during this meeting unless you send the author written notice to the contrary within seven calendar days of receipt date of this meeting record.

Submitted by: John Flora, R.A., AICP
Transportation Planning/PD&E Regional Manager
Metric Engineering, Inc.

C: All attendees

SR 87 Scoping Meeting
July 29, 2010

Brandon Bruner - Opening Remarks

John Flora – Stated meeting would be informal and that questions could be asked throughout the presentation. He discussed several items from the presentation such as the Environmental Issues, Whiting Field location, County Prison, etc.

Commissioner Goodin commented that any planned purchases of Florida Forever Lands that are currently owned by the County should not be considered an obstacle. He stated that this has already been discussed with Secretary Koupelousus. In addition, he also commented that the location be noted of the landfill on SR 87 near Corridor 1C

??Commented that property near the powerline on 1C may be donated land for a water treatment facility.

Cindy Anderson commented that much work has been done on roadway design for Whiting Circle and north of Whiting Field and that information should be utilized.

Vernon Compton asked for more information about the impacts to the Trail.

John Flora replied that Corridor 3A would co-locate with the Trail and extend it. The other Corridors will cross the Trail at some point.

Nancy Model brought up Cindy Anderson's comment and stated that the Blue Line on the Team Santa Rosa Maps has issues with ROW. She added that Federal money had been spent to purchase that property

John Flora commented that no ROW was allotted at the time of purchase for a roadway.

Commissioner Goodin replied that he will work with the Legislature to ensure that ROW is allotted before any future purchases.

John Flora stated that it is extremely difficult to deal with Florida Forever Lands. A Special Council must receive information that proves the land is no longer viable for environmental preservation. As with the Southern Corridors, all option cross Florida Forever Lands. The Special Council would consider for this project that there are other viable corridors.

Commissioner Goodin asked what are the other issues with Corridor 3A

John Flora answered that a Florida Forever Parcel will be orphaned by 3A and that my cause a problem.

Commissioner Goodin asked that mitigation for the orphaned parcel be considered.

Randy Roy stated that Whiting works with all of the property owners in the area of Corridor 3A.

Commissioner Goodin stated that protected wildlife is important, but we need to make sure we can mitigate to keep preservation from impeding projects.

Vernon Compton added that it is not only preservation of existing lands, but managing the lands makes roadways in close proximity a problem. For example, burning is difficult and we need to make sure that we do not isolate Whiting Field as a wildlife island.

John Flora moved on with the presentation to cover Corridors 4-6.

Ryan Jorgenson asked if these corridors were an exercise in futility.

John Flora replied that all corridors must have a thorough review.

Vernon Compton added that there may be viable option of 4A available, possibly in another study.

Ryan Jorgenson asked if the agenda could be flipped.

John Flora added that if another bypass project was study was done, all information collected under this project would be useful.

Bryan Yates agreed and stated that FHWA will require a complete review of all corridors.

John Flora agreed and added that the public must have all corridors and options explained so they fully understand the results of the review.

Marybeth Washnock asked what Public Involvement activities have been done to date and what were the public's comments.

John stated that a Public Kickoff meeting was held in March and that he had presented to the County Commission, the City Council, and the WFRPC. He state that the historical district made it clear that they wanted the southern alignments, whereas the County seems to lean more toward the northern alignments. Part of the project includes a need for an evacuation route that the northern alignments better fill.

Jim DeVries stated that this project was not normal because it has 2 very different objectives. They are the congestion on US 90 and the North-South traffic. We may see 2 projects come out of this study. Everyone should remember that we have only seen the environmental analysis and not the traffic analysis.

Nancy Model agreed and said that she would like to see what the corridors do for traffic.

Jim DeVries added that it is important for people to flee from a storm, but we need to deal with daily traffic as well.

Marianne Gengenbach Clarified the red flags are different. The flag on 3a was from DEP and 4A was from WMD. She also asked if a spur road to the industrial complex could served the County's needs as well as 3A.

Commissioner Goodin asked if the entire roadway network would be reviewed.

John Flora confirmed that all of the roadway network would be reviewed. He also added that Marianne was correct that Corridors 1 and 3 could have a spur and he was looking at that option as well.

Commissioner Goodin added that he was concerned about residential encroachment on Corridors 1 and 2. He feels that 3A would be better and the County would give them free ROW.

John Flora added that 3A would also have less bridge costs than Corridors 1 and 2. Corridors 3 and 4 were red flagged and we will continue to work through them. John then turned the presentation over to Martin.

Martin Gawronski began the discussion on the wetland % acreage impact. Corridors 4 and 5 have the highest, with 3 having the smallest. In addition, 4 and 5 have hardwood floodplains that are usually regulation.

SHPO person? Asked if it was possible to span the Florida Forever Lands in Corridors 4-6.

Martin added that we are looking at that possibility. He added that Corridor 3 also has the least % of Floodplain acreage and the Corridors 4 and 5 have the least threatened and endangered species impacts.

Marianne Gengenbach asked specifically about the imperiled species, the Salamander.

Martin Gawronski stated that habitats would be assigned for these species.

Amy Phillips asked when looking at a Corridor, do you look at the total (all segments).

Ryan Jorgenson asked what would the team do if there was an endangered species found in a corridor.

Martin Gawronski stated that we look at all the segments to make up and entire corridor. In addition, he added that depending on species type, relocation may be possible depending on the number of individuals and habitat type.

Marianne Gengenbach asked if the analysis would include fragmentation that may be caused.

Martin Gawronski replied that habitat can be described for plants and animals and fragmentation would be important depending on species and whether they are migratory or isolated.

Commissioner Goodin stated that the fence around Whiting already causes fragmentation.

Bryan Yates asked if there is a requirement to evaluate indirect effects, for example effects to downtown Milton. The owners of the historic buildings may not like other corridors if they lose business and cannot find renters.

Commissioner Goodin asked what the shelf life of a PD&E study is.

Peggy Kelley stated that around 15 years, reevaluation would be necessary.

Ryan Jorgenson added that the City would agree that this will become 2 different projects.

Commissioner Goodin added that this would be 2 different projects and that it is good to expand this study to collect more information.

Bryan Yates added that he is working with DOT on several projects throughout Milton and that this study should look at the roadway system as the approach.

Nancy Model asked to what extent the economic benefits would be evaluated.

John Flora replied that the PD&E process does look at economic analysis to some extent.

Brian Yates asked about the primary mission for Whiting Field.

Randy Roy answered by stating that the mission is naval air training, mostly with helicopters.

Robin or Gerard? Asked about what the Navy bases comments are on Corridor 3.

Randy said that base is concerned about retention ponds and the accident potential areas. In addition, there will be limited lighting allowed on the roads.

Commissioner Goodin stated that the County would favored a limited access roadway.

Randy also added that a roadway will limit the base expansion to the North.

John Flora ended the meeting for the field review.

City of Milton

Office of the Mayor

September 9, 2010

Secretary Stephanie Kopelousos
Florida Dept. of Transportation
605 Suwannee St – MS 54
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450

Dear Secretary Kopelousos:

The City of Milton would like to thank you for the allowing us to be involved in the Project Development and Environmental Study (PD&E) in regard to the Highway 87 Connector. The Study is reviewing four alternatives that will connect Highway 87 South to Highway 87 North. We believe a thorough review of all four alternatives will be of great benefit to the City, State, and FHA as it pertains to this issue, as well as to deal with future needs in and around this community. Therefore, the City of Milton respectfully requests that all alternatives remain in the study.

As you are aware the selected alternative will connect Highway 87 S to 87 N, either south of the City as is the case with alternative 4, or north as is the case with alternates 1, 2, and 3 (see attachment 1). The City has examined the alternates as presented and believes the best option is the one depicted as proposed segments 1a, 1b and 1c. We believe this option provides the best potential for long term economic impact on the City of Milton and the least potential for long term operational impact on NAS Whiting Field. We believe this option should also be very attractive to the state as to cost, schedule and environmental impact. With this in mind the City Council has endorsed the alternative identified in proposed segments 1a, 1b, and 1c and unanimously passed a resolution stating the same (see attachment 2).

The City Council has taken this action and provided this information to ensure you have a clear understanding of our desires. The City of Milton is working diligently to provide for the economic interest of the citizens of Milton and the surrounding area. The selection of option 1a, 1b and 1c would greatly help us in this quest and the protection of NAS Whiting Field, one of the economic engines of this area. It is the City's opinion that any alternative that could impact the

P. O. Box 909 • 6738 Dixon Street • Milton, Florida 32572 • (850) 983-5400 • Fax (850) 983-5411
~ Established 1844 ~

future expansion or operations of NAS Whiting Field should not be considered. Once again, thank you for the opportunity to participate in the process and your consideration of our request.

Sincerely,

Guy Thompson
Mayor

GT:pkh

Cc: Senator Durell Peaden, Jr.
Senator Bill Nelson
State Representative Jeff Miller
State Representative Greg Evers
Board of County Commissioners
West Florida Regional Planning Council
Florida Highway Administration
Florida/Alabama TPO
Captain Peter Hall, NAS Whiting Field
Metric Engineering

C:\My Files\Correspondence\Miscellaneous\Hwy 87 Support Letter2.docx

RESOLUTION #1160-10

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MILTON, FLORIDA SUPPORTING CORRIDOR 1 FOR THE SR 87 CONNECTOR

WHEREAS, the City of Milton is responsible for local planning; and

WHEREAS, this corridor should be identified in a manner consistent with the City's plans; and

WHEREAS, the city's proposed evaluation and appraisal report identifies this corridor to enhance the City's and County's economic development opportunities; and

WHEREAS, in the National Highway System Act of 1995, Congress directed that designs for new and reconstructed highways take into account: the community impact of road construction; and

WHEREAS, a well-constructed and well-designed corridor 1 improves mobility, improves area commercial activity and thus increases community property values; and

WHEREAS, funding is limited for development of new roads and this corridor is cost effective; and

WHEREAS, the other corridors cross areas classified by State agencies as "critical wildlife habitat"; and

WHEREAS, construction of the other proposed corridors may severely limit Whiting Fields ability to respond to a changing mission environment; and

WHEREAS, Whiting Field is a vital part of the area's economic base; and

WHEREAS, there is no better route to SR 87 N which will open new lands and provide for economic growth:

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: that the City Council of the City of Milton believes it to be in the best interest of the City, County, and State to extend SR 87 N to a point at or about the Southern split of SR 87 and SR 89.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City of Milton, this 10th, day of August, 2010.

