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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) conducted a Project Development and Environment (PD&E) study reevaluation to evaluate alternative improvements for US 92 (SR 600) from east of I-4 (milepoint 6.583) to east of County Line Road (milepoint 24.593) in Hillsborough County (Figure 1-1), a distance of approximately 18.1 miles. Study objectives included: reevaluate proposed typical sections, while minimizing impacts to the environment; consider agency and public comments; and ensure project compliance with all applicable federal and state laws. Improvement alternatives were identified which will improve safety and satisfy future transportation demand.

A comprehensive public involvement program was carried out for this study consistent with the Public Involvement Plan (PIP) prepared for this study.

Subsequent coordination with agencies occurred through the submittal and review of various project reports. Agencies which commented on the proposed project included:

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC)
- Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources (SHPO)

In addition to agency coordination via report reviews, coordination meetings and/or presentations were given to the following local agencies and other groups to inform them about the project and to solicit comments:

- Hillsborough County Public Works engineering staff
- Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
- City of Plant City Engineering Staff
- Plant City Strawberry Festival Board
- Plant City Economic Development Corporation
- Seffner Chamber of Commerce

A mailing list was developed which included 3731 property owners located adjacent to or near the proposed project’s limits, in addition to other interested individuals. This mailing list was used in distributing three newsletters about the project, included in Appendix B:

- An initial Kick-Off newsletter
- A public hearing invitational newsletter, and
- A final newsletter distributed after study approval

A project website (http://active.fdot7studies.com/sr600/garden-lane-to-county-line) was also developed and maintained to make information about the proposed project readily available to the public and to offer a means for citizens to provide comments online to the study team at any time during the reevaluation.

A public hearing was held for this project in two sessions at separate locations. On December 1, 2016, the first session was held from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at the HCC Trinkle Center in Plant City.
The second session was held on December 6th, 2016, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Sheraton Tampa East Hotel. The hearing was held to inform citizens and interested parties about the project details and schedule, and allow them the opportunity to provide comments concerning the proposed improvements. The hearing consisted of an open house for the first hour and a formal presentation and public comment period beginning after and followed by an open house until the end of the session.

A total of 239 people signed in at the public hearing between the two sessions. The public hearing transcript is included in Appendix C. Seventy Seven (77) comment forms were received and 12 verbal statements were made during the formal public comment period for a total of 89 comment forms. Of the 89 comment forms, 33 involved requests to be added to the project contact list and 10 pertained to access management issues. Most comments expressed support for the project. Table 8-1 summarizes public comments received. Appendix D contains copies of the written comments and responses. Copies of all public hearing displays and presentation materials are included in the Public Hearing Scrapbook that was prepared for this PD&E study re-evaluation.

On April 20, 2018, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) approved the US 92 (SR 600) PD&E Study Design Change Reevaluation.
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SECTION 1  INTRODUCTION

1.1 PD&E STUDY REEVALUATION PURPOSE

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) conducted a Project Development & Environment (PD&E) study reevaluation to consider widening a portion of US 92 (SR 600) in Hillsborough County. The project study limits are from east of I-4 to east of County Line Road, a distance of approximately 18 miles.

US 92 is an important east-west roadway that spans central Florida. In Hillsborough County, US 92 connects to several regionally significant corridors including I-4, County Line Road, and CR 579. US 92 is also a hurricane evacuation route and a designated truck route. On April 20, 2018, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) approved the US 92 (SR 600) PD&E Study Design Change Reevaluation.

1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project corridor (Figure 1-1) is expected to be improved from an existing, two-lane undivided facility to a four-lane divided facility within the entire study limits, with the exception of the section from Mobley Street through the downtown Plant City area to east of Park Road where it is currently four-lane divided. The proposed improvements will include various intersection improvements, in addition to pedestrian and bicycle accommodations. Improvement alternatives were developed to improve safety, consider cost and capacity needs, and meet future transportation demand. A feasibility analysis of providing grade separation/interchanges at Park Road and County Line Road was also conducted.

Figure 1-1  Study Area Map
1.3 **EXISTING FACILITY AND PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS**

The existing typical sections throughout the study area vary. The existing typical section for US 92 from Garden Lane to Thonotosassa Road is generally a two-lane undivided rural roadway with 12-foot-wide travel lanes and paved outside shoulders. The paved shoulders are typically five feet wide. Stormwater is collected in swales along the outside of the roadway. Sidewalks or boardwalks have been added along one or both sides of the roadway. No designated bicycle facilities are provided. The existing roadway typical section for US 92 from Garden Lane to Thonotosassa Road is shown in Figure 1-2.

From Thonotosassa Road to Mobley Street, the roadway is in transition and consists of two 12-foot-wide eastbound lanes and two 12-foot-wide westbound lanes, of which the outside westbound lane transitions to a right turn at Thonotosassa Road. The existing roadway typical section for US 92 from Thonotosassa Road Mobley Street is shown in Figure 1-3.

From North Gordon Street to Park Road, the US 92 existing typical section is a four-lane divided urban roadway with an 18-foot-wide raised grassed median and concrete curb and gutter on both the inside and outside of the roadway. There is a five-foot sidewalk along the north side of the road. The existing roadway typical section for US 92 from North Gordon Street to Park Road is shown in Figure 1-4.

From east of Park Road to east of County Line Road, US 92 is a rural facility with two 12-foot-wide lanes and grass shoulders and drainage ditches on both sides. The existing roadway typical section for US 92 east of Park Road to County Line Road is shown in Figure 1-5.

Recommended improvements include widening the existing highway to four lanes (except through downtown Plant City from Mobley Street to Maryland Avenue) as well as adding paved shoulders, and improving sidewalk connectivity. Additional right of way will be required throughout the corridor for the recommended improvements. Recommended typical sections are shown in Figures 1-6, 1-7, 1-8, 1-9 and 1-10. As with the original PD&E study, Downtown Plant City, from Mobley Street to Maryland Avenue, will be considered a “No-Build” segment, with no improvements proposed. There are only two segments currently scheduled for funding, in FDOT’s current adopted 5-year work program (Fiscal Years 16/17 through 20/21).
Figure 1-2   Existing Typical Section 2-Lane Rural Garden Lane to Thonotosassa Road
Figure 1-3  Existing Typical Section 4-Lane Rural Thonotosassa Road to Mobley Street
Figure 1-4  Existing Typical Section 4-Lane Urban US 92 from North Gordon Street to Park Road
Figure 1-5  Existing Typical Section 2-Lane Rural US 92 East of Park Road to East of County Line Road
Figure 1-6  Typical Section 1

Figure 1-7  Typical Section 2

Figure 1-8  Typical Section 3
1.4 PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

US 92 within the study area plays a significant role in connecting southern Hillsborough County to the Tampa Bay region. The purpose of the proposed project is to accommodate future traffic demands on US 92 due to growth within the project limits and surrounding areas. This corridor is projected to operate at level of service (LOS) F in the design year (2040) if no increase in capacity is provided. Additional factors which support the need for the project include:
Regional Connectivity - US 92 is a major east-west regional arterial that parallels I-4 and SR 574 (Dr. Martin Luther King Jr Blvd) and connects eastern Hillsborough County to the Tampa Bay region. It provides connectivity between the communities of Lakeland, Plant City, Valrico, and Seffner.

Safety - With the additional capacity provided in the corridor by the proposed widening to US 92, roadway congestion will be reduced, which will decrease potential conflicts with other vehicles and potentially increase safety. In addition to the proposed widening of US 92, the addition of turn lanes at intersections is expected to improve safety along the corridor. An analysis of traffic crash data for years 2009 thru 2013 revealed that the overall average crash rate within the study limits was higher than the statewide average crash rate for similar type facilities.

Plan Consistency - This project is consistent with local planning. The segments of US 92 from US 301 to County Road 579 and from Park Road to County Line Road have been identified as cost feasible projects in the Imagine 2040: Hillsborough Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). These segments have also been included in the State Transportation Improvement Program and the Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Transportation Improvement Program for design.

Emergency Evacuation - US 92 is listed as an evacuation route by the Hillsborough County Emergency Management and shown on the Florida Division of Emergency Management’s evacuation route network. US 92 provides access to I-4 via interchanges with north-south connections on CR 579 (Mango Rd), McIntosh Rd and Branch Forbes Rd, Thonotosassa Rd, Park Rd, and County Line Road all in close proximity to the study limits.

Current and Future Transportation Demand - The Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization’s (MPO) 2040 LRTP Socioeconomic Projections estimate an employment increase of 56% and a population increase of 48% for Hillsborough County between 2010 and 2040. Based on the growth projected to occur within the corridor, US 92 is projected by the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Model (TBRPM Version 8.0) – Cost Feasible Network to have future traffic volumes ranging from approximately 13,800 vehicles to 40,950 vehicles per day (VPD) within the project limits by year 2040, which would yield a Level of Service (LOS) F for the corridor with the current roadway configuration except for the four lane section from Mobley Street through the downtown Plant City area to east of Park Road which will remain acceptable LOS. These volumes would exceed roadway capacity at the adopted standards of LOS for US 92 within the project limits per FDOT; therefore, widening of US 92 needs to be evaluated in order to meet future transportation demand.

1.5 REPORT PURPOSE

This Final Comments & Coordination Report is one of several documents prepared as part of this PD&E study reevaluation. This report documents the Public Involvement Plan (PIP), agency coordination efforts, public involvement activities, and comments received during the study reevaluation.
SECTION 2   PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN

In accordance with Part 1, Chapter 11 of the FDOT PD&E Manual, a comprehensive Public Involvement Plan (PIP), was originally approved in June 2015, with an update prepared in January 2017, which documented the public involvement program. The purpose of this plan was to develop, implement, and document the methods that were to be used to inform and solicit responses from all interested parties including local residents, public officials, agencies and business owners. The PIP helped to identified stakeholders and affected communities and included the following:

- Project background;
- Project goals;
- Outreach activities; and,
- Evaluation of public involvement for the project.

The public involvement program included various techniques to notify the public of the proposed transportation improvements such as legal display newspaper advertisements, news releases to local media and invitational newsletters. The program included three newsletters; the kick-off newsletter, the public hearing newsletter, and a final newsletter published after final project documents are approved by the District. See Section 5 for more information regarding the project newsletters.

The PIP served as a guidance document for planned public involvement activities. These activities included coordination meetings with local officials, a public hearing, presentations to agencies and business groups, unscheduled meetings, and coordination with adjacent projects.
SECTION 3  COORDINATION EFFORTS

The FDOT coordinated with numerous local, state, and federal agencies throughout the study process. This section summarizes the results of these coordination efforts.

3.1  AGENCY COORDINATION

Throughout the course of the study, coordination was conducted with various federal, state and regional agencies whose agreement is required for this project. The following is a list of the federal, state and regional agencies the FDOT coordinated with:

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC)
- Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources (SHPO)

3.1.1  U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

A copy of the Draft WEBAR (now known as a Natural Resources Evaluation (NRE) was sent to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for review and concurrence on December 8, 2016. UDWS found that the proposed improvements were not likely to adversely affect resources protected by the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) provided that the standard protection measures for the eastern indigo snake are incorporated into the project plan.

3.1.2  Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

A copy of the Draft WEBAR was sent to Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) for review and concurrence on July 29, 2015. On December 22, 2016, FWC responded in concurrence with the project biologist’s findings and recommendations.

3.1.4  Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources (SHPO)

A Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS) Report was submitted to the Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources, and the State’s Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) on September 7, 2016. Since three resources were identified which are considered eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), further coordination with the division will be required during future project development phases. SHPO has been given the Draft CSR for their review and concurrence. A copy of the letter from the SHPO and their CSR concurrence are included in Appendix A.

3.2  LOCAL GOVERNMENT COORDINATION

Notes or “minutes” from the following meetings are included in Appendix A, including copies of slide presentations.
3.2.1 **Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)**

The project was presented to the MPO’s Citizen’s Advisory Committee (CAC) on March 21, 2016 to serve as an update on the PD&E study reevaluation. Members were shown a PowerPoint presentation. General project support was conveyed, though no formal motions were discussed.

3.2.2 **Hillsborough County**

The project was discussed with county staff on July 6, 2016, to review the recommended improvements.

3.2.3 **City of Plant City**

The project was discussed with City of Plant City engineering staff on July 6, 2016, to review the proposed improvements and the project’s impact to Plant City.

3.3 **OTHER LOCAL COORDINATION**

Throughout the course of the study, coordination was conducted with various local or community groups which would have an interest in this project. The following is a list of local nongovernmental organizations or community groups with which the FDOT coordinated. Notes or “minutes” from these meetings are included in Appendix A.

3.3.1 **Plant City Strawberry Festival**

The project was discussed with Plant City Strawberry Festival staff on August 17, 2016, to review the proposed improvements and the project’s impacts to festival traffic patterns.

3.3.2 **Plant City Economic Development Corporation**

The project was discussed with Plant City Economic Development Corporation staff on October 17, 2016, to review the proposed improvements and the project’s impacts to Plant City.

3.3.3 **Seffner Chamber of Commerce**

The project was discussed with Seffner Chamber of Commerce members at their meeting on April 14, 2016, to review the proposed improvements.
SECTION 4        MAILING LIST

A mailing list was developed for this project. The mailing list was updated throughout the duration of the PD&E study and contained:

- Those property owners whose property lies, in whole or in part, within 300 feet on either side of the centerline of the project alternative as required by Florida Statutes Section 339.155. The mailing list was based on information obtained from the property appraiser’s database in Hillsborough County. A GIS map showing these parcels is included in Figures 4-1 to Figure 4-4.
- Elected and appointed public officials.
- Individuals or groups who requested to be placed on the study’s mailing list.
- Public and private groups, organizations, agencies, and businesses and individuals that have an interest in the project.

The property owner mailing list included 3,685 owners. The officials, agency, and interested parties mailing list contained approximately 93 people.

The mailing list was used to disseminate project information and announce the public hearing. Newsletters (Section 5) were mailed to all those on the mailing list.

Figure 4-1        GIS Parcel Map of Mailing List
Figure 4-3  GIS Parcel Map of Mailing List
SECTION 5 NEWSLETTERS

Newsletters were mailed to those on the project mailing list as noted in Section 4. Newsletters were used to announce the project kick-off, the public hearing, and approval of the reevaluation by the District. Copies of the newsletters are provided in Appendix C.

A study kick-off newsletter was distributed in July 2015. The newsletter described the PD&E study reevaluation process, discussed the project purpose, and provided a project schedule with the next steps in the study. The newsletter also included contact information and instructions for those needing special assistance or language support.

A public hearing newsletter was distributed in November 2016 to publicize the public hearing and to encourage participation and comments. The newsletter presented the recommended build alternative and corresponding typical sections. Contact information and instructions for those needing special assistance or language support were also provided.

A newsletter will be published and distributed to the public to announce approval of the project documents and to update the public on changes made to the proposed design concepts subsequent to the public hearing.
SECTION 6  WEBSITE

Public participation is an integral part of the transportation process, which helps to ensure that decisions are made in consideration of public needs and preferences. In an effort to engage and inform the public throughout the study process, a project website was developed (Figure 6-1).

The project website (at http://active.fdotd7studies.com/sr600/garden-lane-to-county-line) was used as an educational tool for the general public; explaining what a PD&E study reevaluation evaluates and why, listing contact information for comments and questions, and providing links to other sites and projects. It was established in April 2015 and updated several times during the study reevaluation.

In addition, the website was used as an information sharing tool. Site visitors could read about project details, review past and current newsletters, follow the project schedule, and peruse available project documents, information sheets, and FAQs. The site was also one of several methods used to notify the public about the public hearing.

Figure 6-1  US 92 PD&E Reevaluation Study Website Screenshot
A public hearing consisting of an informal open house integrated with a formal portion was held for this project in two sessions, on December 1, 2016 and December 6, 2016. The first session was held at the HCC Trinkle Center from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. and the second session at Sheraton Tampa East Hotel from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

The hearing was held to inform citizens and interested parties about the project details and schedule, and allow them the opportunity to provide comments concerning the proposed improvements. The hearing consisted of an open house for the first hour and a formal portion immediately following. After the formal portion, the open house resumed until the end of the session.

The reevaluation’s supporting documents were available for public review from November 8, 2016 through December 19, 2016 on the project website as well as during normal operating hours at the locations shown in Table 7-1.