By: _____
Guy Thompson, Mayor

ATTEST: _____
Dewitt Nobles, City Clerk

MEETING SUMMARY

Final: 4/11/11

PROJECT: SR 87 Connector PD&E Study FPIDs: 4167483-22-01; 4167483-22-02; 4167484-22-01; 4167484-22-02; and 4167484-22-90

ETDM: 12597

MEETING: Florida Department of Transportation D-3 (DOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)

DATE/TIME: March 29, 2011; 9:00 AM CT

LOCATION: FDOT Teleconference

ATTENDEES:

FHWA: George Hadley	george.hadley@fhwa.dot.gov
FHWA: Jorge Rivera	Jorge.rivera@fhwa.dot.gov
FHWA: Cathy Kendall	cathy.kendall@fhwa.dot.gov
FHWA: Joe Sullivan	joe.sullivan@fhwa.dot.gov
FHWA: Linda Anderson	linda.andersen@fhwa.dot.gov
FDOT/D3: Blair Martin	blair.martin@dot.state.fl.us
FDOT/D3: Brandon Bruner	joseph.bruner@dot.stat.fl.us
FDOT/D3: Peggy Kelley	peggy.kelley@dot.state.fl.us
Metric: John Flora	jflora@metriceng.com
Metric: Amy Wiwi	amywiwi@metriceng.com

Purpose of Meeting: The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and Project Team arranged to meet with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to discuss concerns FHWA had regarding phasing in the most recent Newsletter, and to gain a better understanding of the more recent NEPA procedures.

Mr. Hadley led the discussion by outlining that when referencing the Project's public hearing, it should be noted to the reference that the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) information will be available for public review in advance of the meeting.

Ms. Martin stated that it would be no problem to add that reference.

Mr. Hadley stated that the reference could be the basis for issuing a new newsletter or an up-date to the existing one.

Ms. Kendall noted the other concern they had with the Newsletter was that it had narrowed the selection of the corridors down to one recommended corridor. She stated this was inconsistent with NEPA policy and typically there is more than one corridor continued to be evaluated through the study process. She stated any of the corridors that meet the project's Purpose and Need, and have no fatal flaws should be carried forward.

Mr. Flora stated that Corridors 2 and 3 both meet that criteria and could be deemed as viable. Ms. Kendall noted they should then be further analyzed.

Mr. Flora noted that in Corridor 3, DEP had red-flagged the corridor because it traversed lands they had planned to purchase for conservation as part of their larger green belt initiative.

Ms. Kelley asked Mr. Hadley if he saw the red flag as a fatal flaw. She stated the Department had always had concerns about DEP red flagging property that was not owned by them. She state that she had conversations with Pete McGilvray at Central Office about this issue, and he alluded to the fact they could exercise power over land that was not theirs.

Mr. Hadley stated he had similar concerns as outlined by Ms. Kelley, and determined that Corridor 3 should remain for future analysis, because this red-flag does not constitute a fatal flaw. He noted that in the future if need be, a meeting could be set up between Martin Knoop; Marjory Bixby; and the District Secretary to resolve the issue.

Ms. Kendal noted that she concurred that the southern alignments should be eliminated for further evaluation due to their impacts to the Water Management District's Florida Forever parcels, and based on the fact that they were generally unsuccessful in meeting the project's Purpose and Need criteria.

Mr. Flora concurred.

In Summary:

Mr. Flora agreed to prepare a Newsletter up-date to provide clarification on the availability of the DEIS documents prior to the public hearing. He also noted that it would be clarified that all three of the northern corridors would continue to be evaluated and analyzed through the alternatives phase. Upon which time a recommendation will be made on a particular alternative so that concept plans can be developed.

Mr. Hadley stated that he would like to take a look at the Newsletter Up-date before it goes out.

Mr. Flora stated the Corridor Report would be updated to reflect the discussion today. He asked if the up-date could be done concurrent with any changes or edits FHWA might have.

Mr. Hadley stated that Mr. Sullivan had been tasked with the reports review.

Mr. Flora asked Mr. Sullivan when he thought he would have his review completed and comments made.

Mr. Sullivan stated to be conservative let's make it two weeks. (April 12, 2011).

Mr. Hadley requested the Department and the Project Team let DEP know that Corridor 3 was going to remain in consideration.

Ms. Martin stated that they would be informed.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:00 AM CT.

Metric Engineering will rely on these notes as the approved record of matters discussed and conclusions reached during this meeting unless you send the author written notice to the contrary within seven calendar days of receipt date of this meeting record.

Submitted by: John Flora, R.A., AICP
Transportation Planning/PD&E Regional Manager
Metric Engineering, Inc.

C: All attendees
Project File

From: Kelley, Peggy
To: John Flora
Cc: Amy Wiwi
Subject: FW: 416748-3 & -4; SR 87 PD&E Study
Date: Wednesday, March 30, 2011 4:06:03 PM

John,
See the email below from Amanda Marshall and Cathy Kendall. Amanda should be contacting you shortly about FHWA's comments.

Peggy Kelley

Peggy Kelley
Environment Management Office
Phone # (850) 415-9517
Fax # (850) 415-9486
peggy.kelley@dot.state.fl.us

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are public records, available to the public and media upon request. Your e-mail communications may be subject to public disclosure. (Florida Statutes, Chapter 119)

From: Marshall, Amanda
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2011 2:39 PM
To: Cathy.Kendall@dot.gov
Cc: Haddock, Laura; Martin, Blair; Kelley, Peggy; George.Hadley@dot.gov; Joseph.Sullivan@dot.gov; LKammerer@dos.state.fl.us; ACI North
Subject: RE: 416748-3 & -4; SR 87 PD&E Study

Thank You Cathy for your comments! We will certainly proceed as you have advised us.

Amanda Marshall
Florida Department of Transportation
Environmental Management Office
Post Office Box 607 / 1074 Highway 90 East
Chipley, Florida 32428
(850) 415-9508
amanda.marshall@dot.state.fl.us

From: Cathy.Kendall@dot.gov [mailto:Cathy.Kendall@dot.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2011 2:32 PM
To: Marshall, Amanda; LKammerer@dos.state.fl.us
Cc: Haddock, Laura; Martin, Blair; Kelley, Peggy; George.Hadley@dot.gov; Joseph.Sullivan@dot.gov
Subject: RE: 416748-3 & -4; SR 87 PD&E Study

Amanda,

FHWA has no additional suggestions for the proposed approach that uses a phased assessment for Section 106 resources that is explained in the revised methodology dated February 3, 2011. Thank you for addressing our previous comments. Please continue to seek SHPO's concurrence on the proposed methodology as well.

In reviewing the results from the Probability Assessment Report, it appears that the likelihood of adversely affecting an NRHP-eligible site is relatively small. Please note, however, that if the CRAS that will be done on the preferred alignment reveals an NRHP-eligible site that would also be protected by Section 4(f) and adversely affected by the preferred alternative, then it is possible that previously discarded alternatives would have to be reconsidered.

Please let me know if you need additional clarification on this FHWA concurrence with the proposed methodology.

Cathy Kendall, AICP
Environmental Specialist
FHWA - FL, PR & VI
545 John Knox Rd., Suite 200
Tallahassee, FL 32303

(850) 553-2225
cathy.kendall@dot.gov

From: Marshall, Amanda [mailto:Amanda.Marshall@dot.state.fl.us]
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 11:52 AM
To: Kendall, Cathy (FHWA); LKammerer@dos.state.fl.us
Cc: Haddock, Laura; Martin, Blair; Kelley, Peggy
Subject: 416748-3 & -4; SR 87 PD&E Study

Good Morning!

Just checking in to see if you have any comments on the revised Cultural Resources Probability Assessment for the SR 87 PD&E study that was sent to you for review on 02/03/2011. That was a follow-up to the assessment sent to you this past November. Our crew is ready to begin field work, so please let me know if you have any additional comments, questions, or concerns.

Thanks!

Amanda Marshall
Florida Department of Transportation
Environmental Management Office
Post Office Box 607 / 1074 Highway 90 East
Chipley, Florida 32428
(850) 415-9508

PROJECT MEMORANDUM

3/31/11

PROJECT: SR 87 Connector PD&E Study FPIDs: 4167483-22-01; 4167483-22-02; 4167484-22-01; 4167484-22-02; and 4167484-22-90

ETDM: 12597

DATE: March 31, 2011

TO: Lauren Milligan, Environmental Manager
Department of Environmental Protection/Office of Intergovernmental Programs

FROM: Peggy Kelley, PD&E Project Manager
Florida Department of Transportation/District 3

RE: Alternatives Phase of PD&E Study

Dear Lauren,

As a courtesy to you and your office, I am writing to inform you that based on a meeting held on March 29, 2011 with FHWA, the Department of Transportation will be evaluating all three northern Corridors associated with the SR 87 Connector PD&E Study. The NEPA process requires that we evaluate more than one Corridor and the No Build through the alternatives phase.