Table 7-1       Locations the Study Documents were Available for Public Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>FDOT District 7</th>
<th>Seffner-Mango Branch Library</th>
<th>Bruton Memorial Library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>11201 N. McKinley Dr.</td>
<td>410 N. Kingsway Road</td>
<td>302 W. McLendon Street N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tampa, FL 33612</td>
<td>Seffner, Florida 33584</td>
<td>Plant City, Florida 33563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Mon-Fri 8 a.m-5 p.m.</td>
<td>Mon - 10 a.m.-8 p.m.</td>
<td>Mon-Thur - 10 a.m.-9 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tues - 12 p.m.-8 p.m.</td>
<td>Fri - 10 a.m.-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wed-Sat - 10 a.m.-6 p.m.</td>
<td>Sat - 10 a.m.-5 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sun – 1 p.m.-5 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A project newsletter was used to announce the public hearing (Section 5) and was sent via electronic mail to public officials and agencies, and via direct mail to property owners and interested parties. A legal display notice advertising the public hearing sessions was published in the Tampa Bay Times and La Gaceta on the following dates:

- **Tampa Bay Times** – November 11, 2016 and November 21, 2016
- **La Gaceta** – November 11, 2016 and November 18, 2016

A notice was also published in the Florida Administrative Register on November 28, 2016. Copies of these advertisements are shown in the Public Hearing Scrapbook.

FDOT staff and its consultant were available at the hearing to discuss the project and answer questions. A continuously-running PowerPoint presentation describing the project and the
The recommended build alternative was shown during the open house portion of the hearing. Display boards were also available for review and consisted of:

- Existing and Future Traffic Volumes
- Existing and Proposed Roadway Typical Sections
- Aerial of the Project Limits
- Evaluation Matrix
- Project Schedule and Funding
- Welcome and List of Citations

The materials shown at the public hearing were also posted to the project website following the hearing.

The formal portion of the first public hearing session began at 6:30 p.m., with the second session formal portion beginning at 7:00 p.m., and was moderated by Kirk Bogen, PE, District Seven Environmental Management Engineer. The proceedings were recorded by the court reporter who was present throughout the evening. Mr. Bogen welcomed the audience and discussed the purpose of the hearing. The next portion of the hearing was devoted to verbal comments.

Attendees were given the opportunity to provide comments in one of five ways:

- Make a verbal statement during the formal portion of the hearing;
- Make a verbal statement to the court reporter during the informal portion of the hearing;
- Complete a written comment form and place it in the drop box at the hearing;
- Make a comment on the project website; or,
- Mail comments to the Department by December 19, 2016.

A total of 239 people signed in at the public hearing. Forty One (41) written comments were received at the hearing sessions and between sessions combined along with 11 verbal statements made during the formal public comment period.

The public hearing transcript is included in Appendix C. Copies of the public hearing materials, including the legal display advertisement, the sign-in sheets, display graphics, PowerPoint slides, and attendance rosters are included in the Public Hearing Scrapbook prepared for this PD&E study reevaluation.
SECTION 8 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

The public hearing comment period was advertised to end on December 19, 2016. A total of 89 comment forms were received. Thirty six (38) written comment forms and 12 verbal comments were received from the public hearing. Twenty (20) comment forms were received before the public hearing and 19 comment forms were received after. Of the 89 total comment forms, 33 involved requests to be added to the project contact list, of the 56 project comments, 10 pertained to access management questions. Table 8-1 summarizes those public comments received that pertain to this project.

Appendix D contains copies of the written comments and responses. Because some individuals submitted several comments in different formats, the total number of comments received does not equal the total number of individuals in favor of or against the project.
## Table 8-1  Summary of US 92 Public Hearing Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
<th>Support Build Alternative?</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Hearing Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Donna Cline</td>
<td>11/23/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Are the improvements for U.S. Hwy 92 still going to happen? Will you be using the 1994 plans or have new plans been drawn up? Please keep me posted on all new developments.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Gregory Jewell</td>
<td>2/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Would like to discuss speaking at Seffner Chamber</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lori Libhart</td>
<td>3/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Request a Q &amp; A  1. How this project will partner with TBX, Express Bus Service and Rail?  2. Is there any consideration for autonomous vehicles.  3. How will this project reduce sprawl and encourage high density living areas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Mauricio Ross</td>
<td>4/24/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My husband and I own Parkesdale Market located at 3702 W Baker St. We would like to see plans for the proposed widening of US 92 as it will impact our family business.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Xiomara Meeks</td>
<td>5/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Phil Waldron</td>
<td>6/14/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Nicole Cribbs</td>
<td>6/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>David Holloway</td>
<td>6/16/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Kaley Wallace</td>
<td>6/27/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Tim O'Brien</td>
<td>8/22/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hi Lilliam, My name is Ali Shasti and I am the owner of the property located at the above referenced location in Hillsborough County. Could you please keep me abreast of any proposed activities happening in front and around my property? E-notification, Etc. Thank you much, Ali</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Ali Shasti</td>
<td>8/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
<td>Support Build Alternative?</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I own Jarrett-Scott Ford at 2000 E. Baker (SR92). I would like to attend a workshop or have a meeting to learn more about what this project means to my business.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Jim Scott</td>
<td>10/25/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Pat Comstock</td>
<td>11/18/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Valerie Jackson</td>
<td>11/21/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Jane Charpentier</td>
<td>11/22/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Louis Bergeron</td>
<td>11/25/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Would like to know more about our house 4511 Reola Rd. Is the plan to tear it down and when</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Angelo Caltabiano</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Jason Fernandes</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Link Property II</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Bill Yavit</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>* How will water run-off from proposed Hwy be addressed? It is already a problem for those of us whose homes are at a lower elevation that the existing HWY. * What is the timeline for beginning at our address? * Will we be offered a buy-out? At 13512 (Next door to Catabiano - Reola Rd) * From Lynn Oaks Circle to east of Bethlehem Rd pamphlet states build alignment will be centered that would put sidewalk in our front door if the typical section 3 80; minimum is met then 50 mph (minimum) will be flying just feet from our bedroom windows - Dangerous - we would request you buy us out.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>William Brown</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hearing Comments 1st Session (Held on December 1, 2016)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
<th>Support Build Alternative?</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The area in front of my house was change with the construction of schools behind me. The electric and septic tank are within the small area marked as increasing. Can this be discussed? 813-781-2519</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Sue Powers</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Would love to speak to an engineer about the drainage problem we have now since the last road improvement project.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Mark Riebow</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Segment 1 9611 E US Hwy 92, Access Management, Large Trucks - Semis, Vehicles towing boats being denied access to west bound lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jason Ryan</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>We would like to receive information to our address. Had the appraiser not contacted us my husband and I would not have known of this. Please send any communications to our residence. 3970 Medicci Lane Wesley Chapel, FL 33543</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Passard &amp; Karine Dean</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>We are landlords that will be affected. We did not receive any communication. Please send communications to the address below.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Passard Dean</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Ana Chico-Cruz</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Leonardo Arenas</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I am concerned about my parking lot at 711 N. Park Road in Plant City. I have a small parking lot in front of my building and a small parking lot in the rear of my building. If you take even a small piece of my front parking space, I will be in trouble parking wise. There are 4 offices in my building and one of those is a hair &amp; nail salon, one is am an income tax business, and another is an immigration services office. I have one office that isn't occupied currently. So you can see that parking is already maxed out.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Karlene Whidden</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
<td>Support Build Alternative?</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I am a mobile home park manager. I have called DOT to try and do something about HWY 92 between Turkey Creek Rd and Whitehurst because of accidents and there is no crossover from mobile home park (n side of 92) to sidewalks. I believe Hwy 92 from Turkey Creed to Alexander are dangerous and a hazard.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Kay Vance</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I am writing you in regards to the US 92 project. As you know, our business will be severely impacted by this project. I have visited Bruton Memorial Library and I looked through the project documents. I have a major concern, and that is the ability for east bound traffic on US 92 to turn north on our property. And on the flip side, the ability for vehicles leaving our business to turn on to east bound US 92. Currently we have two separate openings in the boulevard for our business and for the parcel of land that we recently purchased directly west of us. We have a tremendous number of customers and vendors daily that currently have the ability to turn north into my business when heading east bound. We also have a tremendous number of customers and vendors (semi-truck car carriers) who use this boulevard opening to head east on US 92 and ultimately north on Park Road to travel to I-4. Looking at the new design, it appears that we would lose both boulevard openings (with the new parcel directly west of us that we purchased). We cannot go from two of these boulevard openings to zero. It would have a major negative impact on our business. Please take this comment into consideration when redesigning US 92, and please keep me informed. -Jim Scott (Jarrett Scott Ford)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Jim Scott</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
<td>Support Build Alternative?</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Suggest FDOT consider improving the intersection of US 92 and Mobley Street. The present condition is not the best, because vehicles headed west turn south onto Mobley and vehicles traveling east turn North and cause congestion. At the least, turn lanes should be built for both directions.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Joseph Herrmann</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>We have lived on this road, Park Rd. and County Line Road for over 25 years. We have seen this road become very dangerous to drive on. Many pedestrians and bicycles use the side of the road in great danger. We have had numerous accidents occur in front of our home. We truly fear getting rear ended attempting to turn left into our property. In our minds this project from Park Rd to County Line Rd. needs major improvement as soon as possible. We will keep praying no one on a cell phone rear ends us as we wait to turn into our property. Thank you for your consideration to our problem. Another issue is that any blip on I-4 throws enormous amounts of traffic onto 92 - this happens regularly.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ronald Boles</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>My name is Miguel Quirino. I am the Pastor of God's Strong Tower Church in Dover, Inc. 5335 W US Hwy 92 Plant City 33566. My concern is the impact it will have on the property of the church. What will the impact be to the parking and the existing construction project on the temple.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Miguel Quirino</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Consider the accommodation of a multi-use trail through all of the corridor. This can be accommodated within the proposed cross section - a possible merging of the buffered bike-lane and sidewalk may be an option to accommodate a multi-use trail. Such a trail would be consistent with the Hillsborough MPO's Hillsborough County Greenways &amp; Trails Plan Update.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Richard Ranck</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
<td>Support Build Alternative?</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 37  | I am writing you in regards to the US 92 project. As you know, our business will be severely impacted by this project. I have visited Bruton Memorial Library and I looked through the project documents. I have a major concern, and that is the ability for east bound traffic on US 92 to turn north on our property. And on the flip side, the ability for vehicles leaving our business to turn on to east bound US 92. Currently we have two separate openings in the boulevard for our business and for the parcel of land that we recently purchased directly west of us. We have a tremendous number of customers and vendors daily that currently have the ability to turn north into my business when heading east bound. We also have a tremendous number of customers and vendors (semi-truck car carriers) who use this boulevard opening to head east on US 92 and ultimately north on Park Road to travel to I-4. Looking at the new design, it appears that we would lose both boulevard openings (with the new parcel directly west of us that we purchased). We cannot go from two of these boulevard openings to zero. It would have a major negative impact on our business. Please take this comment into consideration when redesigning US 92, and please keep me informed.  
   
   -Jim Scott (Jarrett Scott Ford) | Yes            | Jim Scott                | 12/5/2016 |
<p>| 38  | Yes we agree with this project we like selection #1. 92 gets backed up when I-4 is backed up | Yes            | Joe and Debbie Wos     | 12/5/2016 |
| 39  | We have to do something about US 92. Back in September I got rear ended while stopped for a truck. We need more lanes before someone gets killed | Yes            | Hollis Lynn             | 12/5/2016 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
<th>Support Build Alternative?</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>US 92 is dangerous, I like to ride my bike and US 92 is the shortest route I can take. I do not feel safe on the road. Get us some good bike lanes. Any of your proposals will work for me.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Michael Wos</td>
<td>12/5/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Change contact address</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Timothy &amp; Pamela Conway</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Hwy 92 between Falkenburg and Williams is so dangerous, I've been hit by a car while riding my bike 2 times in the last 6 months, we need a bike lane.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>John Simmon</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>When you are taking land belonging to an entire community, is there a point of contact to address the community and their concerns other than this meeting?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Charlene Adewenmi</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Fix 92 traffic is terrible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>We want a left turn out of Anna Drive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Clay Schafer</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>We need a left turn onto Hwy 92 off of Anna Drive. Boat and trailers, Semi-Trucks and RV's are exiting Anna Drive due to the nature of the existing businesses. U-Turns 1/2 a mile away will negatively effect our business.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Jon Reinke</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>To whom it may concern, Being of sound mind get us some help with this traffic, took me half hour to get to this meeting from 92 and Williams. Why didn't you hold the meeting on 92?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Gerald &amp; Carli Harrison</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
<td>Support Build Alternative?</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>My name is Miguel Quirino. I am the Pastor of the Iglesia de Dios Torre Fuente, which is located at 5335 W. US Hwy 92 in Plant City. I just want to relate the concern of the impact that this project will have, not only to myself, but to nearly 100 families that attend our church. We are also in the process of rebuilding for our future sanctuary. This project will definitely effect the construction of our future sanctuary.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Miguel Quirino</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Please have the noise wall come all the way past all the homes on US 92. Makes better sense.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Patricia Williams</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>I don't want to have to turn west to go east. Do to the fact that there will be a grass divide in front of my property.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Greg Moore</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>A roadway of this magnitude will negatively impact the local businesses in the area. It is designated as a high speed roadway, in a suburban business and residential area. A roadway similar to the parallel road at MLK would be more convince to the area and people living and shopping in the community. I vigorously object to this plan as currently proposed.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Salvatore Socci</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Marion Smith</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Cornelio Vazquez-Hernandez</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>I do not feel that this project will be an improvement to the area. There are no traffic issues in front of my neighborhood (Hammocks at Kingsway). This construction project is going to force my family out of our home as my backyard backs up to Hwy 92.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ashley Johnson</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Leonard Arenas</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>I will not be able to make a left turn from Pasadena Dr to US 92. Not acceptable.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Doris Cooper</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
<td>Support Build Alternative?</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Christine Burbage Trust</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Patricia Crabb</td>
<td>12/7/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>I am opposed to the widening of Highway 92 as you have outlined it. You are turning a country into a city, and it is wrong and deceitful to the people who have bought out this way to get away from all of that city mess that you call Tampa etc. You have decided to take a whole bunch of people's homes, or part of their property, and mess up their lives forever to plan to have just more people in this area than we need. We are already overcrowded and it is a mess to get around even Plant City, not to mention trying to go further than that. Just widening roads does not relieve the problem, it just makes it worse. You are already widening 574, and it looks like you are getting ready to make a mess of highway 60. It just brings more and more people out this way. We can't even enjoy our lives because there is always something you are tearing up or messing with. Build it and they will come has been your go to word for ages. It has ruined our lives long ago, and you are fixing to ruin more people's lives. No, No, No, to your plans of widening highway 92.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corlene Findley</td>
<td>12/8/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
<td>Support Build Alternative?</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Our driveway was fine for 30+ years until it was resurfaced several years ago. Now every time we get a hard rain we have erosion issues - it washes gullies down our portion of the driveway even though they paved the apron up to our property line. Can this be fixed now and will it be fixed correctly when the new road will be completed. How high will be road be compared to the height that it is now. Will the driveway be angled/sloped so that we can get our travel trailer in and out without major problems. How is this going to affect the traffic Independence Academy at Hwy 92 &amp; McIntosh Roads. Where will the retention ponds be located?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>George Forte</td>
<td>12/8/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Thank you for the informative meeting, Dec 1. I declined to speak publicly but I was grateful to Mr. Ed McKinney who patiently answered my questions and spoke with compassion as I somewhat emotionally unloaded on him about the future of US 92. I have lived in Florida for 24 years in the same location, 4712 Frizke Rd. We chose a rural location even though my husband's job was in east Tampa. Knowing that living in a rural area meant &quot;inconvenience&quot; at times and a slower pace of life (including getting behind trucks going 30 mph) we chose this location and we have been very happy. I am concerned that the rural lifestyle we have enjoyed with our children and with our grandchildren is being threatened. I understand about I-4 overflow traffic and other issues. However, building and widening our roads only encourages more traffic, more building, etc. I am grateful for the roads we have, but do we have to make quiet Dover into a place of noise and speed? I would be at a great loss.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Deborah Lewis</td>
<td>12/8/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
<td>Support Build Alternative?</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Its about time! US 92 gets backed up all the time. This is good for my business as cars are crawling past my place and my inventory gets better exposure. But not good for traffic flow. The wooden sidewalks are a joke.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A Car Lot</td>
<td>12/13/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Fix I-4 before you do anything on 92. I never use 92 to many trucks. Highway 60 has its own exit lane I-4 doesn’t. Traffic always backed up.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Mary Darner</td>
<td>12/13/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>I vote yes for #3 as long as I have a bicycle lane. I am afraid to ride my bicycle on 92. I never use the wooden sidewalks very uneven I go into the street and that scares me. We need more street lights Thank you.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Tanya Brad</td>
<td>12/13/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Add to mailing list</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Samantha Silber</td>
<td>12/14/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Highway 92 is very dangerous. Please get us some sidewalks.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Richard Baranas</td>
<td>12/19/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Just spent hour on I-4 -US 92 this morning 12-15-16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12/19/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Widen I-4 so trucks stop using 92. Trucks are getting terrible.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>R. Sosa</td>
<td>12/19/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>I think the speed limit should be lowered it is way too fast. Trucks should not be allowed on US 92. They have Martin Luther or I-4 they can use! Get these people with their bicycles off the road have them use side streets.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Carlos Gorrdles</td>
<td>12/19/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>I am concerned about access onto US 92. From our private road each property owner on Brackwood has a driveway to US 92 at this time we share some of the road with only one small access to get onto US 92. The boardwalk also blocks a lot of vision when you are in a car not so bad. When in a truck I have avoided many head ons on our road Brackwood Road. It is to narrow also when I take my horse trailer out onto US 92 I have to pick a certain time of day to enter 92 can’t make a good swing. When the state put the boardwalk in they never considered all the separate access onto 92!</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Nora Menge</td>
<td>12/19/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
<td>Support Build Alternative?</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>If this project is 20 or more years away- you still won’t need it. We have I-4 to the North and 574 (MLK) to the South (which is already being widened). 2 line in segment #5 and cannot imagine us ever needing 4 lanes plus bike lanes and a 54’ median. We already have drainage problems what will this project do. Why not spend the money on I-4. That’s what Interstates are for - to move cars. (add a toll lane) Widening US 92 will only make the backup problems on McIntosh worse. Fix problems like that. Don’t ruin one of the last rural areas left. Again focus on I-4 and 574.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Anette Friese</td>
<td>12/19/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Agency Letters and Meeting Minutes
Ms. Zakia Williams  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
7915 Baymeadows Way, Suite 200  
Jacksonville, FL 32256-7517

RE:  Endangered Species Act Section 7 Coordination  
SR 600 (US 92) From East of I-4 to East of County Line Road  
Hillsborough County, Florida  
WPI Segment No: 435749-1

Dear Ms. Williams:

The Florida Department of Transportation, District Seven, is conducting a Project Development and Environment Study Re-evaluation for the proposed widening of State Road 600 (US 92) from east of Interstate 4 to east of County Line Road in Hillsborough County, Florida. The total project length is approximately 18.1 miles. The environmental document that is being reevaluated is a Type 2 Categorical Exclusion (Approved by the FHWA on March 24, 1994) (Figure 1).