It was stipulated that any viable corridor that meets the project's purpose and need, and has no fatal flaw, be carried forward for further evaluation in the alternatives phase of study. In evaluating the northern corridors (Corridor's 1, 2, and 3) it was determined these corridors met the stipulated criteria. When asked about the red-flag condition imposed on Corridor 3 by DEP to whether that constituted a fatal flaw, the **FHWA Staff stated that it was not**, as the red-flag had been imposed on property owned by others beyond the jurisdiction of DEP. As you may recall, this was a topic of considerable discussion between the Department and your office. I also understand there was concern as it related to the Corridor's crossing the Black Water River Heritage Trail. This would not constitute a red-flag condition either, but perhaps a Section 4(f) issue, for which a Determination of Applicability will be performed.

It may be of interest for you to also know, FHWA concluded that the southern alignments should be eliminated for further evaluation due to their impacts to the Water Management District's Florida Forever parcels, and based on the fact that they were generally unsuccessful in meeting the project's Purpose and Need criteria.

I look forward to working with you and the DEP through this process. Should you have any question, please feel free to contact me at: 850.415.9517, or by email at: peggy.kelley@dot.state.fl.us. Likewise, you can contact my consultant Project Manager, John Flora. He can be reached at 407.644.1898, or by email at: jflora@metriceng.com

Thank you again Lauren, and I look forward to talking with you soon.

Sincerely,
Peggy Kelley

C: John Flora, Consultant Project Manager
Project File

Attachments:
Corridor 1
Corridor 2
Corridor 3

MEETING SUMMARY

Draft: 4/21/11

PROJECT: SR 87 Connector PD&E Study FPIDs: 4167483-22-01; 4167483-22-02; 4167484-22-01; 4167484-22-02; and 4167484-22-90

ETDM: 12597

MEETING: Florida Department of Transportation D-3 (DOT), East Milton WWTP

DATE/TIME: April 12, 2011; 9:00 AM CT

LOCATION: FDOT Teleconference

ATTENDEES:

FDOT/D3: Peggy Kelley	peggy.kelley@dot.state.fl.us
BDI: Scott Jernigan	sjernigan@baskervilledonovan.com
Santa Rosa County: Nancy Model	nancym@santarosa.fl.gov
Santa Rosa County: Roger Blalock	rogerb@santarosa.fl.gov
Metric: John Flora	jflora@metriceng.com
Metric: Amy Wiwi	amywiwi@metriceng.com
Metric: Jessica Bloomfield	jbloomfield@metriceng.com
Metric: Nicole Mauntler	nmauntler@metriceng.com

Purpose of Meeting: The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and Project Team arranged to meet with parties involved in the proposed East Milton Wastewater Treatment Facility. The proposed site for the WWTP is located in the path of the proposed alternatives (all 3 alternatives being evaluated). Therefore the proposed alignments have been recently modified to avoid this newly acquired parcel. The purpose of the meeting is to coordinate the PD&E Study project with the proposed WWTP project.

Ms. Model confirmed that the proposed site for the WWTP has been given to the City by Santa Rosa County within the last year.

Mr. Flora questioned the County and Mr. Jernigan whether the WWTP could be constructed at a different site, or if other sites were still being considered for the location of the WWTP.

Mr. Jernigan confirmed that the City is committed to this site, and has progressed to a point in the design where they couldn't change the site location. He noted that a lot of time and effort had gone into selecting the site.

Ms. Kelly expressed concern of the construction cost increase due to changing the alignment. The new alignment requires a curve at the south portion of the bridge and requires additional spans over wetlands along Black Water River. She asked that we have the Structural Engineers update the cost estimate.

Mr. Jernigan questioned the start of the PD&E design phase.

Mr. Flora responded that the PD&E Study would be done in 2013 and then the design would begin. Although, the design is currently not funded, it is in the Long Range Transportation Plan.

Mr. Jernigan added that the WWTP construction will begin before the design of the corridor. The proposed WWTP is anticipated to begin construction between the summer of 2013 and winter of 2014. The proposed WWTP has a 30-foot utility easement parallel to the Gulf Power Easement across the river which runs along a portion of the SR 87 Connector Project, He noted the easement was for the pipes that run up to whiting Field..

Mr. Flora asked if there would be any concerns if the corridor alignment ran immediately adjacent to the sites western edge.

Ms. Model does not have any concerns, and the others concurred that there would be no problem.

The County and BDI dismissed. Ms. Kelley and Metric continued discussion.

Mr. Flora asked Ms. Model if it might be possible to get the Hackney site plan. He said when doing their field inventory he noticed large utilities in or near the right of way.

Ms. Model stated she would provide site plans of Hackney's newly developed site on the northwest corner of US 90 and SR 87 S.

Mr. Blalock informed everyone that a force main runs along the east side of East Milton Road from the Prison Lift Station to US 90 at SR 87 South.

Ms. Wiwi reminded everyone of the public's comments Metric received in regards to the need for a right turn lane at Punjob Road, just south of US 90 on SR 87 South. She received 3 or 4 letters about it, and would like Metric's designers to look at that while developing corridor alternatives.

Ms. Kelley mentioned that Volkert did the design plans for that portion of the project. She said she would look into if a turn lane could be added.

In Summary:
Metric will progress with designing the alignments to avoid encroachment on the proposed WWTP parcel.

Metric will get plans from Mr. Jernigan for the proposed utilities and easements. Mr. Jernigan will also post Gulf Power's proposed substation plans onto BDI's ftp site for Metric's use.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:30 AM CT.

Metric Engineering will rely on these notes as the approved record of matters discussed and conclusions reached during this meeting unless you send the author written notice to the contrary within seven calendar days of receipt date of this meeting record.

Submitted by: Jessica Bloomfield, P.E.
Metric Engineering, Inc.

c: All attendees
Project File

MEETING SUMMARY

Final: 6/1/11

PROJECT: SR 87 Connector PD&E Study FPIDs: 4167483-22-01; 4167483-22-02; 4167484-22-01; 4167484-22-02; and 4167484-22-90

ETDM: 12597

MEETING: Florida Department of Transportation D-3 (DOT)

DATE/TIME: May 9, 2011; 1:30 PM CT

LOCATION: FDOT Planning Conference Room

ATTENDEES:

FDOT/D3: Scott Golden	john.golden@dot.state.fl.us
FDOT/D3: Peggy Kelley	peggy.kelley@dot.state.fl.us
FDOT/D3: Blair Martin	blair.martin@dot.state.fl.us
FDOT/D3: Keith Shores	keith.shores@dot.state.fl.us
FDOT/D3: Dallas Boyd	dallas.boyd@dot.state.fl.us
Metric: John Flora	jflora@metriceng.com
Metric: Jessica Bloomfield	jbloomfield@metriceng.com
Metric: Amy Wiwi (by telephone)	awiwi@metriceng.com
Finley: Craig Finley	craig.finley@finleyengineeringgroup.com
Finley: Robert Alonso	robert.alonso@finleyengineeringgroup.com

Purpose of Meeting: The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and Project Team arranged to meet to discuss the three SR 87 Connector alternatives. Metric provided binders for each attendee with exhibits of the proposed typical sections, proposed corridors and Geopak reports of the alignments for each corridor.

Mr. Golden questioned if Metric was using the new Highway Safety Manual and if this was going to be one of the test pilot projects. Ms. Martin responded that they had a different project in mind for the test pilot.

Mr. Flora described the purpose and need of the project, and generally discussed each of the three corridors. He stated that there are four alternatives, with the fourth alternative is to extend the Blackwater River Bridge over the Blackwater Heritage Trail. Although, he stated that the counts don't justify a grade separation at the trail and most likely a box culvert will be constructed for the trail to pass under the roadway. Mr. Flora stated that it was his intent to get confirmation from the Department that these alternatives would in fact serve as the alternatives for the further analysis.

Mr. Golden stated as this was a new alignment, the alternatives made sense.

Mr. Golden briefly reviewed each of the three typical sections (urban, suburban and rural) and provided input on each typical section:

- Use a 12' multi-use path, instead of the 10' shown
- Urban typical section shown does not meet the 24' clear zone indicated on the drawing
- Does not like the urban section for various reasons - too constrained

- Put normal crown on south bound lanes for initial 2-lane construction
- Reduce right-of-way of suburban typical as much as possible and use that typical
- Suggested we talk with Ronnie Peel regarding the suburban typical sections as he has a lot of recent experience.

Discussion occurred between **Mr. Golden, Mr. Shores** and **Mr. Finley** whether the bridge would have a "normal crown" on each bridge. Mr. Shores indicated that other recent new alignment projects had reverse crown on the bridge and normal crown roadway portions which transitioned to the bridge. Finley's preference would be to have normal crowns on the bridges to collect storm water runoff on both sides, however, he said they can design either way. He noted the bridge type would involve advancing work trestle similar to the bridge at Victory. At this point he wasn't sure if they would be utilizing drilled shaft or driven piles.

Mr. Golden stated that with the additional width provided with the shoulders and multi-use trail, the water could be accommodated on one side so therefore go ahead and design it without a crown.

General discussion continued on the preliminary bridge length and Mr. Golden questioned why the bridge length is so long. Ms. Kelley and Ms. Martin stated that they were minimizing wetland impacts and to ensure that FDEP would approve the permit. Mr. Golden though that the bridge length should be designed based on hydraulics during PD&E to minimize construction costs. Ms. Martin asked if the Planning Department should begin to adopt a policy to design bridges during PD&E that meet hydraulic capacity as a starting point. Ms. Martin noted that a Bridge Hydraulic Report (BHR) was part of the PD&E process but not a Bridge Design Report (BDR). The general consensus was that this is a practical approach and Mr. Finley and Mr. Alonso said they would look at spanning the Blackwater River with a shorter bridge or bridges (separate bridge off the southern bluff) which are designed based solely upon hydraulic need and clearing flood zones.

Mr. Golden asked how much wetland mitigation costs and Ms. Kelley (Ms. Martin?) stated it was approximately $100,000 per acre. Mr. Golden responded that is much less per square foot than bridge construction.