This Draft Wetland Evaluation and Biological Assessment Report (WEBAR) was prepared as part of this PD&E study. This report summarizes potential impacts to wetlands, federal- and state-listed species and their habitats. Identification of measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate for any potential impacts are also discussed.

Proposed Project
The study generally recommended four and six-lane build alternatives from east of I-4 to Mobley Street and from Park Road to County Line Road. However, the no-build
A review was received for the following:

**Event:** 435749-1 US 92 from East of I-4 to East of County Line Road WEBAR Review  
**Document:** US 92 Draft WEBAR COMPLETE REPORT  
**Submitted By:** Jennifer Goff  
**Global:** Yes  
**Comments:**

The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) staff has reviewed the Draft Wetland Evaluation and Biological Assessment Report (WEBAR) for the above-referenced project, prepared as part of the Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Reevaluation Study. We provide the following comments and recommendations for your consideration in accordance with Chapter 379, Florida Statutes and Rule 68A-27, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.).

The project involves an evaluation of widening US 92 (SR 600) from a two-lane roadway to a four-lane divided roadway between just east of I-4 to east of County Line Road in Hillsborough County. The total project length is approximately 18.1 miles, but the No Build Alternative has been selected for a segment approximately 2 miles long between Mobley Street and Park Road in Plant City. This WEBAR also includes an analysis of 21 Stormwater Management Facility and 14 Floodplain Compensation alternative sites. The project vicinity is a mix of residential and commercial development, agriculture, upland forests, herbaceous and forested wetlands, and man-made ponds and lakes.

The WEBAR evaluated potential project impacts to 22 wildlife species classified under the Endangered Species Act as Federally Endangered (FE) or Threatened (FT), or by the State of Florida as Threatened (ST) or Species of Special Concern (SSC). Listed species were evaluated based on range and potential appropriate habitat or
because the project is within a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Consultation Area. Included were: Eastern indigo
snake (FT), sand skink (FT), American alligator (FT due to similarity in appearance to the American crocodile),
crested caracara (FT), wood stork (FE), Florida scrub jay (FT), gopher frog (SSC), gopher tortoise (ST),
Suwannee cooter (SSC), Florida pine snake (SSC), short-tailed snake (ST), Florida burrowing owl (SSC),
Southeastern American kestrel (ST), Florida sandhill crane (ST), roseate spoonbill (SSC), limpkin (SSC),
snowy egret (SSC), little blue heron (SSC), tricolored heron (SSC), white ibis (SSC), Sherman's fox squirrel
(SSC), and Florida mouse (SSC).

Also evaluated were the bald eagle, which was delisted by state and federal agencies, but this species remains
protected under state rule in Section 68A-16.002, F .A. C. and by the federal Bald and Golden Eagle Protection
Act (16 U.S.C. 668-668d), and the Florida black bear, which is protected by the FWC pursuant to the Florida
Black Bear Conservation Rule 68A-4.009 F.A.C.

Project biologists made a finding of "no effect" for the sand skink, crested caracara, Florida scrub jay,
Suwannee cooter, Florida pine snake, short-tailed snake, and Florida black bear due to a lack of suitable habitat
for these species within the project area. The biologists determined that the project "may affect, but is unlikely
to adversely affect" all the other species. We agree with these determinations.

We support the project commitments for protected species, which include the following.

1. The standard FDOT Construction Precautions for the Eastern Indigo Snake will be followed during
construction.

2. Due to the presence of gopher tortoise habitat within the project area, a gopher tortoise survey in appropriate
habitat will be performed within construction limits within 72 hours to 90 days prior to construction. The
survey will follow the latest survey criteria from the FWC's Gopher Tortoise Permitting Guidelines and the
FDOT will secure any required relocation permit from the FWC.

3. Impacts to potential wood stork suitable foraging habitat will be evaluated during the design phase, and
mitigation for unavoidable impacts will be provided as appropriate. This, along with other required wetland
mitigation, is anticipated to provide mitigation for the loss of foraging habitat for other listed wading bird
species.

The wildlife surveys did not record individual or nest sittings of Florida burrowing owls, Southeastern American
kestrels, Florida sandhill cranes, Sherman's fox squirrels, or bald eagles, largely due to either very limited or
suboptimal habitat for these species within the project area. Should a nest of any of these species be discovered
near the project limits prior to or during construction, please coordinate with the FWC staff identified below to discuss avoidance, minimization, and permitting options.

The WEBAR identified 11.33 acres of wetlands that will be impacted by the project, including 9.84 acres of forested wetlands, 1.43 acres of herbaceous wetlands, and 0.06 acres of surface waters. Mitigation would be provided via one or more of several mitigation banks or using the FDOT Mitigation Program with the Southwest Florida Water Management District. We agree with the findings of this evaluation.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide input on highway design and the conservation of fish and wildlife resources. Please contact Brian Barnett at (772) 579-9746 or email brian.barnett@MyFWC.com to initiate the process for further overall coordination on this project.
September 7, 2016

Dr. Timothy A. Parsons, Ph.D., Director
State Historic Preservation Officer
Florida Division of Historical Resources
500 South Bronough Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0250

Attention: Transportation Compliance Review Program

RE: SR 600 (US 92) Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study
Re-Evaluation from East of I-4 to East of County Line Road
Work Program Item Segment No.: 435749-1
FAP No.: TBD
Hillsborough County, Florida

Dear Dr. Parsons:

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), District Seven is preparing a Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-Evaluation for the proposed widening of SR 600 (US 92) from east of Interstate 4 (I-4) to east of County Line Road in Hillsborough County, Florida. The total project length is approximately 18.1 miles. The original PD&E Study was completed in 1994. The Study recommended a build alternative from east of I-4 to Mobley Street and from Park Road to County Line Road. The no-build alternative was selected for the segment between Mobley Street and Park Road with the exception of improving one section of Baker Street where it was recommended for conversion to an urban section between Mobley Street and Whitehall Street. Due to a change in design standards and existing conditions, the project’s PD&E study is being re-evaluated. The no-build alternative between Mobley Street and Park Road remains as the recommended alternative. Sidewalk and drainage improvements were made to the section of Baker Street between Mobley Street and Whitehall Street which meet the intent of the original PD&E study recommendation for this segment of the project.

A Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS) Update was prepared for this project and submitted to your office on March 17, 2016. In July 2016, the CRAS Update was revised based on comments provided by Alyssa McManus (letter dated May 10, 2016). At this time, edits were made to the original report and select pages were resubmitted. The CRAS Update was again revised in August 2016. At this time, the eligibility for previously recorded Frame Vernacular style residence located at 104 Thrasher Road (8HI04739) was updated and revised pages resubmitted. Enclosed are...
one set of revised pages to the CRAS Update (February 2016, Revised August 2016) that were prepared for the above referenced project.

The CRAS Update included background research and a field survey. The purpose was to locate and identify any archaeological sites and historic resources located within the project area of potential effect (APE) and to assess their significance in terms of eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). This is an update to the CRAS that was prepared for the original PD&E Study. The SR 600 (US 92) PD&E Re-evaluation will replicate the original PD&E approved alignment with modifications as needed. As a result, the project is planned to be mostly developed within the existing right-of-way. A CRAS of the original PD&E corridor was performed in 1991-1992 (ACI 1993), and approved by the SHPO in October 1993. Therefore, systematic archaeological field survey will focus only on areas of new right-of-way. For historic resources, the APE is defined as the properties adjacent to the existing and proposed right-of-way. As contained within these adjacent properties, only the historic resources located within 200 feet of the existing and proposed right-of-way were recorded and evaluated. No improvements to the approximate two-mile long one-way pair system through Plant City between Mobley Street and Park Road (Segment 10) are anticipated. However, the historic resources located along Reynolds Street (US 92 Eastbound) between Mobley Street and Park Road were included in the CRAS. Stormwater management facilities and floodplain compensation sites have been preliminarily sized for the project's ongoing PD&E Study, and an addendum to the CRAS will be prepared to document the historical and archaeological evaluations for these locations later in the PD&E Study.

Background research indicated that 14 previously recorded archaeological sites are located, at least in part, within the project archaeological APE. All were evaluated as ineligible for listing in the NRHP by the SHPO. Limited field survey did not confirm the presence of any of these sites within the project APE. Field survey focused on areas of newly proposed right-of-way yielded negative results. Given these results, and the findings of previous investigations, there are no archaeological sites within the project APE that are listed, eligible, or considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.

Historical/architectural field survey resulted in the identification of 510 historic resources within the project APE, including 102 extant previously recorded and 408 newly identified encompassing 476 buildings, 26 historic districts and building complex resource groups, four bridges, two objects, and two linear resources. In addition, 20 previously recorded historic resources were confirmed demolished.

As a result of field survey, 71 NRHP-listed, eligible and potentially eligible historic resources were located within the SR 600 (US 92) project APE. Of these, 44 were previously listed or determined eligible by the SHPO, and 27 were newly evaluated as potentially eligible. These include two historic districts, three building complex resource groups, one object, and 65 buildings.
No NRHP-listed, eligible, or potentially eligible historic resources were identified within evaluation Segments 2 through 8. Twelve historic resources, including one potentially eligible building complex resource group (8HI04634) with 11 contributing resources, are contained within Segment 1; nine historic resources, including one potentially eligible building complex resource group (8HI13404) with eight contributing resources, are contained within Segment 9; and one individually significant historic resource (8HI05328) is located within Segment 11. Forty-nine of the total significant historic resources are contained within Segment 10, the no-build alternative. These include one NRHP listed individual property (8HI00174) plus three historic districts and building complex resource groups (8HI05386, 8HI05923, and 8HI13405) that collectively contain 45 contributing resources within the project APE. Although there are significant historic resources identified within Segment 10, the proposed project should have no effect on the resources since this segment will only have a no-build alternative.

A previously recorded Frame Vernacular style residence located at 104 Thrasher Road (8HI04739), was determined ineligible by the SHPO in 1993 and was re-evaluated as part of this study (August 2016). After revisiting the site and collecting additional background information this resource remains ineligible for listing in the NRHP. This residence is located within build Segment 11.

This information is being provided in accordance with the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended), which are implemented by the procedures contained in 36 CFR, Part 800, as well as the provisions contained in the revised Chapter 267, Florida Statutes.

Provided you approve the recommendations and findings in the enclosed cultural resource document, please sign below for concurrence. If you have any questions, please contact me at (813) 975-6496 or robin.rhinesmith@dot.state.fl.us or Rebecca Spain Schwarz at (813) 281-8308 or rebecca.spain-schwarz@atkinsglobal.com.

Sincerely,

Robin M. Rhinesmith
Environmental Administrator

RR/RSS
Enclosure

cc:  Cathy Kendall (FHWA)  Roy Jackson (FDOT SEMO)
     Lillian Escalera (FDOT)  Alex Hull (Inwood)
     Rebecca Spain Schwarz (Atkins/GEC)  Marion Almy (ACI)
The Florida State Historic Preservation Officer finds the attached Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Update complete and sufficient and concurs with the recommendations and findings provided in this cover letter for SHPO/DHR Project File Number 2016-1350. Or, the SHPO finds the attached report contains insufficient information.

SHPO Comments:

We acknowledge that a separate effects document will be submitted for SHPO review for segments 1, 9 and 11. We concur with finding of no effect for segs 2-8 and finding of no adverse affect for segment 10.

/\ Timothy A. Parsons, Ph.D.  
Director, Florida Division of Historical Resources  
& State Historic Preservation Officer  
\_/  

Date  
9/16/2016
DATE: July 6, 2016

TO: Lilliam Escalera, PE

FROM: Alex B. Hull, PE

RE: 435749-1 US 92 FROM I-4 TO COUNTY LINE Road PD&E Study Reevaluation Presentation to Hillsborough County Staff Meeting Minutes

ATTENDEES: See attached sign-in sheet

A meeting was held with Hillsborough County Engineering staff on July 1, 2016 at the County Center, 22 Floor Meeting Room, 601 E. Kennedy Boulevard, Tampa, FL. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the US 92 from I-4 to County Line Road PD&E Study Reevaluation. A PowerPoint presentation regarding the project was given and is attached to these meeting minutes.

The meeting began at 2:00 pm.

There was general discussion about the project. The main points of discussion follow:

1. The PD&E traffic analysis showed the need to improve the side streets (county streets) in order to improve the LOS of the intersection. County staff noted there is no plan anticipated in the near future to improve any of the side streets. However, the county staff requested the cost estimates of the proposed side street improvements to consider coordinating their own improvements with the department’s during the upcoming design phases.

2. The north approach at Park Road is a State facility (SR 553) and its improvements will be included in the concept plans. County noted there are future developments planned at this location and requested a copy of the cost estimates at this location to consider if design of the south side of Park Rd (CR 574) can be included as part of the design project (WPIS No. 438998).

3. The County recommended that the Department consider providing a roundabout at Falkenburg Road and all other intersections along the corridor as an intersection alternative.

4. The County recommended contacting the Hillsborough County School Transportation Working Group as part of the Department’s small group meetings efforts. The department indicated that it will send an email to the School District to ask if they will like a presentation of the PD&E Study Reevaluation efforts.
indicated that it will send an email to the School District to ask if they will like a presentation of the PD&E Study Reevaluation efforts.

5. The County noted that there is an existing operational problem at the US 92 and Kingsway Rd. intersection during school days. The department noted that there is no design project presently scheduled for this location.