Mr. Golden asked if the alignments were designed per minimums. Ms. Bloomfield replied that the urban alignments were designed with mostly normal crowns and reverse crowns, while there were some superelevated curves along the rural corridor. The last curve on corridor 3 in particular sparked questioning. Ms. Bloomfield believed it was a 6% superelevated curve and was designed that way to avoid certain parcels. Mr. Golden said to make sure that curves are "smoothed" out as much as possible.

Mr. Golden questioned if right-of-way would be purchased for the four-lane facility and if the ultimate 6-laning would be considered. Mr. Flora replied that the full right-of-way would be acquired and that projected traffic counts did not justify future 6-laning. Mr. Golden also brought up an idea to construct the northbound lanes first and the southbound multi-use path so that there would be a wide separation between the two. Ms. Kelley and Ms. Martin thought that was a good idea and that the

trail could even have a dirt equestrian trail next to the multi-use trail. Mr. Flora is not sure if the large separation is a good idea.

In Summary:

Metric will adjust the typical sections and alignments to incorporate the comments received at this meeting. Then Metric will email new typicals to Mr. Golden for acceptance. Mr. Golden recommended that the roadway not be designed to minimum standards, but the bridge on the other hand should be a short as possible. He requested that the alignment's curves be re-evaluated to reduce their severity to the greatest extent possible.

Based on this meeting summary, the three alternatives discussed in the meeting are accepted by the Department as the "alternatives" for the project and constitute as the alternatives to be further analyzed and taken to the public for the "Alternatives Meeting".

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:45 PM CT.

Metric Engineering will rely on these notes as the approved record of matters discussed and conclusions reached during this meeting unless you send the author written notice to the contrary within seven calendar days of receipt date of this meeting record.

Submitted by: Jessica Bloomfield, PE, Project Manager
Metric Engineering, Inc.

CC: All attendees
Project File

From: Kelley, Peggy [mailto:Peggy.Kelley@dot.state.fl.us]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 5:16 PM
To: John Flora
Cc: Amy Wiwi
Subject: FW: SR 87 alternatives elimination

Fyi-

From: Joseph.Sullivan@dot.gov [mailto:Joseph.Sullivan@dot.gov]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 4:14 PM
To: Kelley, Peggy
Cc: Cathy.Kendall@dot.gov
Subject: SR 87 alternatives elimination

Peggy,
SR 87 Connector Alternatives Analysis:

Multiple State and Federal ETAT members identified alternatives 4, 5, and 6 as having substantial affects on water quality, wetlands, wildlife and habitat, historical sites, recreational areas, parks, and floodplains. These affects are counter to State and Federal responsibility to avoid and minimize impacts to natural resources within this interconnected, ecologically important, highly productive, and protected area proposed project corridor.

Effects on wetlands and potential for secondary and cumulative effects were identified as topics of potential dispute by Northwest Florida Water Management District. Their dispute justification is as follows. "The proposed use is incompatible with the purpose for which District lands were acquired under the Florida Preservation 2000 program with public funds of the Florida Preservation 2000 Trust Fund, such purpose to protect valuable natural resources. (Florida Preservation 2000 Act: Florida Statute 259.101(7)). "

Additionally, alternatives 4, 5, and 6 provide only marginal improvements to providing "a more direct route from areas of high growth in northern Santa Rosa County to I-10" and improved access to I-10 from Whiting Field US Naval Air Station.

Based on the combination of identified land use, public funds invested to support that use, and other reasons it is reasonable that Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 do not require further analysis given the apparent viable alternatives exist which do not have these constraints.

Alternative 3A has been considered for elimination from further analysis also. Documentation of recent State purchase of properties within the Alternative 3 corridor support elimination from further analysis. Confirmation that standard Navy convenants over the purchased property will not be modified to allow the proposed road project also supports elimination of Alternative 3A from further analysis.

The purchase of a property by the State does not specifically remove an alternative from consideration for use. Use of a resource designated as 4(f) property may not be approved unless there is no feasible and prudent avoidance alternative and the action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property resulting from the proposed use. It should also be noted that resources along Alternative 3A will likely be afforded Section 4(f) protection and the process to acquire rights of way from State lands with this designation is particularly arduous. Given the apparent viable alternatives that exist, Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, which do not have these identified constraints it is reasonable that Alternative 3A be removed from requiring further analysis. If Alternatives 1 or 2 have equal or nearly equal constraints which need to be considered then further analysis of the Alternative 3A corridor may be required

I hope this answers your questions.
Joe

Joseph P. Sullivan
Environmental Specialist
Federal Highway Administration
545 John Knox Rd., Ste. 200
Tallahassee, FL 32303
P: 850-553-2248
F: 850-942-8308

From: Kelley, Peggy [mailto:Peggy.Kelley@dot.state.fl.us]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 10:00 AM
To: Sullivan, Joseph(FHWA)
Subject:

Joe,
See the attached email from the Navy as it pertains to the County's request to provide a conveyance of r/w for the purpose of constructing a roadway through the property that DEP purchased on June 30, 2011 with Florida Forever funds.

Peggy Kelley
Environment Management Office
Phone # (850) 415-9517
Fax # (850) 415-9486
peggy.kelley@dot.state.fl.us

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are public records, available to the public and media upon request. Your e-mail communications may be subject to public disclosure. (Florida Statutes, Chapter 119)

Florida Department of Transportation

RICK SCOTT
GOVERNOR

ANANTH PRASAD, P.E.
SECRETARY

District Environmental Management Office
Post Office Box 607
Chipley, Florida 32428-0607

January 6, 2012

Mr. Martin C. Knopp, P.E.
Division Administrator
ATTN: Cathy Kendall
Federal Highway Administration
545 John Knox Road, Suite 200
Tallahassee, Florida 32303

Subject: **CULTURAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT SURVEY**
FPID #: 416748-3 and 416748-4
Location: SR 87S / SR 87N – Connector / New Alignment
SR 87 – Expansion
County: Santa Rosa

Dear Mr. Knopp:

On behalf of the Department, Archaeological Consultants, Inc (ACI) conducted a Cultural Resources Assessment Survey (CRAS) in June and October of 2011 for the subject SR 87 PD&E project.

Historical background research revealed two previously recorded historic resources within the historical APE: one structure (8SR1095) and one NRHP-listed linear resource (SR 1 - 8SR1313). During the field survey, five other historic structures and two other linear resources (railroads) were recorded within the historical APE. With the exception of NRHP-listed SR 1 (8SR1313), none of these structures or resources are considered eligible for listing in the NRHP due to the compromised integrity and the lack of significant historical associations. In addition, there is no potential for a historic district due to the low concentration of historic resources with integrity and significance.

SR 1 is located within the APE for both proposed corridors at the intersection of US 90 and SR 87. The roposed undertaking may have an effect on this resource where vehicular traffic currently crosses SR 1 at the intersection of US 90. The project proposes to widen the crossing to accommodate additional travel lanes, a

proposed multi-use trail and sidewalks. As a result, a small portion of the trail that has not previously been used as a vehicle crossing will be impacted by this project. Please refer to page 5-9 of the CRAS for more detailed information. Once this project reaches the design phase, further options can be explored to minimize the potential effect this project will have on SR 1. At that time, we can look into options that would meet the needs of this project while also preserving the resource as much as possible. If your office concurs with this commitment, as well as the remainder of the report, then we ask that you send your recommendations to the State Historic Preservation Officer so that they may also review and concur with these findings.

Please contact me if your office needs any additional information or if further discussion is needed.

Sincerely,

Amanda Marshall

Amanda Marshall
Cultural Resources Coordinator

:C: Peggy Kelley – FDOT PD&E Project Coordinator
John Flora – Metric Engineering PD&E Project Manager
Elizabeth Horvath – ACI

The FHWA finds the attached Cultural Resources Assessment Report complete and sufficient and _X_ approves / ___ does not approve, the above recommendations and findings.

The FHWA requests the SHPO's opinion on the sufficiency of the attached report and the SHPO's opinion on the recommendations and findings contained in this cover letter and in the comment block below.

FHWA Comments:

for /s/ Joseph Sullivan

Martin C. Knopp, P.E.
Division Administrator
Florida Division
Federal Highway Administration

1-31-2012
Date

The Florida State Historic Preservation Officer finds the attached Cultural Resources Assessment Report complete and sufficient and concurs with the recommendations and findings provided in this cover letter for SHPO/DHR Project File Number 2011-624.

for Alissa Slade, Deputy SHPO

Robert F. Bendus
State Historic Preservation Officer
For Review and Compliance
Florida Division of Historical Resources

2-23-12
Date

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
United States Coast Guard

Commander
Eighth Coast Guard District
Hale Boggs Federal Building

500 Poydras Street, Room 1313
New Orleans, LA 70130-3310
Staff Symbol: (dpb)
Phone: (504) 671-2128
Fax: (504) 671-2133
D8DPBALL@uscg.mil

16591C
March 9, 2012

RECEIVED
MAR 13 2012
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT OFFICE

Ms. Joy Giddens
Environmental Permits Director
Florida Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 607
Chipley, Florida 32428

Dear Ms. Giddens:

We have reviewed your information package, pertaining to Florida Department of Transportation's proposed project crossing the Blackwater River at Milton, in Santa Rosa County, Florida. We understand that this bridge project may be federally funded.

As part of our project review, we received a Bridge project Questionnaire from the Finley Engineering Group, Inc., dated December 20, 2011 along with a site map and pictures of the proposed bridge site. Based on our observations and the information that was provided, as well as the fact that Federal funds may be utilized for this project, it appears that the waterway, at the site of the bridge, would meet the criteria for the Surface Transportation Act of 1978 (STAA). In such cases, FHWA has the responsibility for the STAA under 23 U.S.C. 144(h) and would make the determination as to whether or not a Coast Guard Bridge Permit would be required. Based on 23 CFR Part 650.805, a Coast Guard Bridge permit would not be required if the FHWA determines that the proposed construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation or replacement of the federally funded or federally assisted funded bridge crosses waterways which (1) are not used or are not susceptible for use in their natural condition, or by reasonable improvement as a means to transport interstate or foreign commerce; and (2) which are not tidal, or if tidal, used only by recreational boating, fishing, and or other small vessels less than 21 feet in length.

Should FHWA determine that Blackwater River, at the bridge location, meets the criteria for the STAA, the Coast Guard would accept that determination and the project would be exempt from Coast Guard Bridge Administration purposes. Therefore, I suggest that you contact the FHWA Division Administrator in Tallahassee, Florida, regarding this proposed bridge project, and that you request that FHWA review the proposed project to determine if it meets the criteria for the STAA.

If you have any questions or if we can be of additional assistance please contact our office.

Sincerely,

DAVID M. FRANK
Chief of the Bridge Administration Branch
U. S. Coast Guard
By direction

Copy: Mr. Martin C. Knopp, P.E., Division Administrator, FHWA, Tallahassee, FL

U.S. Department
of Transportation

**Federal Highway
Administration**

Florida Division

**545 John Knox Road, Suite 200
Tallahassee, Florida 32303**

(850) 942-9650

March 28, 2012

In Reply Refer To: HPO-FL
Re: SR 87 Connector Bridge
over the Black Water River
in Santa Rosa County-FL

Mr. David Frank
Bridge Administrator
Eighth Coast Guard District
Hale Boggs Federal Building
500 Poydras Street
New Orleans, LA 70130

Attn: Ms. Donna Gagliano

Subject: SR 87 Connector bridge over the Black Water River in Santa Rosa County-FL

Dear Mr. David Frank;

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has reviewed the navigation determination requested for the building of a SR 87 connector bridge over the Black Water River in Santa Rosa County, FL. As stated in 23 CFR 650 subpart H, the FHWA has the responsibility to determine that a USCG permit is not required for bridge construction, if the FHWA determines that the proposed construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of the federally aided or assisted bridge is over a tidal waterway that is used only for recreational purpose and other vessels, which are less than 21 feet in length. Based on the criteria stated in 23 CFR 650, Subpart H, the FHWA has made the determination that the U. S. Coast Guard permit is not required for the SR 87 Connector bridge over the Black Water River in Santa Rosa County-FL.

If you have any question or comments, please contact Joseph Sullivan at (850)–553-2248.

Sincerely,

/s/ Joseph Sullivan
For: Martin C. Knopp, P.E.
Division Administrator

cc: Mrs. Blair Martin, and Joy Giddens, FDOT D3

PM S\:Environment\District 3\SR 87 Connector frm US90 to SR87N\Correspondence :

U.S. Department
of Transportation

**Federal Highway
Administration**

Florida Division

545 John Knox Road, Suite 200
Tallahassee, Florida 32303

Phone: (850) 553-2200
Fax: (850) 942-9691 / 942-8308

www.fhwa.dot.gov/fldiv

April 27, 2012

In Reply Refer To:
HPO-FL

Mr. David Frank
Bridge Administrator
Eighth Coast Guard District
Hale Boggs Federal Building
500 Poydras Street
New Orleans, LA 70130

RECEIVED
MAY 03 2012
CTRL#12-0182
D8

Attn: Ms. Donna Gagliano

Dear Mr. David Frank;

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has reviewed the navigation determination requested for the building of a SR 87 connector bridge over the Black Water River in Santa Rosa County, FL. As stated in 23 CFR 650 subpart H, FHWA is allowed to make the determination, when the tidal waterway is used only for recreational purpose and other vessels which are less than 21 feet in length. Based on the guidelines stated in 23 CFR 650, FHWA has determinedn that the U. S. Coast Guard permit is not required for the SR 87 Connector bridge over the Black Water River in Santa Rosa County-FL.

If you have any question or comments, please contact Joseph Sullivan at (850)–553-2248.

Sincerely,

For: Martin C. Knopp
Division Administrator

cc: Mrs. Blair Martin, and Joy Giddens, FDOT D3

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
United States Coast Guard

Commandant
United States Coast Guard
Hale Boggs Federal Building

500 Poydras Street, Room 1313
New Orleans, LA 70130-3310
Staff Symbol: dpb
Phone: (504) 671-2128
Fax: (504) 671-2133
D8DPBALL@uscg.mil

16591C
3 May 2012

MEMORANDUM

From: David M. Frank
CGD EIGHT (dpb)

To: Mr. Martin C. Knopp, P.E., Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration

Subj: STA ACT CONCURRENCE

1) You have determined by letter dated 27 April 2012 that the proposed bridge on SR 87 connector bridge crossing Blackwater River, Mile 4.8, in Santa Rosa County, Florida is exempt under the Surface Transportation Authorization Act (STAA) from Coast Guard Permitting. We concur with your findings.

2) FHWA has the responsibility for the STAA and based on the information provided by Florida Department of Transportation and a project site evaluation, conducted by Coast Guard personnel, the Coast Guard accepts your determination that this bridge project meets the criteria for the STAA and is exempt for Coast Guard Bridge Administration purposes.

3) The bridge is not exempt from the Coast Guard required lights and other signals as the subject Act which amended Title 23 U.S. Code, to include 23 U.S.C. 144(h), did not exclude this category of bridges from the application of 14 U.S.C. 85. The later statute requires the establishment, maintenance, and operation of Coast Guard required lights and signals on fixed structures, including bridges. The owner, in this case, the Florida Department of Transportation must request the lighting exemption and provide the reason, the only exemption being Title 33 CFR 118.40(b). The statement of the reason for the exemption must fulfill the requirements of this section. Specifically, if it is determined that no significant nighttime navigation occurs at the bridge sites a statement to this effect is required before a decision can be made. Once we receive the required information from the bridge owner, we will evaluate the specified conditions and respond accordingly.

4) If we could be of further assistance, please contact our office at 504-671-2128.

#

Copy: Ms. Joy Giddens, FDOT, District 3, Chipley, Florida
Mr. Joseph Sullivan, FHWA

MEETING SUMMARY

Final: 5/25/12

PROJECT: SR 87 Connector PD&E Study FPIDs: 4167483-22-01; 4167483-22-02; 4167484-22-01; 4167484-22-02, and 41674842290

ETDM: 12597

MEETING: Florida Department of Transportation D-3 (DOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)

DATE/TIME: May 16, 2012; 5:30 PM

LOCATION: Via Teleconference

ATTENDEES:

FHWA: Joe Sullivan	joe.sullivan@fhwa.dot.gov
FDOT: Peggy Kelley	peggy.kelley@dot.state.fl.us
Metric: John Flora	jflora@metriceng.com

Purpose of Meeting: To seek direction from FHWA on the following:

- How to structure the SR 87 Connector Preliminary Engineering Report in light of taking two Alternatives through the Public Hearing
- To obtain input from FHWA regarding the Letter of Significance on the Blackwater Heritage Trail, and
- To review USFWs request for formal action.

Preliminary Engineering Report:

Mr. Flora stated he understood that it was FHWAs desire to carry both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 through the entire process including the Public Hearing. He noted that in the preparation of the Preliminary Engineering Report (PER) there was a chapter that normally discussed a recommendation on the Alternatives. He asked if taking both Alternatives through the public hearing would preclude the consultant/FDOT from making a recommendation on an Alternative.

Mr. Sullivan clarified by stating that the consultant/FDOT could make a ***recommendation*** on the Alternatives, but all of the information on both Alternatives needed to be provided in the PER, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), as well as be presented at the public hearing. He explained that the recommendation, along with the public input from the hearing, would be taken into consideration by FHWA when making their determination on a ***Preferred*** Alternative. Once FHWA selected the ***Preferred*** Alternative, that Alternative would then be carried forward into the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).

Blackwater Heritage State Trail Letter of Significance:

Mr. Flora explained that the letter had been requested from the Department of Environment (DEP) in association with the preparation of the SR 87 Connector Section 4(f) Determination of Applicability (DOA) that was being prepared by the consultant. Mr. Flora noted that he had

requested that DEP provide recognition that the proposed plans for the SR 87 Connector called for grade separation between the two facilities, but that recognition had not been included in the letter. Mr. Flora asked if it should be included, or was it not really needed by FHWA in order for them to make their determination of applicability.

Mr. Sullivan asked why the DEP had chosen to not include the information.

Mr. Flora stated that he had not yet spoken with Mr. Klein to find out why the reference had not been included.

Mr. Sullivan stated that it was not necessary for the recognition be included, but would be helpful. He recommended that the consultant discuss the matter with DEP. Mr. Sullivan noted that given the trail was eight miles long and we were merely crossing the trail, the Section 4(f) would unlikely be applicable. He noted that FHWA would need to get a better understanding of what more than grade-separation DEP was expecting.

Mr. Flora stated that he would follow up with a conversation with DEP.

USFWs Request for Formal Action:

Ms. Kelley referenced an e-mail she had received from Mary Mittiga that she had forwarded to Mr. Sullivan. She noted that in the e-mail Ms. Mittiga had requested formal consultation. She also noted that it was her understanding that Ms. Ms. Mittiga was asking for an HDR methodology field survey of both corridors in their entirety. Ms. Kelley stated that she thought that was too excessive for the project.

Mr. Sullivan stated that he thought it was to excessive as well.

Ms. Kelley asked if Mr. Sullivan was in agreement with the formal consultation.

Mr. Sullivan stated that it was probably appropriate for the Reticulated Flatwoods Salamander, but he said that he wanted to get more clarity from Ms. Mittiga to understand exactly what she was looking for, and what kind of information she was expecting to receive.

Ms. Kelley stated that she would get with Mary to request that she outline the specifics on her request formally.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:20 PM.