The meeting was concluded at 3:15 pm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diana Ramirez</td>
<td>Hillsborough County</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ramirezdp@hillsboroughcounty.org">ramirezdp@hillsboroughcounty.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian Escalera</td>
<td>FDOT - PD&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:lillian.escalera@dot.state.fl.us">lillian.escalera@dot.state.fl.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leland O'Neal</td>
<td>Hillsborough County - PW</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:diansl@hillsboroughcounty.org">diansl@hillsboroughcounty.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Williams</td>
<td>Hc - PW</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:WilliamsM@HILLSBOROUGHCOUNTY.ORG">WilliamsM@HILLSBOROUGHCOUNTY.ORG</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Hull</td>
<td>Inwood</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ahull@inwoodinc.com">ahull@inwoodinc.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SR 600 (US 92)
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT & ENVIRONMENT (PD&E) STUDY RE-EVALUATION
FROM I-4 TO COUNTY LINE ROAD

WPI Segment No.: 435749-1 | Hillsborough County, Florida
• Project begins at Garden Lane (East of I-4)
• Project ends at County Line Road
• Re-evaluation of original 1994 PD&E Study

18 miles
US 92 is:

- Major east-west roadway through Hillsborough County
- Important in Tampa Bay area regional transportation network
- Project will increase capacity and improve safety
- Four-lane improvement from Garden Lane to Mobley Street and from Park Road to County Line Road
- No-build through Plant City
• Re-evaluation of the original PD&E Study approved by the Federal Highway Administration on March 24, 1994
• Focuses on changed conditions
• Re-evaluation of proposed improvements includes:
  – Costs
  – Engineering aspects
  – Environmental aspects
  – Public and agency input
• Capacity
  – Future estimated traffic volumes will cause US 92 to operate below desired standards

• Transportation Planning
  – US 92 from US 301 to CR 579 (Mango Road) and from Park Road to County Line Road
    • Included in the Imagine 2040: Hillsborough County MPO Long Range Transportation Plan Cost Feasible Plan

• Safety
  – Crash data shows that the average five-year crash rate is higher than the statewide average

• Socioeconomic Demand
  – Projected regional growth will increase traffic
Five typical sections are proposed for the project:
- Garden Lane to west of I-4 overpass and east of I-4 overpass to east of Crow Wing Drive (purple area)
- West of I-4 overpass to east of I-4 overpass (yellow area)
- East of Crow Wing Drive to Edwards Street (orange area)
- Edwards Street to Mobley Street (blue area)
- West of Park Road to County Line Road (teal area)

No-build
- Mobley Street to west of Park Road (green area)
- Garden Lane to west of I-75 overpass
- East of I-75 overpass to east of Crow Wing Drive
- 45 mph design speed
- 136 feet R/W
• West of I-75 overpass to east of I-75 overpass
• 45 mph design speed
- East of Crow Wing Drive to Edwards Street
- 50 mph design speed
- 160 feet R/W
RECOMMENDED BUILD ALTERNATIVE

- Edwards Street to Mobley Street
- 45 mph design speed
- 114 feet R/W
RECOMMENDED BUILD ALTERNATIVE

• West of Park Road to County Line Road
• 50 mph design speed
• 136 feet R/W
• Combination of directional and full median openings proposed
  – Directional median openings allow some turns
  – Full median openings allow turns in all directions
• Driveway and crossroad locations considered
• Access Management Class 5 spacing criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Medians</th>
<th>Median Openings</th>
<th>Signal</th>
<th>Connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Directional</td>
<td>More than 45 mph posted speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>2,640’</td>
<td>At greater than 45 mph posted speed</td>
<td>660’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,320’</td>
<td>At 45 mph or less posted speed</td>
<td>660’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Disadvantages**
  - Increased traffic congestion
  - Emergency vehicle access is degraded
  - Does not improve pedestrian or bicyclist safety
  - Increased user costs due to congestion
  - Not consistent with the identified needs of the corridor by the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization

• **Advantages**
  - No acquisition of right-of-way
  - No design, right-of-way or construction costs
  - No inconvenience to the public during construction
  - No construction impacts to natural, physical, and social environment
BUILD ALTERNATIVE

• Advantages
  – Reduced traffic congestion and intersection delay
  – Reduced potential for crashes
  – Reduced vehicle emissions
  – Improved emergency vehicle response
  – Improved pedestrian and bicyclist safety
  – Consistent with the identified needs of the corridor by the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization

• Disadvantages
  – Additional right-of-way needed
  – Design, right-of-way, and construction costs
  – Inconvenience to the public during construction
  – Construction impacts to natural, physical, and social environment
• Two segments tentative scheduled for design
  – US 92 from US 301 (east of I-4) to Mango Road
  – US 92 from west of Park Road to County Line Road
• Design scheduled to begin in Spring 2017
• Re-evaluation began January 2015
• Small group meetings are currently scheduled with local community organizations
• Public hearing – October 18, 2016
• PD&E study re-evaluation completion - end of 2016
Contact Information

- [http://active.fdotd7studies.com/sr600/i4-to-county-line/](http://active.fdotd7studies.com/sr600/i4-to-county-line/)

- FDOT Project Manager
  
  Lilliam E. Escalera  
  EMO Project Manager  
  FDOT District VII  
  Planning & Environmental Management Office (PLEMO)  
  11201 N. McKinley Dr., 7-800  
  Tampa, FL 33612  
  P: (813)975-6445  
  F: (813) 975-6451
DATE: July 6, 2016, 2016

TO: Lilliam Escalera, PE

FROM: Alex B. Hull, PE

RE: 435749-1 US 92 PD&E Study Plant City Staff Presentation and Discussion Meeting Minutes

ATTENDEES: See attached sign-in sheet

A meeting was held at Plant City City Hall on June 30, 2016. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the US 92 PD&E Study Re-evaluation with the City staff. A PowerPoint presentation regarding the project was given and is attached to these meeting minutes.

Issues that the City staff brought up for discussion are as follows:

1. There is planned development being considered along Charlie Taylor Road north of US 92. It is anticipated that the development will generate a considerable amount of traffic. Therefore, the City would like to give preference to Charlie Taylor Road for a full median opening.

2. The Hillsborough MPO is planning on conducting a bike plan study for the area. Mark Hudson with Plant City is the City’s point of contact for the study.

3. Parksdale Farm Market representatives have expressed concern to the City Council about the US 92 widening project and the impacts to their site.

4. The City staff will organize a joint meeting of the Greater Plant City Chamber of commerce, Strawberry Festival, and the Economic Development Council (EDC) for the project team to make a presentation informing these groups about the project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Schenk</td>
<td>Plant City</td>
<td>302 W. Reynolds Street, PC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MSchenk@plantcitygov.com">MSchenk@plantcitygov.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry R. Ritter</td>
<td>PLANT CITY</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td><a href="mailto:TRITTER@PLANTCITYGOV.COM">TRITTER@PLANTCITYGOV.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatjana Austin</td>
<td>City of PC/Engineering 302 W. Reynolds St., PC, FL</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tausting@plantcitygov.com">tausting@plantcitygov.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Gassaway</td>
<td>CPC/Utilities</td>
<td>1802 Spooner, PC, FL</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LGassaway@plantcitygov.com">LGassaway@plantcitygov.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Buyens</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>d <a href="mailto:buyens@plantcitygov.com">buyens@plantcitygov.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Karp</td>
<td>Plant City</td>
<td>302 W. Reynolds St., PC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MIKARP@PLANTCITYGOV.COM">MIKARP@PLANTCITYGOV.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Hu</td>
<td>Inwood</td>
<td>2000 Dovera Dr., Suite 200</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ahull@inwoodinc.com">ahull@inwoodinc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hudson</td>
<td>City of Plant City</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>m <a href="mailto:hudson@plantcitygov.com">hudson@plantcitygov.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Escalaz</td>
<td>PD&amp;E PH</td>
<td>701 McKinley Dr., Tampa, FL</td>
<td><a href="mailto:william.escalaz@dot.state.fl.us">william.escalaz@dot.state.fl.us</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SR 600 (US 92)
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT & ENVIRONMENT (PD&E) STUDY RE-EVALUATION
FROM I-4 TO COUNTY LINE ROAD

WPI Segment No.: 435749-1 | Hillsborough County, Florida
• Project begins at Garden Lane (East of I-4)
• Project ends at County Line Road
• Re-evaluation of original 1994 PD&E Study

18 miles
US 92 is:
• Major east-west roadway through Hillsborough County
• Important in Tampa Bay area regional transportation network
• Project will increase capacity and improve safety
• Four-lane improvement from Garden Lane to Mobley Street and from Park Road to County Line Road
• No-build through Plant City
PD&E STUDY PROCESS

• Re-evaluation of the original PD&E Study approved by the Federal Highway Administration on March 24, 1994
• Focuses on changed conditions
• Re-evaluation of proposed improvements includes:
  – Costs
  – Engineering aspects
  – Environmental aspects
  – Public and agency input
• Capacity
  – Future estimated traffic volumes will cause US 92 to operate below desired standards

• Transportation Planning
  – US 92 from US 301 to CR 579 (Mango Road) and from Park Road to County Line Road
    • Included in the Imagine 2040: Hillsborough County MPO Long Range Transportation Plan Cost Feasible Plan

• Safety
  – Crash data shows that the average five-year crash rate is higher than the statewide average

• Socioeconomic Demand
  – Projected regional growth will increase traffic
Five typical sections are proposed for the project:

- Garden Lane to west of I-4 overpass and east of I-4 overpass to east of Crow Wing Drive (purple area)
- West of I-4 overpass to east of I-4 overpass (yellow area)
- East of Crow Wing Drive to Edwards Street (orange area)
- Edwards Street to Mobley Street (blue area)
- West of Park Road to County Line Road (teal area)

No-build

- Mobley Street to west of Park Road (green area)
RECOMMENDED BUILD ALTERNATIVE

- Garden Lane to west of I-75 overpass
- East of I-75 overpass to east of Crow Wing Drive
- 45 mph design speed
- 136 feet R/W
RECOMMENDED BUILD ALTERNATIVE

- West of I-75 overpass to east of I-75 overpass
- 45 mph design speed
• East of Crow Wing Drive to Edwards Street
• 50 mph design speed
• 160 feet R/W
• Edwards Street to Mobley Street
• 45 mph design speed
• 114 feet R/W
RECOMMENDED BUILD ALTERNATIVE

- West of Park Road to County Line Road
- 50 mph design speed
- 136 feet R/W
• Combination of directional and full median openings proposed
  – Directional median openings allow some turns
  – Full median openings allow turns in all directions
• Driveway and crossroad locations considered
• Access Management Class 5 spacing criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Medians</th>
<th>Median Openings</th>
<th>Signal</th>
<th>Connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Directional</td>
<td>More than 45 mph posted speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>2,640’ At greater than 45 mph posted speed</td>
<td>660’</td>
<td>440’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NO-BUILD ALTERNATIVE

• Advantages
  – No acquisition of right-of-way
  – No design, right-of-way or construction costs
  – No inconvenience to the public during construction
  – No construction impacts to natural, physical, and social environment

• Disadvantages
  – Increased traffic congestion
  – Emergency vehicle access is degraded
  – Does not improve pedestrian or bicyclist safety
  – Increased user costs due to congestion
  – Not consistent with the identified needs of the corridor by the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization
• Advantages
  – Reduced traffic congestion and intersection delay
  – Reduced potential for crashes
  – Reduced vehicle emissions
  – Improved emergency vehicle response
  – Improved pedestrian and bicyclist safety
  – Consistent with the identified needs of the corridor by the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization

• Disadvantages
  – Additional right-of-way needed
  – Design, right-of-way, and construction costs
  – Inconvenience to the public during construction
  – Construction impacts to natural, physical, and social environment
• Two segments tentative scheduled for design
  – US 92 from US 301 (east of I-4) to Mango Road
  – US 92 from west of Park Road to County Line Road
• Design scheduled to begin in Spring 2017
• Re-evaluation began January 2015
• Small group meetings are currently scheduled with local community organizations
• Public hearing – October 18, 2016
• PD&E study re-evaluation completion - end of 2016
Contact Information

• [http://active.fdotd7studies.com/sr600/i4-to-county-line/](http://active.fdotd7studies.com/sr600/i4-to-county-line/)

• FDOT Project Manager
  Lilliam E. Escalera
  EMO Project Manager
  FDOT District VII
  Planning & Environmental Management Office (PLEMO)
  11201 N. McKinley Dr., 7-800
  Tampa, FL 33612
  P: (813)975-6445
  F: (813) 975-6451
DATE: August 17, 2016

TO: Lilliam Escalera, PE

FROM: Alex B. Hull, PE

RE: 435749-1 US 92 PD&E Study Plant City Strawberry Festival Committee Representatives Presentation and Discussion Meeting Minutes

ATTENDEES: Lee Bakst, Phil Waldron, Lilliam Escalera, Alex Hull

A meeting was held at the Plant City Strawberry Festival offices in Plant City on August 3, 2016. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the US 92 PD&E Study Re-evaluation with the Strawberry Festival Committee representatives. A PowerPoint presentation regarding the project was given and is attached to these meeting minutes.

Issues that the City staff brought up for discussion are as follows:

1. The Strawberry Festival representatives expressed concern about the impact that construction of the project would have on Festival traffic patterns. Ms. Escalera explained that the construction documents can contain provisions addressing this issue.

2. They explained that the parking lot on the west side of the Festival grounds received significant eastbound right turns into the lot. Westbound traffic is primarily directed to lots on the eastside of the Festival, but eastbound traffic also reaches the west lot. They requested that FDOT consider adding a eastbound right turn into the west parking lot and adding a median opening that would serve the west lot westbound ingress and egress traffic. Ms. Escalera stated that she would discuss this request with the access management representative from FDOT.

3. Mr. Waldron requested a rollout print of the concept map (Note: The map was mailed to Mr. Waldron on the following day.)
SR 600 (US 92)
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT & ENVIRONMENT (PD&E) STUDY RE-EVALUATION
FROM I-4 TO COUNTY LINE ROAD

WPI Segment No.: 435749-1 | Hillsborough County, Florida
• Project begins at Garden Lane (East of I-4)
• Project ends at County Line Road
• Re-evaluation of original 1994 PD&E Study

18 miles
US 92 is:

• Major east-west roadway through Hillsborough County
• Important in Tampa Bay area regional transportation network
• Project will increase capacity and improve safety
• Four-lane improvement from Garden Lane to Mobley Street and from Park Road to County Line Road
• No-build through Plant City
• Re-evaluation of the original PD&E Study approved by the Federal Highway Administration on March 24, 1994

• Focuses on changed conditions

• Re-evaluation of proposed improvements includes:
  – Costs
  – Engineering aspects
  – Environmental aspects
  – Public and agency input
• Capacity
  – Future estimated traffic volumes will cause US 92 to operate below desired standards

• Transportation Planning
  – US 92 from US 301 to CR 579 (Mango Road) and from Park Road to County Line Road
    • Included in the Imagine 2040: Hillsborough County MPO Long Range Transportation Plan Cost Feasible Plan

• Safety
  – Crash data shows that the average five-year crash rate is higher than the statewide average

• Socioeconomic Demand
  – Projected regional growth will increase traffic
RECOMMENDED BUILD ALTERNATIVE

- Five typical sections are proposed for the project:
  - Garden Lane to west of I-4 overpass and east of I-4 overpass to east of Crow Wing Drive (purple area)
  - West of I-4 overpass to east of I-4 overpass (yellow area)
  - East of Crow Wing Drive to Edwards Street (orange area)
  - Edwards Street to Mobley Street (blue area)
  - West of Park Road to County Line Road (teal area)
- No-build
  - Mobley Street to west of Park Road (green area)
- Preferred alignment shown on concept plans
**Recommended Build Alternative**

- Garden Lane to west of I-75 overpass
- East of I-75 overpass to east of Crow Wing Drive
- 45 mph design speed
- 136 feet R/W
• West of I-75 overpass to east of I-75 overpass
• 45 mph design speed
• East of Crow Wing Drive to Edwards Street
• 50 mph design speed
• 160 feet R/W
• Edwards Street to Mobley Street
• 45 mph design speed
• 114 feet R/W
• West of Park Road to County Line Road
• 50 mph design speed
• 136 feet R/W
• Combination of directional and full median openings proposed
  – Directional median openings allow some turns
  – Full median openings allow turns in all directions
• Driveway and crossroad locations considered
• Access Management Class 5 spacing criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Medians</th>
<th>Median Openings</th>
<th>Signal</th>
<th>Connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Directional</td>
<td>More than 45 mph posted speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>2,640’ At greater than 45 mph posted speed</td>
<td>660’</td>
<td>440’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,320’ At 45 mph or less posted speed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Advantages**
  - No acquisition of right-of-way
  - No design, right-of-way or construction costs
  - No inconvenience to the public during construction
  - No construction impacts to natural, physical, and social environment

• **Disadvantages**
  - Increased traffic congestion
  - Emergency vehicle access is degraded
  - Does not improve pedestrian or bicyclist safety
  - Increased user costs due to congestion
  - Not consistent with the identified needs of the corridor by the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization
BUILD ALTERNATIVE

• Advantages
  – Reduced traffic congestion and intersection delay
  – Reduced potential for crashes
  – Reduced vehicle emissions
  – Improved emergency vehicle response
  – Improved pedestrian and bicyclist safety
  – Consistent with the identified needs of the corridor by the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization

• Disadvantages
  – Additional right-of-way needed
  – Design, right-of-way, and construction costs
  – Inconvenience to the public during construction
  – Construction impacts to natural, physical, and social environment
Design Schedule

• Two segments scheduled for design
  – US 92 from US 301 (east of I-4) to Mango Road
  – US 92 from west of Park Road to County Line Road
• Design scheduled to begin in Spring 2017
• Re-evaluation began January 2015
• Small group meetings are currently scheduled with local community organizations
• Public hearing – November 1, 2016
  – Hillsborough Community College Trinkle Center
• PD&E study re-evaluation completion - end of 2016
Contact Information

- [http://active.fdotd7studies.com/sr600/i4-to-county-line/](http://active.fdotd7studies.com/sr600/i4-to-county-line/)

- **FDOT Project Manager**
  Lilliam E. Escalera  
  EMO Project Manager  
  FDOT District VII  
  Planning & Environmental Management Office (PLEMO)  
  11201 N. McKinley Dr., 7-800  
  Tampa, FL 33612  
  P: (813)975-6445  
  F: (813) 975-6451
Appendix B
Newsletters
The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), District Seven has begun a Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Re-evaluation for SR 600 (US 92) from east of I-4 to east of County Line Road in Hillsborough County, a distance of approximately 18 miles (see study area map below).