Metric Engineering will rely on these notes as the approved record of matters discussed and conclusions reached during this meeting unless you send the author written notice to the contrary within seven calendar days of receipt date of this meeting record.

Submitted by: John Flora, R.A., AICP
Transportation Planning/PD&E Regional Manager
Metric Engineering, Inc.

C: All attendees

Florida Department of
Environmental Protection
Marjory Stoneman Douglas Building
3900 Commonwealth Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3000

Rick Scott
Governor

Jennifer Carroll
Lt. Governor

Herschel T. Vinyard Jr.
Secretary

May 21, 2012

John Flora, R.A., AICP
Transportation Planning/PD&E Manager
Metric Engineering, Inc.
Lake Mary, FL 32746

Dear Mr. Flora:

The Blackwater Heritage State Trail (BHST) is a multi-use trail facility located in southern Santa Rosa County and titled to the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund of the State of Florida (Trustees). As manager of the BHST, the DEP Division of Recreation and Parks (DRP) is the official having jurisdiction over this property. As presented in the adopted management plan for the BHST, the purpose for which the Trustees acquired this property in 1993 was "the conservation and protection of natural and historical resources and for resource-based outdoor recreation and conservation". In terms of both acquisition and ongoing management, this property meets the definition of "conservation land" as presented in state law (Chapters 253 and 259, Florida Statutes).

Significant recreational resources on this property include the 8-mile paved multi-use trail, a visitor center, and three trailheads. This property serves the recreational needs of a wide diversity of user groups: bicyclists, walkers/hikers, joggers, skaters, equestrian riders, and wildlife viewers/birders. As the preeminent bikeway facility in this area of Florida, the BHST plays an important role in meeting the recreation objectives of the greater Milton community, including both the City of Milton and Naval Air Station Whiting Field.

Significant natural resources include several wetland areas, which help purify stormwater runoff as it drains into the Blackwater River – a waterbody formally designated as an Outstanding Florida Water (OFW). These wetlands occur across four natural communities within the property: bog, baygall, wet flatwoods, and seepage streams (the most significant of which is Clear Creek – a perennial clear watercourse). Various listed species of flora and fauna are known to occur within the immediate vicinity of the property. Listed flora include the white topped pitcher plant (*Sarracenia*

leucophylla) and the panhandle lily (*Lilium iridollae*), while listed fauna include the flatwoods salamander (*Ambystoma cingulatum*).

The BHST provides numerous recreational, ecological, and hydrological benefits on a local, regional, and even national level. Consequently, the BHST is highly significant with regards to the resource-based recreational opportunities and the conservation benefits that it affords area residents and visitors alike. To ensure the BHST's enjoyment by future generations, it is imperative that its resource values are not diminished.

DRP acknowledges that the design plans for the State Road 87 Connector intend for the roadway to cross the 100'-wide trail corridor as a grade-separated elevated overpass, and that no bridge pilings or other bridge infrastructure will be installed within the trail corridor. We consider this to be a positive development as it relates to natural resource protection and trail user safety and enjoyment.

We look forward to completing our review of the project once a final version of the PD&E study is available. Please let me know if you have any further questions or require any additional information.

Sincerely,

Matthew Klein
Land Administration & Acquisition Coordinator
Division of Recreation and Parks

/mk

cc: Albert Gregory, Bureau Chief, Office of Park Planning
Jim Wood, Bureau Chief, Office of Greenways and Trails
Daniel Jones, Chief, Florida Park Service – District One

Mary Mittiga/R4/FWS/DOI
07/12/2012 01:59 PM

To peggy.kelley@dot.myflorida.com
cc Harold Mitchell/R4/FWS/DOI@FWS, Karen Herrington/R4/FWS/DOI@FWS
bcc
Subject Fw: SR 87 Connector Draft ESBAR

Hi Peggy -

I've read through the desktop analysis for the reticulated flatwoods salamander. That looks good - and can be included as an attachment to the ESBAR. Again, the shift of the alignment to the south and use of bridging are very effective in reducing the scope of impact. However, I still have some unanswered questions from my previous email below. The ESBAR should be updated to address these issues:

Reticulated flatwooods salamander
1. The effect determination for the reticulated flatwoods salamander should be re-evaluated. We recommend formal consultation since at this time it appears that the corridor will be impacting habitat (Pond 2 as well as upland and dispersal habitat) within the critical habitat unit RFS-2A.

Gulf sturgeon
1. Can the in-water work restrictions be extended as suggested below (see below Gulf sturgeon #1)?
2. Can the additional commitments be made (see below Gulf sturgeon #2)?
If the timing restrictions can't be met, we recommend initiating formal consultation for Gulf sturgeon.

Rare Plants
1. Can additional information be provided on the number of plants and their locations for the two species of at-risk plants identified in the ESBAR (see below)?
2. Can impacts to these plants be avoided to the extent practicable?

I'm available to meet with you if you'd like to discuss further! Thanks, Mary

Mary A. Mittiga
Fish and Wildlife Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1601 Balboa Avenue
Panama City, Florida 32405
Tel: (850) 769-0552 Ext. 236
Fax: (850) 763-2177
Email: Mary_Mittiga@fws.gov
Website: http://www.fws.gov/panamacity/
----- Forwarded by Mary Mittiga/R4/FWS/DOI on 07/11/2012 03:01 PM -----

Mary Mittiga/R4/FWS/DOI
05/16/2012 06:30 AM

To <peggy.kelley@dot.myflorida.com>
cc
Subject Re: SR 87 Connector Draft ESBAR

Hi Peggy -

Thanks for sharing the draft ESBAR early for my comments. I'm glad to see the corridor has shifted to the south within the reticulated flatwoods salamander critical habitat unit (RFS-2A), and that FDOT proposes to bridge the area. Those changes go a long way toward reducing direct and indirect effects to the unit. Similarly, bridging the Blackwater River floodplain-to-floodplain and restricting in-water work to outside the

MEETING SUMMARY

Draft: 8/14/2012

PROJECT: SR 87 Connector PD&E Study FPIDs: 4167483-22-01; 4167483-22-02; 4167484-22-01; 4167484-22-02; and 4167484-22-90

ETDM: 12597

MEETING: Florida Department of Transportation D-3 (DOT), Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP)/OGT

DATE/TIME: August 9, 2012; 10:00 AM CT

LOCATION: FDOT Teleconference

ATTENDEES:

FDOT/D3: Peggy Kelley	peggy.kelley@dot.state.fl.us
FDEP/Parks: Danny Jones	daniel.r.jones@dep.state.fl.us
FDEP/OGT: Gerard Greco	gerard,greco@dep.state.fl.us
Metric: John Flora	jflora@metriceng.com
Metric: Amy Wiwi	amywiwi@metriceng.com

Purpose of Meeting: The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and Project Team arranged to meet with the Florida Department of Environmental (FDEP) staff to discuss the proposed SR 87 Connector's crossing of the Blackwater Heritage Trail in Santa Rosa County.

Mr. Flora led the discussion by outlining the status of the project. He explained that originally six corridors were being evaluated. Of those six corridors, only two remained as viable alternatives. The other four had been eliminated due to fatal flaws associated with Florida Forever Lands. Mr. Flora went on to explain that the majority of the two corridors shared the same alignment until it reached southwest of Whiting Field. He explained that Corridor 1 went due west to SR 87N, whereas, Corridor 2 headed north for a connection with SR 87N near the SR 89N split.

Mr. Flora noted that where the corridors crossed the Blackwater Heritage Trail, the corridors had a common alignment. He explained the crossing location was immediately adjacent to where the northern power easement crossed the trail. Mr. Flora also noted that the crossing was due west of the Reticulated Flatwoods Salamander habitat.

Mr. Flora noted that to minimize impacts to the salamander habitat, FHWA agreed for FDOT to elevate (bridge) the habitat area. Mr. Flora noted that the Project Team had been coordinating with United States Fish and Wildlife (USFW) in developing an approved crossing.

Mr. Flora also noted that the Office of Greenways and Trails (OGT) had requested the proposed roadway be grade separated. Pursuant to their request, FDOT met with FHWA to discuss extending the bridge so that the trail could be grade separated. FHWA agreed to the extension of the bridge.

Mr. Flora outlined that in the preparation of the Section 4(f), he had been coordinating with Matt Cline at OGT in Albert Gregory's office. Mr. Flora explained that OGT had requested that the bridge clear

span the entire Park right of way of 100 feet. Mr. Flora stated that a design would be developed to span the entire right of way to help ensure that Section 4(f) would not come to play.

Mr. Jones stated that the Parks Department was very pleased with the design that had been developed and was very happy about the coordination with OGT that has taken place. He stated that, like OGT, the Parks Department supported the design concept.

Ms. Wiwi stated that she had also met with the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization's Bicycle-Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) on August 7th and presented the grade-separated concept. She stated the Committee was very happy with the design, and was very pleased to hear the roadway design included a separate multi-use sidewalk, and not just bike lanes. They stated that with a connection to the Blackwater Heritage Trail, the bike/ped regional connectivity would be enhanced tremendously.

Mr. Jones stated that this project would be a real enhancement for the County and applauded the efforts made by the design team.

Ms. Kelley stated she appreciated the participation by OGT and the Parks. She noted that the Department looked forward to continue working with the agencies throughout the course of the project.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:00 AM CT.

Metric Engineering will rely on these notes as the approved record of matters discussed and conclusions reached during this meeting unless you send the author written notice to the contrary within seven calendar days of receipt date of this meeting record.

Submitted by: John Flora, R.A., AICP
Transportation Planning/PD&E Regional Manager
Metric Engineering, Inc.