The re-evaluation, which began in January 2015, will consider a full range of alternatives for improving mobility and safety along US 92, including adding traffic lanes, adding turn lanes in key locations and improving bicycle and pedestrian access. A feasibility analysis of providing grade separation/interchanges at Park Road and County Line Road will also be conducted.

What is a Re-evaluation?

The purpose of this re-evaluation is to update the original PD&E environmental document completed in 1993 and approved by the Federal Highway Administration on March 24, 1994. A re-evaluation is the process used to document compliance with new federal laws and to identify any changes that may have occurred on a project since the approval of the original environmental document. A re-evaluation is used to update the earlier study, document changes in the design concept, reassess environmental impacts, incorporate commitments, and to maintain eligibility for future federal funding before the project advances to the next phase of project development. The re-evaluation will also determine if new alternative options exist and compare them to the previously approved improvements.
**SR 600 (US 92) Project Development & Environment Re-evaluation**

**FDOT Adopted Five Year Work Program FY 2015-2020**

SR 600 (US 92) from Kingsway Rd. to McIntosh Rd. is funded for design in FY 2016 and SR 600 (US 92) from McIntosh Rd. to SR 566 is funded for design in FY 2016. No other portions of SR 600 (US 92) within the project limits, including this segment, are funded for design, right-of-way acquisition or construction at this time.

**Para Preguntas En Español**

Si usted tiene preguntas o comentarios o si simplemente desea más información sobre este en Español, favor de ponerse en contacto con la señora Elba Lopez al teléfono 813-975-6403 o correo electrónico elba.lopez@dot.state.fl.us.

**Project Website**

If you would like to learn more about this study or submit a comment, please visit the project website at:

http://active.fdotd7studies.com/sr600/i4-to-county-line/

**Project Schedule**

The SR 600 (US 92) re-evaluation began in January 2015. Data collection is currently underway. A public hearing is scheduled for Spring 2016. Additional public meetings may be held throughout the duration of the study as engineering and environmental analyses are completed. The re-evaluation is anticipated to be completed by Summer 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASKS</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluation Begins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Environmental Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons who require special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services (free of charge) should contact Lee Royal by calling 813-975-6427 or by email to: lee.royal@dot.state.fl.us.
Dear Property Owner or Interested Citizen:

You are invited to attend and participate in the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), District Seven public hearing for improvements to US 92 (SR 600) in Hillsborough County, Florida. This public hearing is being held to allow interested persons an opportunity to provide comments concerning the location, conceptual design, and social, economic, and environmental effects of widening US 92 (SR 600) from east of I-4 to east of County Line Road, a distance of approximately 18.1 miles.

This letter serves as notice to property owners (pursuant to F.S. 339.155) that all or a portion of their property may be affected. Therefore, please note the time differences as well. The same meeting will be held at different locations. Please check the schedule for the time and location that is most convenient to you. Department representatives will be available at the public hearing beginning at 6:00 p.m. to provide comments, ask questions, and make suggestions about the project.

Public Information

Florida Department of Transportation District Seven
11201 N. McKinley Drive MS 7-500T
Tampa, FL 33612-6456

To provide comments, ask questions, or speak with the department’s Project Manager or Right-of-Way Representative at your convenience.

You may submit written comments or other exhibits must be postmarked no later than Monday, December 19, 2016 to become part of the official public hearing record. If you have questions about the project or the scheduled hearing, please contact:

Lillian Escalera, Project Manager
813-975-6445, lillian.escalera@dot.state.fl.us

WE WANT YOUR INPUT!

A successful project depends on the public’s participation in the project’s development. We are interested in hearing your concerns and answering your questions. We also encourage you to speak with the department’s Project Manager or Right-of-Way Representative at your convenience.

Non-Discrimination Laws

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons who require special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services (free of charge) should contact Christopher Speese, Public Involvement Coordinator, at (813) 975-6440, or by email to: christopher.spees@dot.state.fl.us at least seven (7) days before the public hearing.

WEANTOHEARYOUROPINION

Please note the time differences as well. The same meeting will be held at different locations. Please check the schedule for the time and location that is most convenient to you.

The public hearing will be held in two sessions (two different days/two different locations). Please note the time differences as well. The same information will be shown at both sessions, so feel free to attend the session that is most convenient to you. Department representatives will be available at the public hearing beginning at 6:30 pm on December 1st (6:00 pm on December 6th) to answer questions and discuss the project informally. Draft project documents and other project related materials will be displayed, and a PowerPoint presentation will run continuously during the open house. FDOT representatives will begin the formal portion of the hearing at 7:00 pm on December 1st (7:00 pm on December 6th), which will provide an opportunity for attendees to make formal oral public comments. Following the formal portion of the hearing, the informal open house will resume and continue until 7:30 pm on December 1st (8:00 pm on December 6th). A court reporter will be available to take comments from the audience.

Comments or other exhibits must be postmarked no later than Monday, December 19, 2016 to become part of the official public hearing record. If you have questions about the project or the scheduled hearing, please contact:

Lillian Escalera, Project Manager
813-975-6445
lillian.escalera@dot.state.fl.us

Sincerely,

Kirk Bogen
Environmental Management Engineer

FDOT Adopted Five Year Work Program FY 2017-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Time Frame (Fiscal Year)</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering (Final Design) (1)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way (2)</td>
<td>2026-2030</td>
<td>$31,570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (3)</td>
<td>2031-2035</td>
<td>$43,140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,980,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Hillsborough County MPO TIP for FY 2016/17 to FY 2020/21
(2) Hillsborough County MPO Imagine 2040 LRTP Cost Feasible Plan
(3) FDOT Long Range Estimates (LRE) program

Comunicarse con Nosotros

Nos importa mucho la opinión del público sobre el proyecto. Si tiene preguntas o comentarios, o simplemente desea más información, por favor comuníquese con nosotros. Nuestra representante en español es: Lillian Escalera, (813) 975-6445, Departamento de Transporte de la Florida – Distrito 7.

Right-of-Way Acquisition (ROW) Procedure

We understand that when a transportation project proposes the acquisition of private property, you may have questions and concerns. To better educate and inform you about the right-of-way acquisition process and your rights, the department has created real estate acquisition and relocation brochures. These brochures and other education materials will be available at the public hearing. Copies of the brochures may also be found on our website: http://www.dot.state.fl.us/rightofway/Documents.shtml. We are interested in hearing your concerns and answering your questions. We also encourage you to speak with the departments’ Project Manager or Right-of-Way Representative at your convenience.

Funding Summary: Garden Lane to Mango Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Time Frame (Fiscal Year)</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering (Final Design) (1)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way (2)</td>
<td>2021-2025</td>
<td>$19,380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (3)</td>
<td>2031-2035</td>
<td>$38,780,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$69,960,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Hillsborough County MPO TIP for FY 2016/17 to FY 2020/21
(2) Hillsborough County MPO Imagine 2040 LRTP Cost Feasible Plan
(3) FDOT Long Range Estimates (LRE) program

US 92 (SR 600) from East of I-4 to East of County Line Road Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Re-evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Time Frame (Fiscal Year)</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering (Final Design) (1)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way (2)</td>
<td>2026-2030</td>
<td>$31,570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (2)</td>
<td>2026-2030</td>
<td>$43,140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,980,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Hillsborough County MPO TIP for FY 2016/17 to 2020/21
(2) Hillsborough County MPO Imagine 2040 LRTP Cost Feasible Plan
(3) FDOT Long Range Estimates (LRE) program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Hearing Session 1 (Est)</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>December 1, 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place:</td>
<td></td>
<td>HCC Trinkle Center 1206 N. Park Road Plant City, FL 33565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>6:30 pm-8:00 pm</td>
<td>Open House 7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Hearing Session 2 (Est)</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>December 6, 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheraton Tampa East Hotel 10211 Princess Palm Avenue Tampa, FL 33610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>6:00 pm-8:00 pm</td>
<td>Open House 7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| WPI Segment No: | 435749-1 | Hillsborough County, Florida | November 2016 |

| Funding Summary: Mango Road to Mobley Street |
|--------------------------|-----------|
| Preliminary Engineering (Final Design) (1) | Not Currently Funded | $9,150,000 |
| Right-of-Way (2) | Not Currently Funded | $100,431,300 |
| Construction (3) | NotCurrently Funded | $59,300,000 |
| Total | | $160,881,300 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Summary: Park Road to County Line Road Segment Project</th>
<th>Time Frame (Fiscal Year)</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering (Final Design) (1)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way (2)</td>
<td>2021-2025</td>
<td>$19,380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (3)</td>
<td>2021-2025</td>
<td>$38,780,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$69,960,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Draft project documents will be available for public review at the following locations from Tuesday, November 8, 2016 to Monday, December 19, 2016 |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| Soffner-Napier Branch Library | 410 N. Kingsway Road | Seffner, FL 33584 |
| Time: | Monday - Friday 8 a.m.–5 p.m. |
| Comment Session: | Monday - Friday 8 a.m.–5 p.m. |
| Sun Closed |

| Bruton Memorial Library | 302 W. McAlley Road | Plant City, FL 33565 |
| Comment Session: | Monday - Thursday 9 a.m.–5 p.m. |
| Sat 10 a.m.–5 p.m. |
| Sun 1 p.m.–5 p.m. |

| FDOT District Seven | 11201 N. McKinley Drive | Tampa, FL 33612 |
| Comment Session: | Monday - Friday 8 a.m.–5 p.m. |

| Environmental Management Engineer | Kirk Bogen | 813-975-6445 | 800-226-7220 | lilliam.escalera@dot.state.fl.us |
What is a PD&E Study Re-evaluation?

A re-evaluation is the process used to document compliance with federal laws and to identify any changes that may have occurred since the approval of the original environmental document. The original PD&E study for this portion of US 92 (SR 600) was approved on March 24, 1994. However, upon completion, the study was put on hold and not advanced to the next phase of development.

This re-evaluation is needed to update the 1994 study, documenting changes in the design standards, reassessing socio-economic and environmental impacts, and comparing any new alternative options with the previously approved roadway improvement.

Project Location & Existing Conditions

The FDOT is conducting this PD&E re-evaluation to improve mobility and safety along US 92 from east of I-4 to east of County Line Road, a distance of approximately 18.1 miles. This section of US 92 (SR 600) is currently a two-lane, divided roadway with 12-foot travel lanes and four-foot outside paved shoulders. Sidewalks in the area are intermittent. Turn lanes have been provided at certain locations.

Project Purpose and Need

US 92 is a major east-west arterial of regional significance that parallels Interstate I-4 and SR 574 (E. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd) in Hillsborough County. Within the study area, US 92 plays a significant role in connecting eastern Hillsborough County to the Tampa Bay region. The purpose of the proposed project is to accommodate future traffic growth and provide for faster emergency response and evacuation times. This corridor is projected to operate at level of service (LOS) F in the design year (2040) if no increase in capacity is provided. Other factors which support the need for the project include: regional connectivity, safety, consistency with transportation plans, emergency evacuation, and modal interrelationships.

Recommended Build Alternative

Recommended improvements include widening the existing roadway to four lanes (except for Mobley Street to Maryland Avenue), adding paved shoulders and improving sidewalks. Bicycle facilities and transit accommodations will be considered as part of the project. Proposed roadway typical sections include rural, suburban, and urban typical sections. The project was divided into 11 evaluation segments based on changes in land use and the proposed typical section in comparison with the land use and typical sections from the original PD&E Study. Five different typical section alternatives were recommended for the project in addition to the No-Build Alternative which was recommended for the project segment from Mobley Street to Maryland Avenue. The five typical section alternatives are listed below and the proposed action for each segment is described in the table on the next page.

No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative applies to the entire project length except for a segment from Mobley Street to Maryland Avenue. The No-Build Alternative was established in the original PD&E Study completed in 1994. The original PD&E Study recommended that the section of Baker Street, between Mobley Street and Whitehall Street, be converted from a rural roadway to an urban roadway in order to provide sidewalks and drainage enhancements. These improvements were completed for this section and met the intent of the original PD&E Study recommendation. This re-evaluation concludes that this segment, Mobley Street to Maryland Avenue, will remain a No-Build Alternative. The No-Build Alternative assumes that no further improvements will be made to this segment of US 92 through the year 2040 except for routine maintenance and safety enhancements as required.
Public Hearing Session 2 Directions:
Sheraton Tampa East Hotel | 10221 Princess Palm Avenue, Tampa, FL 33610 | 6:00 pm-8:00 pm

- **From Interstate 75**
  From I-75 take Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard Exit, proceed west to Falkenburg Road, turn left onto Falkenburg Road, then turn left onto Princess Palm Avenue and proceed to the hotel.

- **From Broadway Ave**
  Head east on E Broadway Avenue toward Queen Palm Drive, turn left onto Falkenburg Road, then turn right at the 2nd cross street onto Princess Palm Avenue and proceed to the hotel.

- **From US 92**
  Head west on US 92 toward N Falkenburg Road, turn left onto N Falkenburg Road, turn left onto FL 574 E/ E Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard, turn right onto Queen Palm Drive, then turn left onto Princess Palm Avenue and proceed to the hotel.

- **From Mango Road**
  Head south on Mango Road, turn right onto FL 574 W/E Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard, turn left onto Queen Palm Drive, then turn left onto Princess Palm Avenue and proceed to the hotel.
Public Hearing Comment Form

We encourage your comments regarding this project

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Name (Print):________________________________________
Address:____________________________________________
City, State, Zip:_______________________________________
Email:______________________________________________

If you did not receive notice of the public hearing but would like to be included on the mailing list for this project, please check.

PUBLIC HEARING SESSION ATTENDED:

☐ Session 1
   Thursday, December 1, 2016
   HCC Trinkle Center

☐ Session 2
   Tuesday, December 6, 2016
   Sheraton Tampa East Hotel

NOTE: Please complete and place in the “Comments” box or mail Kirk Bogen, P.E., at the address on the back of this comment form. All comments postmarked by Monday, December 19, 2016 will become part of the public hearing record and are available for viewing by the public and the media.

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons who require special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services (free of charge) should contact Christopher Speese, Public Involvement Coordinator, at 813-975-6405 or 800-226-7220 at least seven working days in advance of the Public Hearing.
Kirk Bogen, PE, Environmental Management Engineer
Florida Department of Transportation, District 7
MS 7-500
11201 N. McKinley Drive
Tampa, Florida  33612-6456
PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPT CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that on December 1, 2016, beginning at 5:30 p.m., and on December 6, 2016, beginning at 6:00 p.m., I presided over a Public Hearing for the following project:

**US 92 (SR 600)**

Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Reevaluation
from east of I-4 to East of County Line Road
Hillsborough County, Florida
Financial Project ID: 435749-1

I further certify that the subject public hearing was conducted relative to the economic and social effects of the location and design concept for the subject project and its impact on the environment, that a transcript was made and the document attached herein is a full, true, and complete transcript of what was said at the hearing, and that the Florida Department of Transportation has considered the social, economic, and environmental effects of the proposed improvement and is of the opinion that it is properly located and should be constructed.

Kirk Bogen, FDOT Hearing Moderator

3/14/17
(Date)
PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPT CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that on December 1, 2016, beginning at 5:30 p.m., and on December 6, 2016, beginning at 6:00 p.m., I presided over a Public Hearing for the following project:

US 92 (SR 600)
Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Reevaluation
from east of I-4 to East of County Line Road
Hillsborough County, Florida
Financial Project ID: 435749-1

I further certify that the subject public hearing was conducted relative to the economic and social effects of the location and design concept for the subject project and its impact on the environment, that a transcript was made and the document attached herein is a full, true, and complete transcript of what was said at the hearing, and that the Florida Department of Transportation has considered the social, economic, and environmental effects of the proposed improvement and is of the opinion that it is properly located and should be constructed.

Kirk Bogen, FDOT Hearing Moderator

3/14/17
(Date)
PUBLIC HEARING

US 92 (SR 600) PD&E STUDY REEVALUATION

DATE: Thursday, December 1, 2016
TIME: 5:30 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.
PLACE: Trinkle Center
1206 North Park Road
Plant City, Florida

DATE: Tuesday, December 6, 2016
TIME: 6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.
PLACE: Sheraton Tampa East Hotel
10221 Princess Palm Avenue
Tampa, Florida

REPORTED BY: CATHY J. JOHNSON MESSINA, RMR, FPR
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Computer-Aided Transcription
(Session #1)

MR. BOGEN: Good evening. Today is Thursday, December 1, 2016, and it is approximately 6:30 p.m. We are assembled at Trinkle Center located at 1206 North Park Road in Plant City, Florida.

Welcome to the Public Hearing for the reevaluation of the US 92 (State Road 600) Project Development and Environment Study, or PD&E from east of I-4 to east of County Line Road.

My name is Kirk Bogen and I am the Environmental Management Engineer for District Seven of the Florida Department of Transportation.

This public hearing is being held relative to Work Program Item Segment Number 435749-1. We are conducting the hearing this evening to provide you an opportunity to discuss the project and to submit comments on the PD&E study reevaluation.

This public hearing is being held in accordance with applicable federal and state laws and public participation is encouraged and solicited without regard to race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, disability or family status.

This hearing was advertised consistent with federal and state requirements and is being conducted in accordance with the Americans With Disabilities Act of
1990. This information is provided in the project brochure and can be found at the sign-in table as well.

This public hearing is being conducted in two sessions at two separate locations. Both sessions will be combined into a single public hearing record for the PD&E study.

The first session tonight is the 1st day of December, 2016, from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m., at Trinkle Center located at 1206 North Park Road in Plant City, Florida.

The second session will be held on Tuesday, December 6, 2016, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., at the Sheraton Tampa East Hotel located at 10221 Princess Palm Avenue, Tampa, Florida.

This is your opportunity to receive information on the US 92 (State Road 600) PD&E study reevaluation and officially comment on the Department's recommended build alternative and other documents available here tonight.

Re evaluations of originally approved PD&E studies are conducted for several different instances. Due to a substantial time lapse since the original PD&E study's approval in 1994, the project team looked at its approved build alternative with respect to changes in policies, laws and regulations, land uses, and design standards. The team updated the original PD&E study's preferred
build alternative and estimated the new costs and impacts as a result.

The recommended build alternative shown at tonight's public hearing is based on comprehensive environmental and engineering analyses completed to date, as well as on public comments that have been received throughout the duration of the reevaluation study.

I will now explain information about the proposed widening of US 92 (State Road 600) from east of I-4 to east of County Line Road.

The recommended build alternative consists of widening US 92 (State Road 600) through the project limits in Hillsborough County with the exception of a segment between Mobley Street to Park Road in Plant City.

US 92 is a major east-west roadway through Hillsborough County and plays a significant role in connecting eastern Hillsborough County to the Tampa Bay region.

The proposed project includes widening the existing roadway from two to four lanes (except through downtown Plant City) adding paved shoulders to the travel lanes, and improving sidewalk connectivity.

The project was divided into 11 evaluation segments based on changes in land use and typical sections when
compared to the original PD&E study.

There are four major typical sections proposed for the recommended build alternative that include urban and suburban roadways. The typical sections consist of two 11-foot or 12-foot lanes in each direction, curb and gutter, bike lanes, sidewalks, and grassed medians that vary between 22 feet to 54 feet. The length of the proposed project is approximately 18 miles. This widening is intended to accommodate future traffic growth, provide faster emergency response and evaluation times, and improve safety and mobility for vehicles, bicyclists and pedestrians.

The no-build alternative applies to the segment from Mobley Street to Maryland Avenue. The original PD&E study recommended that the section of Baker Street between Mobley Street and Whitehall Street be converted from a rural roadway to an urban roadway in order to provide sidewalks and drainage enhancements. The sidewalk and drainage enhancements were completed previously for this section and met the intent of the original PD&E study recommendation.

This PD&E study reevaluation of US 92 concludes that the remaining part of this segment will remain a no-build alternative. The no-build alternative involves foregoing major improvements to the existing roadway and
provides only routine maintenance, pavement resurfacing, and safety enhancements as required.

During the PD&E study reevaluation, specialists conducted a cultural resources assessment survey in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Three resources located within the build segments have been identified as eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. They are the Polk County Obelisk, the Camp Knox Tourist Court Resource Group, and the Tomlin Middle School Resource Group. No new archaeological sites were found, and no new evidence of any previous identified archaeological sites was discovered in the reevaluation. A no effect and a no adverse effect conclusion is anticipated as a result of completing the draft case study report.

A draft Section 106 case study report was prepared and is available for review and comment at this hearing. Details of all project impacts are on display tonight.

The estimated total cost of this project is approximately $399 million in 2016 dollars. The total cost includes design, right of way, acquisition, mitigation, construction, and construction inspection.

Now I am going to give you some information about right-of-way acquisition and how you can make comments on
the project.

On transportation projects such as this, one of the unavoidable consequences is the necessary acquisition of properties and the relocation of families and businesses. On this project, we anticipate the relocation of 230 properties, 120 residential locations, and 110 business relocations.

If a project requires that all or part of your property is to be acquired, the acquisition will be done in accordance with all applicable eminent domain law. If a project requires people and/or businesses to relocate, the relocation process will be done in accordance with the federal Uniform Relocation Act.

Informational brochures describing both the acquisition and the relocation process are available this evening at the right-of-way table.

In addition to the printed material, experienced right-of-way specialists who are familiar with the acquisition and relocation process are available this evening to answer your questions.

Jackie Fernandez and Zenia Gallo, if you would please stand so that anyone who is an affected property owner, displaced resident, or displaced business will know who to see to discuss these issues.

Thank you.
Before I continue, I would like to recognize any elected officials or their representatives who are here tonight. I ask that you please stand and introduce yourself for the record.

When you arrived this evening, you should have received an informational newsletter and a comment form. If you weren't able to sign in or did not receive an information packet, please stop by our sign-in table before leaving this evening. You should have also had the opportunity to view the video presentation that is continuously running throughout this public hearing.

Anyone desiring to make a statement or present written views and/or exhibits regarding the location, conceptual design, social, economic, or environmental effects of the proposed US 92 widening will now have an opportunity to do so.

You may also make a statement at the public hearing second session scheduled for Tuesday December 6th, 2016, in Tampa.

If you have completed a speaker's card, please give them to the Department staff member. If you have not received a speaker's card and wish to speak, please raise your hand so we can get you a card to complete.

In addition to making an oral statement during this portion of the hearing, you can also make a comment after
the presentation to the court reporter who is here tonight.

You can also submit your comments to the Department in writing. Comment forms can be placed in one of the comment boxes this evening, or you can complete the form at a later date and mail it to us at the preprinted address on the back of the sheet.

You can also email comments to us at the project website found on the front of the handout. Please keep in mind that comments must be postmarked or emailed no later than Monday, December 19, 2016, to be included in the official public hearing record.

At this time, we will begin taking public comments. I will call each speaker in the order in which their request was received.

Please limit your comments to the US 92 PD&E study reevaluation and keep them to three minutes. This is in order to allow everyone an opportunity to speak. Those who wish to provide additional comments may return to the microphone following the last speaker, or you may present your additional comments related to the PD&E study directly to the court reporter after the formal session has concluded.

As I call your name, please step to the microphone and state your name and address clearly into the
microphone before making your comment. If you represent an organization, municipality or other public agency, please provide that information as well.

The first speaker is Xiomara Meeks.

MS. MEEKS: Good evening. My name is Xiomara Meeks, and I'm here for Parksdale Farms. Our address is 3702 West Baker Street, Plant City.

As you know, Parksdale has been a community landmark for almost 60 years. About ten years ago my husband and I moved to Plant City from Boca Raton to carry on his grandpa's legacy, Roy Parks.

The existing right-of-way and road in front of the market extends about 75 feet. In the '90s, the DOT had conducted a PD&E study for widening US 92. This is nothing new to us. We're aware this has been going on. That study showed a much smaller cross section than the one that's shown on the plans in the other room.

Initially, we had thought that on the previous cross section we'd only lose our front spots. With the new cross section, it would completely eliminate all of our business space.

Another point I want to make is if you think of the intersection of State Road 60 and Polk County Line going towards Polk County, that intersection is still smaller than what you have designed on the plans out there. I
believe that that type of road is too big for coming into
the city limits of Plant City.

So my final comment is I look forward to having
further discussions in making the design more feasible
for us for Parksdale to stay as an institution and a
community member of Plant City.

Thank you.

MR. BOGEN: Our next speaker is Bob DuBe'.

MR. DUBE': I've already made my comment to the
reporter.

MR. BOGEN: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Donald Owen.

MR. OWEN: My name is Donald Owen. I'm
representing Motel 92, LLC. It's a nine and a half acre
piece of property that in 1957 was not zoned. There was
no zoning in the area. It was zoned as 150 feet highway
commercial from the center line of the existing
Highway 92 then.

The presentation today indicated several things
that are of great concern: Number one, the cross section
that was presented in the PowerPoint display showed that
the well that supplies all the water for the property,
the power supply from TECO Electric. All of the motel's
business and RV spaces will be basically destroyed
because there will be no power and no water to them.
The center line of -- I'm sorry -- the presentation said that there would be -- I thought it said that there would be stop lights at all entrances. I don't know if that was true or not, if I misread that, or misheard that or whatever, but if you don't do that there is no way in the world anybody is going to make a U-turn on Highway 92, whatever direction you're coming from, if you widen it to a four-lane highway.

Right now it's two lanes. You can't even get across the street anywhere. From McIntosh Road to Plant City, forget it. There is just too much traffic.

So if there is not any consideration there, there needs to be some type of consideration; otherwise, you're going to have a bunch of people killed because of this project. There is just no way to get in and out of your property.

And Kirk Bogen, did you say B-O-G-A-N?

MR. BOGEN: No, B-O-G-E-N.

MR. OWEN: Okay. This project, I guess it was 435-749-1, has a noise issue also. Even if the project is not going to be completed until 20 -- what did you say -- 21? Basically, when is the end of the project?

MR. BOGEN: Sir, it's not a question and answer --

MR. OWEN: Okay. Whenever the project is going to be done, as soon as you guys come through there and wipe
out the business and the power supply and the water, we're effectively out of business, period. No if, and, or buts.

I have spoken both to Zenia Gallo -- or I have spoken to her. She gave us the information and we had the forms here. We probably are going to make the report.

Thank you.

MR. BOGEN: Thank you for your time.

The next speaker is Rene' Owen.

MS. OWEN: I decline.

MR. BOGEN: Okay.

Our next speaker is Warren Russell.

MR. RUSSELL: I decline also.

MR. BOGEN: And the next speaker is Mark Riebow.

MR. RIEBOW: Riebow. I'm not going to decline.

My name is Mark Riebow. I'm with Hollemans Mobile Home Park just past 92. What I'm trying to figure out is you're going to widen the road in sections, so to speak, segments, and you're going to widen starting at Martin's Gardens where you did a widening project five years ago, six years ago, or maybe a little further where you widened it just past 579, which when people come off at work at night it already is backed up tremendously.

We've had people killed out in front of our
property because of the traffic flow, and now you’re going to widen it to four lanes and stop in that area and not carry on, and all of that traffic is going to dump four lanes up from 301, four lanes coming off of I-4, and you’re going to create a traffic congestion and nobody seems to be giving this much thought.

The second part I’m worried about is the drainage system. When you did it last time -- my front yard floods out when it rains because all the water comes into my yard where they stopped the gutter at my property line for some unusual reason.

And I don't understand why we're doing these things and don't think it through. I mean I have to pump my front yard out for hours because all the water comes off and runs in my yard because they stopped the gutters and now you’re going to add the traffic. What more? And you’re not going to build and do the right thing. I think that section was not being done for a few years. You're jumping to Plant City and leaving that where all of the traffic problems are?

Is someone not thinking this through or they just don't care?

MR. BOGEN: If you'll speak with me after this formal portion and we can sit down --

MR. RIEBOW: Well, we've got phone call after phone
call to the FDOT about the draining problem. He had come out and build some stupid speed bump thinking that would stop the water. They won't answer our calls anymore.

It should have been done during the initial construction. So I guess — I'm reading this off — is anyone thinking this through that we're going to widen the street where all of this traffic comes to and stop where it's going to two lanes again, with two major roads coming through? And we don't care. It's not being thought through very clear where you're stopping and where you're starting.

Also, you're destroying businesses. I understand there's going to be some people that will be losing their homes, and hopefully you're going to compensate them, but I don't think it's being thought through some of the segments of what you're doing, and I don't think you've really looked at the traffic flow that comes off of I-75 to 92, and the visibility causes wrecks.

And so you're going to dump all this traffic down here where there's no visibility or nothing, with the school where they won't even give a light to Wal-Mart who wanted to build something there because they didn't want to stop the traffic, and you're going to clog it up the nose. Something's just not — I don't know.

And the students walk along there. They're just
always walking back and forth.

Anybody else want to say anything?

It's just not -- you're not thinking it through.

We want to say that's government, but we're just not thinking it through.

MR. BOGEN: That is the last card that I have.

Was there anyone else that would like to speak?

If you would state your name and address and we'll have you fill out a card afterwards.

MR. HERRMAN: Joseph Herrmann, 6011 Highway 92 West. I understand the project is stopping at Mobley Street here in Plant City. And that intersection, I'd like to call your attention to there's a school there, people bringing them kids and dropping them off on Mobley, very congested intersection, and you absolutely are not doing anything to improve it, and it just seems like another hundred feet of you all putting in there could put proper turn lanes of sufficient lengths so that moms and dads picking up students could safely turn off 92. I don't know what else you can do. Maybe a traffic light. That's out of the question because they -- a traffic light would be nice, but mainly proper turn lanes, because it's very bad, people going east and west. Turning north or south causes a problem.

MR. BOGEN: Thank you. We'll refer that comment to
our traffic operations office.

MR. QUIRINO: Yes. My name is Miguel Quirino, and I am the pastor of the Iglesia de Dios Torre Fuerte in Dover, Inc., there at 5335 West US Highway 92.

I'm just concerned that this will impact our church facilities there where we were at, and I just wanted to know more information, if it will impact our church and our facilities.

Thank you.

MR. BOGEN: Thank you for your comment.

Is there anyone else?

MR. BERGERON: Yeah, I'd like to make a comment, actually a couple of them. Louis Bergeron. I own the property at 337 West US 92.

Yeah, I noticed out there this was a one of nine step process. Did I miss something? I just found out you guys are in process step number eight.

You guys normally send stuff out. I mean I finally got something in the mail the other day about this meeting. Was there anything before this that was sent out?

MR. BOGEN: We send out notifications to all property owners at least 21 days before.

MR. BERGERON: For these meetings for comment?

MR. BOGEN: Yes.
MR. BERGERON: Okay. So we only have 21 days. You guys have, what, a year and a half?

Okay. Drainage, I notice it's done in sections and I see these nice typical sections here in your brochure. I see these big retention areas and water drainage. Where's that water go when it leaves the new area? It goes into our old, inadequate drainage system out here. Very inadequate.

MR. BOGEN: If you would get with me afterwards, I can answer some of those questions.

MR. BERGERON: You can't answer them for everybody?

MR. BOGEN: This is not a question-and-answer session.

MR. BERGERON: Okay. I understand. And I do support better roads and I do support the four-laning, but it needs to be done right and in one nice unison stretch, not all chopped up, or you're just going to destroy everybody's businesses out here.

MR. BOGEN: Thank you for your comment.

Is there anyone else?

Seeing none, the public hearing transcript, written statements and exhibits and reference material will be available for public inspection at the District Seven Office, 11201 North McKinley Drive, Tampa, Florida,
within three weeks.

Thank you for attending this session and for providing your input into this project.

It is approximately 6:57. I hereby officially suspend the formal portion of the public hearing for the US 92 PD&E study reevaluation.

This hearing will be continued at the second session on Tuesday, December the 6th, 2016, from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m., in Tampa, Florida.

Department representatives will be available to answer questions and the materials shown this evening will be on display. You may continue to view the materials on display and speak with our project staff.

On behalf of the Florida Department of Transportation, thank you for attending.

Remember to be alert today, alive tomorrow. Safety doesn't happen by accident.

Good night.
COMMENTS

Greg Pilcher
RV Clear Coat
10716 East US Highway 92
Tampa, Florida 33610
Phone: 813.626.4487

I own the business on the corner of Anna and 10716 East Highway 92. It's a RV paint and body shop. We have large 40-foot RVs pulling in and out of there. Right now we only have access through Anna. We have no direct access onto 92.

With the proposed plans, I'll only be able to take a left when leaving my property and not a right, and I need to have access to my property. I need to be able to turn left and right.

I'm also one of the few businesses, I don't know if there is another business, but doesn't have direct access to 92, and I want to see about possibly getting that done when they widen the road to where you can actually pull off 92 onto my property like the other business is, but then when you pull out of Anna I need to be able to turn right or left.

These are huge 40-foot homes towing cars. Sometimes they'll have a 40-foot RV with a car that they pull behind. They're pretty big.

Okay. I just wanted to put that on the record.
Teresa Yavit
Hammocks of Kingsway
437 Down Pine Drive
Seffner, Florida 33584
Phone: 813.655.3735

We are the first house coming in leaving the
development and we have a bigger lot and we also have a
pool and a spa back there. They want to come in to the
middle of the pool. That's sort of my problem.