C: All attendees
Project File

Attachment: Blackwater Heritage Trail Crossing Rendering
FDEP/OGT Matthew Klein letter dated May 21, 2012

SR 87 Connector PD&E

Meeting Minutes

August 27, 2012
8:00 AM – 9:00 AM (CST)

Meeting to discuss the species considerations related to the SR 87 Connector PD&E, previous USFWS comments, and Desktop Analysis Results

Meeting Facilitator: John Flora (Metric Engineering) & Daniel Van Nostrand (ERC)

Attendees: Joe Sullivan (FHWA), Peggy Kelley (FDOT), Mary Mitiga (USFWS), Harold Mitchell (USFWS), Karen Herrington (USFWS), John Flora (Metric), Jessica Bloomfield (Metric), Nicole Mauntler (Metric), and Daniel Van Nostrand (ERC)

I. May 16, 2012 ESBAR Comment Email

- Dan provide brief discussion of email comments to recap the determinations and the status of USFWS's opinions related to Gulf sturgeon and reticulated flatwoods salamander
- Peggy stated that FDOT was not in agreement with the entire email and that more discussion was needed especially related to the Gulf sturgeon commitments.
- Mary stated that "in-water" work was only referring to pile driving not just having a barge in the water.
- Peggy asked if we could follow similar timelines as the Yellow River consultation.
- Mary stated that the specifics related to this project would have to be discussed.
- Harold described that Gulf sturgeon impacts would have to be assessed related to the Primary Constituent Elements of the species and their critical habitat.

II. Desktop Analysis, Field Survey, and Project Modifications

- Dan described the reticulated flatwoods salamander desktop analysis, and that the analysis resulted in 8 potential pond areas. Only the known pond area within the critical habitat had decent habitat quality and appropriate habitat type to support flatwoods salamanders.
- Mary agreed that the majority of the habitat was not suitable and said the desktop analysis looked good.

- Dan described that the bridges had been lengthened, that the stormwater ponds were all located outside of the critical habitat unit, and that all stormwater would be collected to minimize impacts. He asked if formal consultation for RFS was still necessary.
- Mary stated that those were all good avoidance and minimization measures but that the only time formal consultation is not required is when they can demonstrate that impacts to the species or habitat will be insignificant or non-detectable. As such, formal consultation would be required for the flatwoods salamander.

III. Potential Formal Consultation

<u>Gulf sturgeon</u>

- Mary stated that consultation would be necessary if FDOT cannot agree to the March through November construction condition. If FDOT wants to work outside the March through November guideline, then they could discuss with FHWA initiating formal consultation.
- Karen stated that in water work is only the installation of pilings and that work on the piling caps and the decking would not constitute in water work. Working outside of the restricted window would constitute an insignificant affect.
- Jessica stated that there would most likely be approximately 18-20 pilings in the river.
- Peggy stated that FDOT cannot commit to the construction window and wants to coordinate with FDOT construction and structure folks.
- Joe stated that consultation takes 135 days complete and asked Mary and Karen what the main impact was to the sturgeon.
- Mary stated that it could affect the sturgeon's movement up the river.
- Joe stated that there would be substantial open area north and south of the piling installation for the sturgeon to move during construction.
- Karen indicated that the other impacts include noise, turbidity, vibration, and not just the location of the construction.
- Joe asked for literature related to the effects of vibration on fish migration and for Mary to provide the requested literature.
- John asked what kind of information USFWS would be looking for in the Biological Assessment.
- Mary stated that they would need to know information about the bridge design, the scope of the impact, the construction methodology, the timeline, and the BMPs that are proposed.
- John – what kind of mitigation would be required?
- Karen stated that there could be stream restoration or protection depending on the timing. (Peggy stated that the project would let in approx. 5 years) Since the project is starting in about 5 years, we could start a study now by installing a receiver at the bridge location. The

receiver would give us more information about the tagged sturgeon and how far upstream they go and determine if they use this portion of the river or not. If we find they do not, then formal consultation may not be necessary.

- Karen stated as an alternative that formal consultation could be conducted at the time of project letting.
- Peggy asked Mary if the standard sturgeon guidelines were no longer good since the work timeframes are always being shifted to a longer time period than the standard guidance.
- Karen stated that USFWS has worked on revised guidelines in FDOT District 2, but that it's hard to have a one size fits all approach since they do not know a ton about the species and their populations.
- Harold clarified that the USFWS was not stipulating the work timeframes and that if the FDOT wants coverage for a potential species impact without working inside the specified timeframes they should initiate formal consultation. If FDOT prefers to work outside of the timeframe, then they do not have to do formal.
- Joe asked how long the "take" provided in the formal consult conclusion (BO) is 'good for' and if there is an expiration
- Harold stated that it would depend on the type of take (whether direct individual or harassment) and that the language in the final BO specifying the take could be worded to specify a timeframe.
- Peggy asked if the timeline could be extended.
- Mary clarified that there can be flexibility in the take if we built it in and could include language that discusses re-evaluation if the project does not occur within a certain timeframe.
- Joe asked if there was a set structure for data collection and what was needed for the BA and for the USFWS to approve a take.
- Harold stated that a BA is needed to describe the possible impact.
- Karen clarified that information about the # of individuals with the potential for impact, the project timing, etc. is needed, but that there is no specific surveys that are required.
- Peggy asked if the information and timing from the Yellow River BA could be used for this project.
- Mary stated that the window is more flexible with a formal consultation.

Reticulated Flatwoods Salamander

- Peggy clarified that the impacts to salamander are because of habitat impacts in the critical habitat unit.
- Harold stated that he understands that we have pilings in the critical habitat and that he is recognizing the avoidance and minimization measures (we are getting credit for it). All critical habitat is assumed to be occupied since they err on the side of the species according to Congress. The fact that the project is FHWA funded raises the bar for the

Endangered Species Act process. The impact within the critical habitat must evaluate the species PCE's especially hydrology in this case. The formal consultation is a type of "insurance policy" from the USFWS in case of any impact or perceived impact from a challenge from Natural Resources Defense Council or other groups. For instance, pond RFS2-B was occupied in 1993, surveyed every 2-5 years without finding any RFS and then they just found RFS in the most recent survey 17 years later. For this reason they err on the cautionary side and advise FDOT to conduct formal consultation.

- Dan asked what types of mitigation measures they would consider for the RFS impacts.
- Harold stated that if the pond could be improved with prescribed fire, hydrological monitoring, and/or private land acquisition. (Peggy stated that may not be feasible due to the landowners that own the property and asked for additional suggestions). Harold mentioned that RFS2-B in the Yellow River Management area, which is managed by DOF, could be improved and considered off-site mitigation. Harold stated that half of the critical habitat ponds are on or partially on public property.
- Peggy stated she would discuss these options with Joy Giddens.

IV. General Discussion

Related to the sturgeon, Peggy needs to talk to the structures folks to see if the timelines are feasible.

Peggy asked how much take will USFWS allow – how many individuals and how is it determined.

Harold stated that they need a means for estimation and in most cases they estimate a species number / acre/ year and that they would need to evaluate the estimation method and # of individuals as part of their BO.

John asked about the procedure and general timeframe.

Mary said they need the BA.

Dan stated that he started working on the BA following the FHWA National BA template.

Harold and Mary agree that if we have all the information in the national template that we should be ok.

Peggy asked about the cost of the sturgeon tag detectors.

Karen stated that they are approximately $1,200 / detector, that USFWS would install them, monitor them, and download data. They would also commit to sharing the data with FDOT for reporting.

Peggy stated that she would coordinate internally and that we would get back with the USFWS regarding the internal discussions.

Mary will resend her emails to Peggy so that Joe can take a look and we can decide how to move forward.

No other questions or comments and meeting adjourned at 9:20am (CST)

From: John Flora <JFlora@metriceng.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2012 9:18 AM
To: Dan Van Nostrand

Hi Peggy -

Thanks for sharing the draft ESBAR early for my comments. I'm glad to see the corridor has shifted to the south within the reticulated flatwoods salamander critical habitat unit (RFS-2A), and that FDOT proposes to bridge the area. Those changes go a long way toward reducing direct and indirect effects to the unit. Similarly, bridging the Blackwater River floodplain-to-floodplain and restricting in-water work to outside the Gulf sturgeon migratory period significantly reduces impacts from the project on sturgeon and their critical habitat (Unit 4-Yellow River System). In reading through the ESBAR I do have a few comments.

Reticulated flatwoods salamander

1. The analysis for the reticulated flatwoods salamander is incomplete. It should look at effects both to the species and its habitat, as well as to the critical habitat unit. To fully evaluate the effects to the species, the HDR model should be used for the length of the corridor to determine if potential habitat is present. We told the consultant this both during the field review and by email (attached). Especially this close to a known pond, other potential ponds may be present.

2. Even though bridging and the new alignment location greatly reduce effects to unit RFS-2A, there still will be impacts to the habitat within the unit. Some of these effects may include, but aren't limited to: direct habitat loss/degradation from the placement of bridge supports, temporary construction area, shading, altering water quality and quantity; and indirect effects such as reduced potential for future land management activities such as prescribed burning and increased human access. An effect determination of "may affect, not likely to adversely affect" (NLAA) is reached when effects on listed species are insignificant (not measurable) and discountable (extremely unlikely to occur). As long as impacts are occurring to habitat within the unit, we recommend initiating formal consultation to assure that FDOT and FHWA are covered for potential incidental take of the flatwoods salamander. Formal consultation will also look at the potential for your action to adversely modify the critical habitat unit - or determine whether there is a loss of the unit's conservation function.

Gulf sturgeon

1. The ESBAR includes a commitment to avoid in-water work from April through October. This commitment is a key factor toward reaching your NLAA effect determination. In order to assure that no fish are in the area during in-water construction activities, we recommend extending this window to March through November. Currently our office lacks the data necessary to more narrowly define when fish move through the area proposed for construction. In the future, our office may be able to place receivers near your proposed project area to better define when fish are present and your commitment could then be revised as appropriate.