We are the only person that -- to my knowledge, on
the pool, on the whole side there. I have terminal
cancer. By right, I should be buried already, and I'm
concerned about -- my bedroom is right next to the pool
area and everything and I'm concerned about my comfort
while this is going on.

My husband wants to keep my home. I want to go
into a nursing home. I don't want him to bother with me
with therapy, but my concern is when are they going to do
my area and can they work around me with this, you know.
Like, I don't know what to do or what my actual complaint
is, but that's my concern and my statement.
Bob Dube'
5407 Anna Drive
Tampa, Florida 33601
Phone: 813.381.7650

The entrance or easement, whatever they get, in the drive on the map is undoable. They're going to block the road off.

I have a towing company, a repo company, operating 24/7 bringing in large semis and stuff over there. They would ruin my business and make it impossible for me to sell it if they block off the ability to go to the east.

They want to put a glass thing in front of there and make you go one way a half mile down the road and try to turn around. I cannot do that. It's going to ruin my business and ruin my property values.

Yeah, we can't get in with the semis and stuff. That's not a residential anymore. That's part of the I-75 industrial corridor, which means industry, which means big trucks in and out. If they block that off, we're not going to have that.

So it's going to ruin everything. I don't know what to say, but I'm against whatever they're doing. I'm against the blocking off Anna Drive and McCloud Avenue. We need to be able to go across the grassy knoll.

Okay.
(Session #2)

MR. BOGEN: Good evening. Today is Tuesday, December 6, 2016, and it is approximately 7:00 p.m. We are assembled at the Shearton Tampa East Hotel located at 10221 Princess Palm Avenue, Tampa, Florida.

Welcome to the Public Hearing for the reevaluation of the US 92 (State Road 600) Project Development and Environment Study, or PD&E from east of I-4 to east of County Line Road.

My name is Kirk Bogen and I am the Environmental Management Engineer for District Seven of the Florida Department of Transportation.

This public hearing is being held relative to Work Program Item Segment Number 435749-1. We are conducting the hearing this evening to provide you an opportunity to discuss the project and to submit comments on the PD&E study reevaluation.

This public hearing is being held in accordance with applicable federal and state laws and public participation is encouraged and solicited without regard to race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, disability or family status.

This hearing was advertised consistent with federal and state requirements and is being conducted in accordance with the Americans With Disabilities Act of
1990. This information is provided in the project brochure and can be found at the sign-in table as well.

This public hearing is being conducted in two sessions at two separate locations. Both sessions will be combined into a single public hearing record for the PD&E study.

The first session was held on Thursday, December 1, 2016, 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m., at the Trinkle Center located at 1206 North Park Road in Plant City, Florida.

The second session is being conducted tonight, on the 6th day of December, 2016, at the Sheraton Tampa East Hotel located at 10221 Princess Palm Avenue, Tampa, Florida.

This is your opportunity to receive information on the US 92 (State Road 600) PD&E study reevaluation and officially comment on the Department's recommended build alternative and other documents available here tonight.

Reevaluations of originally approved PD&E studies are conducted for several different instances. Due to a substantial time lapse since the original PD&E study's approval in 1994, the project team looked at its approved build alternative with respect to changes in policies, laws and regulations, land uses, and design standards. The team updated the original PD&E study's preferred build alternative and estimated the new costs and impacts.
as a result.

The recommended build alternative shown at tonight's public hearing is based on comprehensive environmental and engineering analyses completed to date, as well as on public comments that have been received throughout the duration of the reevaluation study.

I will now explain information about the proposed widening of US 92 (State Road 600) from east of I-4 to east of County Line Road.

The recommended build alternative consists of widening US 92 (State Road 600) through the project limits in Hillsborough County with the exception of a segment between Mobley Street to Park Road in Plant City.

US 92 is a major east–west roadway through Hillsborough County and plays a significant role in connecting eastern Hillsborough County to the Tampa Bay region.

The proposed project includes widening the existing roadway from two to four lanes (except through downtown Plant City) adding paved shoulders to the travel lanes, and improving sidewalk connectivity.

The project was divided into 11 evaluation segments based on changes in land use and typical sections when compared to the original PD&E study.
There are four major typical sections proposed for the recommended build alternative that include urban and suburban roadways. The typical sections consist of two 11-foot or 12-foot lanes in each direction, curb and gutter, bike lanes, sidewalks, and grassed medians that vary between 22 feet to 54 feet. The length of the proposed project is approximately 18 miles. This widening is intended to accommodate future traffic growth, provide faster emergency response and evaluation times, and improve safety and mobility for vehicles, bicyclists and pedestrians.

The no-build alternative applies to the segment from Mobley Street to Maryland Avenue. The original PD&E study recommended that the section of Baker Street between Mobley Street and Whitehall Street be converted from a rural roadway to an urban roadway in order to provide sidewalks and drainage enhancements. The sidewalk and drainage enhancements were completed previously for this section and met the intent of the original PD&E study recommendation.

This PD&E study reevaluation of US 92 concludes that the remaining part of this segment will remain a no-build alternative. The no-build alternative involves foregoing major improvements to the existing roadway and provides only routine maintenance, pavement resurfacing,
and safety enhancements as required.

During the PD&E study reevaluation, specialists conducted a cultural resources assessment survey in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Three resources located within the build segments have been identified as eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. They are the Polk County Obelisk, the Camp Knox Tourist Court Resource Group, and the Tomlin Middle School Resource Group. No new archaeological sites were found, and no new evidence of any previous identified archaeological sites was discovered in the reevaluation. A no effect and a no adverse effect conclusion is anticipated as a result of completing the draft case study report.

A draft Section 106 case study report was prepared and is available for review and comment at this hearing. Details of all project impacts are on display tonight.

The estimated total cost of this project is approximately $399 million in 2016 dollars. The total cost includes design, right of way, acquisition, mitigation, construction, and construction inspection.

Now I am going to give you some information about right-of-way acquisition and how you can make comments on the project.
On transportation projects such as this, one of the unavoidable consequences is the necessary acquisition of properties and the relocation of families and businesses. On this project, we anticipate the relocation of 230 properties, 120 residential locations, and 110 business relocations.

If a project requires that all or part of your property is to be acquired, the acquisition will be done in accordance with all applicable eminent domain law. If a project requires people and/or businesses to relocate, the relocation process will be done in accordance with the federal Uniform Relocation Act.

Informational brochures describing both the acquisition and the relocation process are available this evening at the right-of-way table.

In addition to the printed material, experienced right-of-way specialists who are familiar with the acquisition and relocation process are available this evening to answer your questions.

Pat Berg and Zenia Gallo, if you would please stand so that anyone who is an affected property owner, displaced resident, or displaced business will know who to see to discuss these issues.

Thank you.

Before I continue, I would like to recognize any
elected officials or their representatives who are here tonight. I ask that you please stand and introduce
yourself for the record.

When you arrived this evening, you should have received an informational newsletter and a comment form.
If you weren't able to sign in or did not receive an information packet, please stop by our sign-in table
before leaving this evening. You should have also had the opportunity to view the video presentation that is continuously running throughout this public hearing.

Anyone desiring to make a statement or present written views and/or exhibits regarding the location, conceptual design, social, economic, or environmental effects of the proposed US 92 widening will now have an opportunity to do so.

You may also make a statement at the public hearing second session scheduled for Tuesday December 6th, 2016, in Tampa.

If you have completed a speaker's card, please give them to the Department staff member. If you have not received a speaker's card and wish to speak, please raise your hand so we can get you a card to complete.

In addition to making an oral statement during this portion of the hearing, you can also make a comment after the presentation to the court reporter who is here
tonight.

You can also submit your comments to the Department in writing. Comment forms can be placed in one of the comment boxes this evening, or you can complete the form at a later date and mail it to us at the preprinted address on the back of the sheet.

You can also email comments to us at the project website found on the front of the handout. Please keep in mind that comments must be postmarked or emailed no later than Monday, December 19, 2016, to be included in the official public hearing record.

At this time, we will begin taking public comments. I will call each speaker in the order in which their request was received.

Please limit your comments to the US 92 PD&E study reevaluation and keep them to three minutes in order to allow everyone an opportunity to speak. Those who wish to provide additional comments may return to the microphone following the last speaker, or you may present your additional comments related to the PD&E study directly to the court reporter after the formal session has concluded.

As I call your name, please step to the microphone and state your name and address clearly into the microphone before making your comment. If you represent
an organization, municipality or other public agency,
please provide that information as well.

Is there anyone that wishes to speak?

Seeing none, the public hearing transcript,
written statements and exhibits and reference material
will be available for public inspection at the District
Seven Office, 11201 North McKinley Drive, Tampa,
Florida, within three weeks.

It is approximately 7:11. I hereby officially
close the formal portion of the public hearing for the US
92 PD&E study reevaluation.

You may continue to view the materials on display
and speak with our project staff.

On behalf of the Florida Department of
Transportation, thank you for attending.

Remember to be alert today, alive tomorrow.
Safety doesn't happen by accident.

Good night.
COMMENTS

Greg Moore
9816 US 92 East
Tampa, Florida 33610
Phone: 813.363.3613

My concern is when I pull out of my driveway, if I want to go to the east I don't want to have to cross over a grass median or have to go to the west down.

I don't know. I don't know how they're planning on wanting me to go to the left out of my driveway is my concern, because we're talking about having a grass median in front of my house that I can only go to the right, according to the map, and I don't want to have to go to the right if I want to go to the left.

I don't know what else to say.
Salvatore Socci
206 & 208 West Highway 92
Seffner, Florida 33584
Phone: 813.684.6934

I just feel that the roadway, the way it's proposed, is too large for the community. It's an urban roadway in a suburban community.

It's going to adversely affect the local residents, businesses and residential properties as well. It's certainly going to impact the business as far as harming the traffic that has access to the businesses.

I cannot get -- travel into the property due to the center median being so wide. A roadway similar to the MLK project that is parallel in Seffner would be more suitable to the local community.

That's about all I can think of for right now.
Based on the display up there, it looks like the noise -- the wall is only going to go to a certain home. My home is the last one on the lot.

I recommend if they're going to do it that they bring it all the way past the last home, which is Lot 18 off of US 92.

That's what I wanted to say.
STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF HILLSBOROUGH
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Appendix D

Public Hearing Comments and Responses
Hall, Justin P.

To: Escalera, Lilliam  
Subject: RE: 435749-1: SR 600 (US 92) PD&E Study Re-evaluation Meeting Request

From: Bogen, Kirk [mailto:Kirk.Bogen@dot.state.fl.us]  
Sent: Monday, May 2, 2016 11:16 AM  
To: mrosas1001@mac.com  
Cc: Escalera, Lilliam; Adair, Rick; Hull, Alex  
Subject: RE: 435749-1: SR 600 (US 92) PD&E Study Re-evaluation Meeting Request

Dear Mr. Rosas:

Thank you for your interest in the US 92 Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study. We received the questions you submitted through the project website and we offer the following responses.

1. How will this project partner with TBX, Express Bus Service and Rail?
   The proposed US 92 multi-laning project would be independent of the TBX, Express Bus Service and Rail projects. However, the Tampa Bay Regional Model on which the need for this project is based takes into account those projects that are in the cost feasible Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)

2. Is there any consideration for autonomous vehicles?
   Although the use of autonomous vehicles is not precluded, the project does not specifically provide for special features related to autonomous vehicles at this time.

3. How will this project reduce sprawl and encourage high density living areas?
   The project’s purpose and need is to address future capacity needs due to projected regional population growth. Also, the project is intended to improve safety for motorists and other facility users. The project’s implementation is not specifically intended to reduce urban sprawl nor encourage high density urban growth but to address the stated need. The goals you mentioned would be best addressed to Hillsborough County Planning Commission as well as the City of Plant City as they undertake their comprehensive planning activities.

I hope this response has addressed your questions. However, if you require additional information or have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via e-mail at kirk.bogen@dot.state.fl.us or by phone at (813) 975-6448.

Sincerely,

Kirk Bogen, P.E.  
Environmental Management Engineer  
FDOT District Seven  
Planning & Environmental Management Office (PLEMO)  
kirk.bogen@dot.state.fl.us  
(813) 975-6448 / (800) 226-7220 x6448  
FAX: (813) 975-6451

-----Original Message-----
From: Mauricio Rosas [mailto:mrosas1001@mac.com]  
Sent: Sunday, April 24, 2016 12:55 PM  
To: Bogen, Kirk  
Subject: 435749-1: SR 600 (US 92) PD&E Study Re-evaluation Meeting Request

To:
Meeting Details:
Request a Q & A
1. How this project will partner with TBX, Express Bus Service and Rail?
2. Is there any consideration for autonomous vehicles.
3. How will this project reduce sprawl and encourage high density living areas
Public Hearing Comment Form

We encourage your comments regarding this project.

Would like to know more about our house, 4511 Reola Rd. Is the plan to tear it down and when.

Name (Print): Angelo Calhabiano
Address: 4511 Reola Rd
City, State, Zip: Dover, FL 33527
Email: 

PUBLIC HEARING SESSION ATTENDED:

☒ Session 1
Thursday, December 1, 2016
HCC Trinkle Center

☐ Session 2
Tuesday, December 6, 2016
Sheraton Tampa East Hotel

☐ If you did not receive notice of the public hearing but would like to be included on the mailing list for this project, please check.

NOTE: Please complete and place in the "Comments" box or mail Kirk Bogen, P.E., at the address on the back of this comment form. All comments postmarked by Monday, December 19, 2016 will become part of the public hearing record and are available for viewing by the public and the media.

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons who require special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services (free of charge) should contact Christopher Speese, Public Involvement Coordinator, at 813-975-6405 or 800-225-7220 at least seven working days in advance of the Public Hearing.
May 10, 2017

Angelo Caltabiano
4511 Reola Rd.
Dover, FL 33527

Re: WPI Segment No. 435749-1/US 92 PD&E Study Reevaluation – Right of way Acquisition

Dear Angelo Caltabiano,

This letter is in response to your comments about the proposed future widening of US 92, from east of I-4 to east of County Line Road. Specifically, you inquired about the acquisition and demolition of your property.

Following the hearing, the FDOT evaluated your request along with the other comments received during the comment period. Currently this segment of the project corridor is not funded for design, right of way acquisition, or construction based on the FDOT 5-year work program. Of course, once the project receives further funding, impacts to properties along the corridor will be reviewed further during the design phase with the most current survey data to determine the exact location of the roadway improvements.

Thank you for your interest in this reevaluation, and do not hesitate to contact Ms. Lilliam Escalera, Project Manager at lilliam.escalera@dot.state.fl.us or (813) 975-6445 with any future questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Kirk Bogen, P.E.
Environmental Management Engineer
FDOT District Seven

www.dot.state.fl.us
Public Hearing Comment Form

We encourage your comments regarding this project

* How will the water runoff from proposed Hwy be addressed? It is already a problem for those of us whose homes are at a lower elevation than the existing Hwy.

* What is the timeline for beginning at our Address?

* Will we be offered a buy-out? At 13512 (Next Door to Calatabiano - Reola Rd)

* From Lynn Oaks Circle to East of Bethlehem Rd, rampart states Build Alignment will be centered that would put sidewalk in our front door; if the typical Section 3 80', minimum is met then 50mph (minimum) will be flying just feet from our bedroom windows - DANGEROUS. We would request you buy us out.

Name (Print): William E. Brown
Address: 13512 E US Highway 92
City, State, Zip: Dover, FL 33527
Email: ______________

PUBLIC HEARING SESSION ATTENDED:

☐ Session 1
Thursday, December 1, 2016
HCC Trinkle Center

☐ Session 2
Tuesday, December 6, 2016
Sheraton Tampa East Hotel

☐ If you did not receive notice of the public hearing but would like to be included on the mailing list for this project, please check.

NOTE: Please complete and place in the “Comments” box or mail Kirk Bogen, P.E., at the address on the back of this comment form. All comments postmarked by Monday, December 19, 2016 will become part of the public hearing record and are available for viewing by the public and the media.

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons who require special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services (free of charge) should contact Christopher Speese, Public Involvement Coordinator, at 813-975-6405 or 800-226-7220 at least seven working days in advance of the Public Hearing.
May 10, 2017

William Brown  
13512 E US Highway 92  
Dover, FL 33527  

Re: WPI Segment No. 435749-1/US 92 PD&E Study Reevaluation – Right of way Acquisition  

Dear William Brown:  

This email is in response to your comments made at the December 1, 2016 public hearing session held for the proposed future widening of US 92, from east of I-4 to east of Count Line Road. Specifically, you inquired about the drainage impact to your property and about the acquisition of your property.  

Following the hearing, the FDOT evaluated your request along with the other comments received during the comment period. Currently this segment of the project corridor is not funded for design, right of way, or construction based on the FDOT 5-year work program. Of course, once the proposed project enters the design phase, this plan could be revised to reflect future traffic patterns, crash information, land use conditions as well as the latest design standards. Until the project is funded for right of way acquisition there will not be any properties purchased along the corridor. As far as the drainage is concerned, your home is located in an area where the drainage basins are semi closed with significant relief. During storms you will see water being conveyed downstream through your property. US 92 is a small contributor of runoff compared to the total runoff in the overall basin.  

Thank you for your interest in this reevaluation, and do not hesitate to contact Ms. Lilliam Escalera, Project Manager at lilliam.escalera@dot.state.fl.us or (813) 975-6445 with any future questions or concerns.  

Sincerely,  

Kirk Bogen, P.E.  
Environmental Management Engineer  
FDOT District Seven
Mi Nombre es Miguel Quirino, Soy el Pastor de la Iglesia de Dios Torre Fuerte in Dover, Inc. 5335 W. US Hwy 92 Plant City 33566. Mi Preocuapación es el Impacto que hara a la Propiedad de la Iglesia, que sera el Parking el Edificio Existent e y el Proyecto de Reconstrucción del Templo en Construcción.
Public Hearing Comment Form

We encourage your comments regarding this project

My name is Miguel Quirino, I am the Pastor of the Iglesia de Dios Torre Fuerte, which is located at 5385 W. US Hwy 92 in Plant City. I just want to relate the concern of the impact that this project will have, not only to myself but to nearly 100 families that attend our church. We are also in the process of Rebuilding for our future Sanctuary, this project will definitely effect the Construction of our future Sanctuary.

Name (Print): Miguel Quirino
Address: 3706 Moore Lake Rd
City, State, Zip: Dover, FL 33527
Email: quirino41@aol.com

PUBLIC HEARING SESSION ATTENDED:

☑️ Session 1
Thursday, December 1, 2016
HCC Trinkle Center

☑️ Session 2
Tuesday, December 6, 2016
Sheraton Tampa East Hotel

☐ If you did not receive notice of the public hearing but would like to be included on the mailing list for this project, please check.

NOTE: Please complete and place in the “Comments” box or mail Kirk Bogen, P.E., at the address on the back of this comment form. All comments postmarked by Monday, December 19, 2016 will become part of the public hearing record and are available for viewing by the public and the media.

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons who require special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services (free of charge) should contact Christopher Speese, Public Involvement Coordinator, at 813-975-6405 or 800-226-7220 at least seven working days in advance of the Public Hearing.
May 10, 2017

Miguel Quirino - Pastor
Iglesia de Dios Torre Fuente, Inc.
5335 W US Hwy 92
Plant City, FL 33566

Re: WPI Segment No. 435749-1/US 92 PD&E Study Reevaluation – Right of way Acquisition

Dear Miguel Quirino,

This letter is in response to your comments made at the public hearing session held on December 1, 2016 for the proposed future widening of US 92, from east of I-4 to east of County Line Road. Specifically, you inquired about the impact to your property adjacent to US 92.

Following the hearing, the FDOT evaluated your request along with the other comments received during the comment period. Based on the concept displayed at the public hearing, your business is listed as a potential relocation. Currently this segment of the project corridor is not funded for design, right of way acquisition, or construction based on the FDOT 5-year work program. Of course, once the proposed project enters the design phase, this plan could be revised to reflect the most current survey data to determine the exact location of the roadway improvements using the latest design standards. If you have any questions about the right of way acquisition or business relocation process please feel free to contact our right of way acquisition office at (813) 975-6495.

Thank you for your interest in this reevaluation, and do not hesitate to contact Ms. Lilliam Escalera, Project Manager at lilliam.escalera@dot.state.fl.us or (813) 975-6445 with any future questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Kirk Bogen, P.E.
Environmental Management Engineer
FDOT District Seven
Public Hearing Comment Form

1. Our driveway was fine for 30+ years until it was resurfaced several years ago. Now every time we get a hard rain we have erosion issues - it washes gullies down our portion of the driveway even though they paved the apron up to our property line. Can this be fixed now and will it be fixed correctly when the new road will be completed.

2. How high will be road be compared to the height that it is now.

3. Will the driveway be angled/sloped so that we can get our travel trailer in and out without major problems.

4. How is this going to affect the traffic Independence Academy at Hwy 92 & McIntosh Roads.

5. Where will the retention ponds be located?

Email: ghaste53@gmail.com

☐ If you did not receive notice of the public hearing but would like to be included on the mailing list for this project, please check.

NOTE: Please complete and place in the “Comments” box or mail Kirk Bogen, P.E., at the address on the back of this comment form. All comments postmarked by Monday, December 19, 2016 will become part of the public hearing record and are available for viewing by the public and the media.

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons who require special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services (free of charge) should contact Christopher Speese, Public Involvement Coordinator, at 813-975-6405 or 800-226-7220 at least seven working days in advance of the Public Hearing.
1. Our driveway was fine for many years, but every time we get a hard rain, part of the driveway shows up on our property. Can this be fixed now and before the construction is completed.

2. How high will be road be?

3. Will the driveway be angle improved enough to be usable without major problems.

4. How is this going to affect our Roads.

5. Where will the retention pond go.

Email: fforte53@gmail.com

☐ if you did not receive notice of the public hearing but would like to be included on the mailing list for this project, please check.

NOTE: Please complete and place in the “Comments” box or mail Kirk Bogen, P.E., at the address on the back of this comment form. All comments postmarked by Monday, December 19, 2016 will become part of the public hearing record and are available for viewing by the public and the media.

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons who require special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services (free of charge) should contact Christopher Speese, Public Involvement Coordinator, at 813-975-6405 or 800-226-7220 at least seven working days in advance of the Public Hearing.
Re: WPI Segment No. 435749-1/US 92 (SR 600) PD&E Study Reevaluation – Project Concerns

Dear George Forte:

This email is in response to your comments made at the December 1, 2016 public hearing session held for the proposed future widening of US 92, from east of I-4 to east of Count Line Road. Specifically, you inquired about erosion issues, road height, traffic at Independence Academy, and retention ponds.

Following the hearing, the FDOT evaluated your request along with the other comments received during the comment period. Currently this segment of the project corridor is not funded for design, right of way acquisition, or construction based on the FDOT 5-year work program. Of course, once the proposed project enters the design phase, this plan could be revised to reflect future traffic patterns, crash information, land use conditions as well as the latest design standards. Until the project is funded for right of way acquisition there will not be any properties purchased along the corridor. In addition the vertical alignment and retention pond locations are all issues that will be handled during the design phase when it is funded. As far as the drainage is concerned, your home is located in an area where the drainage basins are semi closed with significant relief. During storms you will see water being conveyed downstream through your property. US 92 is a small contributor of runoff compared to the total runoff in the overall basin.

Thank you for your interest in this reevaluation do not hesitate to contact me at lilliam.escalera@dot.state.fl.us or (813) 975-6445 with any future questions or concerns or you can access the project website for any project update: http://active.fdot7studies.com/sr600/garden-lane-to-county-line/

Sincerely,

Lilliam E. Escalera
EMO Project Manager
FDOT District VII
Planning & Environmental Management Office (PLEMO)
Public Hearing Comment Form

We encourage your comments regarding this project

When you are taking land belonging to an entire community, IS THERE A POINT OF CONTACT to address the community and their concerns other than this meeting?

Name (Print): Charlene Adeyemi

Address: ________________________________

City, State, Zip: ___________________________

Email: Charlene@premiumsolutions99.com

PUBLIC HEARING SESSION ATTENDED:

☐ Session 1
   Thursday, December 1, 2016
   HCC Trinkle Center

☐ Session 2
   Tuesday, December 6, 2016
   Sheraton Tampa East Hotel

☐ If you did not receive notice of the public hearing but would like to be included on the mailing list for this project, please check.

NOTE: Please complete and place in the “Comments” box or mail Kirk Bogen, P.E., at the address on the back of this comment form. All comments postmarked by Monday, December 19, 2016 will become part of the public hearing record and are available for viewing by the public and the media.

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons who require special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services (free of charge) should contact Christopher Speese, Public Involvement Coordinator, at 813-975-6405 or 800-226-7220 at least seven working days in advance of the Public Hearing.
From: Escalera, Lilliam [mailto:Lilliam.Escalera@dot.state.fl.us]
Sent: Monday, May 15, 2017 11:34 AM
To: Cherlene@premiumsolutionsgrp.com
Cc: Hull, Alex; Hall, Justin P.
Subject: WPI Segment No. 435749-1/US 92 (SR 600) PD&E Study Reevaluation – Right of way Acquisition

Dear Cherlene Adewinmi:

This email is in response to your comments made at the December 6, 2016 public hearing session held for the proposed future widening of US 92, from east of I-4 to east of County Line Road. Specifically, you inquired about the point of contact for right of way acquisition for this project.

Following the hearing, the FDOT evaluated your request along with the other comments received during the comment period. Currently this project is not funded for right of way acquisition based on the FDOT 5-year work program, so there is not a specific point of contact assigned. You can always request public records via email at D7.PublicRecords@dot.state.fl.us or contact the project team through the project website http://active.fdotd7studies.com/sr600/garden-lane-to-county-line/.

Thank you for your interest in this reevaluation, and do not hesitate to contact me with any future questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Lilliam E. Escalera
EMO Project Manager
FDOT District VII
Planning & Environmental Management Office (PLEMO)
11201 N. McKinley Dr., 7-800
Tampa, FL 33612
P: (813)975-6445
F: (813) 975-6451
Lilliam.escalera@dot.state.fl.us
January 23, 2017

Ms. Lilliam E. Escalera
Project Development Engineering Specialist I
Florida Department of Transportation
11201 N. Malcolm McKinley Drive
Tampa, FL 33612

RE: US 92 PD&E Study
    Jarrett Scott Ford
    Plant City, FL

Dear Ms. Escalera:

I would like to thank you for our telephone discussion regarding Jarrett Scott Ford access on US 92 we had on January 17th. The telephone conversation follows a meeting that was held with the City staff and Jim Scott regarding the preliminary plans for US 92 / SR 600 that were issued for public comment. A summary of our discussion is provided in the following paragraphs. It should be noted that Jarrett Scott Ford employees 67 full time staff and 3 part time staff at the business, has approximately 12 semi-trucks and large trucks entering and exiting the business to drop off cars, trucks and parts and has a substantial volume of costumer traffic that enter and exit the business on a daily basis.

Jarrett Scott Ford new and used car and truck business in located in the northwest corner of the intersection of N. Park Road and US 92 (E. Baker Street). I have attached a map which identifies the properties that are currently owned by Jarrett Scott Ford. Currently the business has four (4) driveway connections; two (2) are on N. Park Road and two (2) are on US 92 / SR 600 as shown on the map.

The northern driveway on N. Park Road is closed off to traffic in order for the business to maintain traffic flow within its car and truck display area. The southern driveway has full access to entering and exiting vehicles from the north and south bound traffic lanes on N. Park Road. There are currently no concrete medium barriers prohibiting the flow of traffic in and out of the southern driveway on N. Park Road.
On US 92 the eastern driveway is an entrance in and a right turn only exit onto westbound US 92 (E. Baker Street). The western driveway has a full medium access that allows vehicles the ability to enter and exit the business from east bound or west bound US 92 / SR 600 (E. Baker Street). The adjacent 3.65 acre parcel also has two driveways. The eastern driveway has an entrance in and a right turn only exit onto westbound US 92 / SR 600 (E. Baker Street) and the western driveway has a full medium access that allows vehicles the ability to enter and exit from east bound or west bound US 92 / SR 600 (E. Baker Street).

In reviewing the PD&E US 92 / SR 600 Plan Sheets, see attached plan sheet, the preliminary design layout of N. Park Road and US 92 / SR 600 shows a number of road improvements which will directly impact the Jarrett Scott Ford business entrances and exits in a negative manner. The plan sheet indicates that the two driveways on N. Park Road would become a right turn only entrance and a south bound exit out of the business. Those vehicles wanting to go north on N. Park Road would have to perform a U-Turn at the N. Park Road and US 92 / SR 600 intersection. This movement would be difficult for semi-truck and large truck traffic to complete within the paved traffic lanes.

A larger negative impact to the business is the closure of all medium openings on US 92 / SR 600 from the intersection of N. Park Road west to the intersection of N. Maryland Avenue. The closures would require vehicles that want to go east on US 92 / SR 600 to perform a U-Turn at the N. Maryland Avenue and US 92 / SR 600 intersection. This movement would be extremely difficult for semi-truck and large truck traffic to complete within the paved traffic lanes.

In closing, when the Department of Transportation starts the design phase of the improvements to US 92 / SR 600 and N. Park Road I would suggest that this letter be provided to the design firm that will be responsible for the improvements and I further strongly suggest that the design firm contact Jarrett Scott Ford to discuss the issues presented in this letter. I think that the issues can be somewhat worked out to provide Jarrett Scott Ford an acceptable means for vehicles to enter and exit the business and provide for the safety and convenience of the vehicles that will be traveling on US 92 / SR 600 and N. Park Road.

Should you have any questions or comments regarding the above, please contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Michael A. Schenk, P.E.
City Engineer

Cc: Mike Herr, City Manager
    Jim Scott, Jarrett Scott Ford
June 23, 2017

Michael Schenk, P.E.
City of Plant City Engineering Division
P.O. Box C
Plant City, FL 33564

Re: WPI Segment No. 435749-1/US 92 (SR 600) PD&E Study Reevaluation

Dear Michael Schenk,

This letter is in response to your comments about the proposed future widening of US 92, from east of I-4 to east of County Line Road. More specifically, in response to your letter dated January 23, 2017 regarding the median openings adjacent to the Jarrett Scott Ford business entrances.

Currently this segment of the project corridor is not funded for design, right of way acquisition, and/or construction. Of course, once the project enters the design phase, impacts to properties along the corridor and access management will be reviewed further during the design phase with the most current survey data and design standards to determine the exact location of the roadway improvements.

Thank you for your continued coordination with FDOT and your interest in this reevaluation. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any future questions or concerns.

Sincerely

Lilliam Escalera
EMO Project Manager
Lilliam.Escalera@dot.state.fl.us
(813) 975-6445 / (800) 226-7220 x6445

www.fdot.gov
February 8, 2017

Lilliam Escalera, Project Manager
FDOT District Seven
11201 N. Malcolm McKinley Drive, MS 7-500
Tampa, Florida 33612-6403

Subject: US 92 PD&E Study Comments

Dear Ms. Escalera,

Thank you for briefing the Hillsborough MPO and its advisory committees about proposed capacity improvements on US Highway 92 between Interstate 4 and County line. The segments near I-75 and near County Line Road are forecast highly congested, and the MPO’s adopted long range transportation plan identify them as a priority for funding. We appreciate the Department’s work to move forward.

Having reviewed the PD&E recommended build alternative, the MPO’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) approved a motion at its January meeting requesting the following two items:

1. That FDOT consider a separated Multi-Use Trail facility along the entire corridor (except in the ‘no build’ segment through Plant City). Such a facility would help make an important connection between the SUN Southwest Coast Corridor and other trail facilities of statewide significance such as the Van Fleet Trail in the Lakeland area.

2. If a Multi-Use Trail cannot be accommodated, the committee requests that bicycle facilities pass under bridges, they be protected behind bridge structural supports, rather than being located on the vehicular side of the bridge supports as currently shown.

The MPO Board supports this request. Thank you for your consideration, and please contact me or Michele Ogilvie of my staff if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Beth Alden, AICP
Executive Director

Cc: Stephen Benson, District 7 Local Liaison Administrator
BPAC Chair Patrick Thorpe
June 23, 2017

Beth Alden, AICP
Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization
601 E Kennedy Blvd – 18th Floor
Tampa, FL 33602

Re: WPI Segment No. 435749-1/US 92 PD&E Study Reevaluation

Dear Ms. Alden,

This letter is in response to your letter dated February 8, 2017 regarding the subject project and proposed future widening of US 92, from east of I-4 to east of County Line Road. As countywide trail planning activities move forward, any new bicycle/pedestrian facilities requested along a state highway corridor beyond the FDOT standard must be added to the Hillsborough County Greenways and Trails Plan map indicating the proposed continuous route and its relationship to the surrounding trail network.

The subject segment of the project is not funded for design, right of way acquisition, or construction. It is critical that these features be discussed jointly between the MPO, Hillsborough County, and the Department, during the design phase of the project. FDOT will coordinate with the MPO and Hillsborough County regarding the opportunity to include a trail along US 92 from Park Road to County Line Road, consistent with current FDOT trail maintenance policies. We will reach out to you to continue this discussion once the design phase is moved into the Five Year Work Program.

Thank you for your continued partnership with FDOT and for your interest in improving safety for bicyclists and pedestrians. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any future questions or concerns.

Sincerely

Lilliam Escalera
EMO Project Manager
Lilliam.Escalera@dot.state.fl.us
(813) 975-6445 / (800) 226-7220 x6445

www.fdot.gov