2. In addition to commitments to limit in-water work to outside the sturgeon's migratory window and following sturgeon construction guidelines, we recommend adding the following commitments to help support your NLAA determination for Gulf sturgeon and its designated critical habitat. Some of these are discussed in the ESBAR but no commitments were provided.

- Placement of piles in the river should be avoided if possible. If placement in the river is unavoidable, piles should be minimized to the extent practicable.

- Innovative, environmentally sensitive construction techniques should be used such as top-down construction.
- If siltation barriers are used within the river, they should be made of material in which a sturgeon cannot become entangeld, be properly secured, and be regularly monitored to avoid entrapment. Barriers should not block entry to or exit from designated critical habitat.
- If a sturgeon is seen within 100 yards of the active daily construction operation or vessel movement, all appropriate precautions should be implemented to ensure its protection. These precautions should include cessation of operation of any moving equipment closer than 50 feet of a sturgeon. Operation of any mechanical construction equipment should cease immediately if a sturgeon is seen within a 50-foot radius of the equipment. Activities should not resume until the protected species has departed the project area of its own volition.
- Stormwater should be collected and conveyed off of the bridge to treatment ponds to eliminate run off during construction and operation.
- Equipment should be staged and stored in areas without environmentally sensitive habitats, including the docking, removal, or storage of boats during periods of inactivity.
- Native vegetation should be planted immediately following completion of construction and erosion control measures should be removed only after vegetation has become fully established.
- All applicable Best Management Practices (BMPs) should be implemented to control erosion, sedimentation, and turbidity. An erosion control plan should be submitted to the Service for approval prior to the start of construction.

3. Provided that the above recommendations are met, the Service could concur with your determination of NLAA for the Gulf sturgeon. However, if FDOT is unable to complete all in-water work outside of the peak migratory periods for the sturgeon, or if FDOT wants to plan in advance for potential project delays that may result in a need to work during the migratory period, we recommend initiating formal consultation. Formal consultation includes reasonable and prudent measures with terms and conditions that could reduce the impacts of the project should work take place while fish are likely to be present.

<u>West Indian manatee</u>

1. As the project is located in waters accessible to the manatee, we recommend including appropriate Standard Manatee Construction Conditions for this project. Note that measures c and f are not required in Santa Rosa County.

<u>Rare plants</u>

The ESBAR indicated that two plants considered "at-risk" by the Service were identified during surveys in the project corridor: the panhandle lily (*Lilium iridollae*) and small-flower meadow beauty (*Rhexia parviflora*). A list of at-risk plants is attached for your information. The Service received a formal request to list these species and our 90-day finding indicated that listing may be warranted. At present we are in the process of assessing the status of these species. We would greatly appreciate it if you could provide further information such as the number of plants and their GPS locations to assist with our status assessment. While not currently protected under the Endangered Species Act, conserving these species now may prevent the need to list them in the future. We recommend avoiding potential impacts to these plants to the extent practicable. It would also assist our review of the ESBAR if the occurrences of these species used an alternate symbol to clearly identify them. Some colors in the legend are difficult to differentiate.

Everything else looks good! Thanks again for the opportunity to provide comments.

(See attached file: 20121209_em_Mittiga to Van Nostrand, HDR model for potential habitat SR 87.pdf)(See attached file: 2011_StandardConditionsForIn-waterWork.pdf)(See attached file: Species at risk.docx)

Mary A. Mittiga
Fish and Wildlife Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1601 Balboa Avenue
Panama City, Florida 32405
Tel: (850) 769-0552 Ext. 236
Fax: (850) 763-2177
Email: Mary_Mittiga@fws.gov
Website: http://www.fws.gov/panamacity/

<peggy.kelley@dot.myflorida.com>

John Flora, R.A., AICP
Transportation Planning/PD&E Manager
METRIC ENGINEERING, INC.
Lake Mary, FL 32746

Phone: 407.644.1898
Cell: 407.952.9458
Fax: 407.644.1921
www.METRICENG.com

Attention: The information contained in this E-mail message is privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the individual(s) named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copy of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please contact the sender by reply E-mail and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.

US Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Report Comments

Division Florida	Report(s) DOA – SR 87 Crossing of the Blackwater Heritage Trail	Fed Aid Project No. SFT1 296 R, S129 348 R	
Review by Joseph Sullivan, Environmental Specialist	Date 10-26-2012	State No: FIN: 416748-3-22-01, 416748-3-22-02	District 3
In Company With:			
Location: Blackwater Heritage Trail intersection with the proposed SR 87 connector.		County: Santa Rosa Counties, FL	
Description: The proposed SR 87 will 'fly' over the existing trail without incorporating park property or impacting the trail.			

Comments:
-Blackwater Heritage Trail is a publically owned openly accessible significant recreational property. As such, impacts to Blackwater Heritage Trail would constitute an impact to a 4(f) resource.
-The proposed SR 87 will not incorporate portions of the trail either permanently or temporarily based on the information provided.
Conclusion:
-Based on the information provided this project will not result in a severance of the existing trail and there is no proposed significant impacts to trail property therefore 4(f) will not apply to the proposed intersection of the trail. With that said, whether Section 4(f) applies or not, it is FHWA's policy that every reasonable effort should be made to maintain the continuity of existing shared use paths and similar facilities. Additionally, to the best of our ability the viewshed and quality of the trail should be maintained.

Distribution	Project File District Transportation Engineer Environmental Coordinator Peggy Kelley, FDOT, District 3

Ashley Pate

From: Amy Wiwi
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 2:06 PM
To: Ashley Pate
Subject: FW: SR 87 Connector PD&E
Attachments: 87_Connector_Comments.docx

-----Original Message-----
From: Roy, Randy CIV NAS WHITING FIELD [mailto:randy.roy@navy.mil]
Sent: Tuesday, October 08, 2013 3:00 PM
To: Amy Wiwi
Cc: Fischer, Larry D CIV NAVFAC SE, Whiting Field
Subject: RE: SR 87 Connector PD&E

Amy,

Please let me know if the attached data points meet the intent of the questions you provided. Do you need me to provide comments via ETDM?

v/r

Randy Roy
Navy Operational Liaison Officer
NAS Whiting Field
850-665-6132
DSN 868

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY - This email and any attached files may contain Privacy Sensitive information. Any misuse or unauthorized disclosure may result in both civil and criminal penalties. If you received this document in error, please notify me at the above phone number and destroy the document immediately in accordance with Privacy Act procedures.

The Federal Highway Administration is reviewing our final documents for the SR 87 Connecter Study. They have asked that I contact you to discuss your thoughts on the following:

- Generally, how do you see the new connector road serving Whiting Field's needs? In general, our average monthly vehicular traffic arriving to the base is 71,000. The traffic is mostly attributed to our gate facing 87N; 65,000 vehicles and 6,000 on our back gate (East Gate Road) ... this does include delivery trucks and other support vehicles. Support personnel, military, DOD Civilian, etc. is a little under 5,000 personnel. If the selection is to 4-lane in front of the main gate; it would be reasonable to assume that most of the 6,000 vehicles would use the new 4-lane access to the base.
- Would you be using the road to go back and forth to Eglin (for maneuvers)? Our mission footprint is chiefly tied to some support vehicles that will traverse the 4-lane access to meet requirements at NOLF Choctaw (1 to 4 vehicles on a daily basis).

  However, it would be advisable to ask Mr. Mike Speights (Eglin PAO) if they will see a planned increase in overall traffic use. There is a desire to look at broadening the footprint mission capabilities (on-going) with respect to non-lethal operations in the Blackwater River Forest. This may produce a metric that was not previously captured.

- Would you be using the road for "bulk" movements . . . (I guess they mean convoys or big equipment)? The "bulk" movements that we conduct (if they are categorized in this way) would be in our transport of downed TH-57 aircraft and movement of Crash Support personnel via Fire Trucks to our Navy Outlying Landing Fields. I would defer to a potential impact from Eglin along the vector that connects via existing 87N to points north of 90/I-10 en route to the Blackwater River Forest.

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
United States Coast Guard

Commandant
United States Coast Guard
Hale Boggs Federal Building

500 Poydras Street, Room 1313
New Orleans, LA 70130-3310
Staff Symbol: dpb
Phone: (504) 671-2128
Fax: (504) 671-2133
D8DPBALL@uscg.mil

16591C
June 26, 2014

RECEIVED
JUN 30 2014

MEMORANDUM

From: David M. Frank
CGD EIGHT (dpb)

To: Mr. James Christian, P.E., Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration

Subj: Surface Transportation Authorization Act Concurrence

1) You have determined by letter dated June 19, 2014 that the proposed State 87 connector bridge project crossing Clear Creek, Santa Rosa County, Florida is exempt under the Surface Transportation Authorization Act (STAA) from Coast Guard Permitting. We concur with your findings.

2) FHWA has the responsibility for the STAA and based on the information provided by Florida Department of Transportation and the project site evaluations, the Coast Guard accepts your determination that this bridge project meets the criteria for the STAA and is exempt for Coast Guard Bridge Administration purposes.

3) The bridge is not exempt from the Coast Guard required lights and other signals as the subject Act which amended Title 23 U.S. Code, to include 23 U.S.C. 144(c), did not exclude this category of bridges from the application of 14 U.S.C. 85. The later statute requires the establishment, maintenance, and operation of Coast Guard required lights and signals on fixed structures, including bridges. The owner, in this case, the Florida Department of Transportation must request the lighting exemptions and provide the reason, the only exemption being Title 33 CFR 118.40. The statement of the reason for the exemptions must fulfill the requirements of this section. Specifically, if it is determined that no significant nighttime navigation occurs at the bridge site and a statement to this effect is required before a decision can be made. Once we receive the required information from the bridge owner, we will evaluate the specified conditions and respond accordingly.

4) If we could be of further assistance, please contact our office at 504-671-2128.

#

Copy: Ms. Joy Swanson, FDOT D3
Mr. Joseph Sullivan, FHWA