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## APPENDICES

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) is conducting a Design Change and ROW Authorization Project Development and Environmental (PD\&E) Reevaluation Study to evaluate the various operational improvements along US 41/SR 45/SR 599 from south of the Causeway Boulevard intersection to north of the Causeway Boulevard intersection.

The purpose of this project is to reduce traffic delays associated with the CSX railroad crossing, adequately support the safe movement of vehicle traffic, including trucks and freight, and enhance connectivity and safety for bicyclists and pedestrians.

The project limits identified along US 41 begin south of Denver Street (MP 22.578) and extend north of the Causeway Boulevard intersection to 23rd Avenue (MP 23.925). The improvements along Causeway Boulevard begin west of 45th Street (MP 3.554) and extend east of the Causeway Boulevard intersection terminating prior to the CSX crossing (624815B; MP 2.971). US 41 is currently a six-lane roadway throughout the project limits and Causeway Boulevard is currently four-lanes. US 41 and Causeway Boulevard are functionally classified by the FDOT as urban principal arterials. US 41 south of Causeway Boulevard and Causeway Boulevard west of US 41 are part of FDOT's Strategic Intermodal System (SIS), designated as a SIS Connector. The CSX railroad crossing east of US 41 is a designated SIS Railway Corridor and the CSX railroad crossing south of Causeway Boulevard is designated as a SIS Railway Connector. There is one bridge culvert south of Causeway Boulevard for US 41 over Delaney Creek (MP 23.003).

The project study is located in Sections 27, 28, 33, and 34 of Township 29 South and Range 19 East in the Tampa Bay Watershed within the Coastal Hillsborough Bay Tributary Planning Unit. The project is split between WBID 1605D (Delaney Creek Tidal) and WBID 1615 (Drainage to McKay Bay). Both WBIDs are verified as impaired for Enterococci. WBID 1605D is also impaired for lead, copper and iron. Along US 41, the stormwater runoff is collected by curb and gutter and conveyed either to FDOT stormwater management facilities (SMFs) located at the northwest and northeast corners of the US 41 and Causeway Boulevard intersection or directly to the outfall without treatment.

The purpose of this report is to provide a location hydraulics study for the project, in accordance with 23 CFR 650 Subpart A, Section 650.111. The report utilizes the National Flood Insurance Program maps to determine highway location encroachments. This report evaluates risks associated with the implementation of the project, impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values, the discouragement of incompatible floodplain development, and measures to minimize floodplain impacts. Applicable floodplain management agencies were consulted to determine if the proposed project is consistent with existing floodplain management programs.

Based on the current effective maps, the entire project area is located within a FEMA Zone AE 100-year floodplain with a base flood elevation (BFE) which ranges between 12 and 13 feet. The FEMA BFE is based on storm surge. The riverine 100-year flood stage is based on the Delaney Creek Watershed Model and ranges from 4 to 8 feet within the project limits. An isolated Zone A exists on the north side of Causeway Boulevard east of the CSX railroad tracks that appears to be outside of the study limits.

The recommended alternative will have transverse and longitudinal impacts to the existing floodplain. The longitudinal impacts will result from filling the floodplain areas associated with proposed roadway widening and improvements. The transverse impacts will result from the replacement and extension of the existing cross drains and bridge culvert. These impacts cannot be avoided as the entire project is within the floodplain.

The analysis in this report indicates that the preferred alternative is feasible from a hydraulic perspective. The following statement summarizes the results of our analysis:

The proposed structures will perform hydraulically in a manner equal to or greater than the existing structures, and backwater surface elevations are not expected to increase. Thus, there will be no significant or adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values. There will be no significant change in flood risk, and there will not be a significant change in the potential for interruption or termination of emergency service or emergency evacuation routes. Therefore, it has been determined that this encroachment is not


## SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) is conducting a Design Change and Right of Way (ROW) Authorization Reevaluation of a previous Environmental Assessment (EA) (Work Program Item Segment (WPIS) \#No. 255598-1) with a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) approved by the Federal Highway Administration on May 24, 1994. Figure 1-1 shows the limits of the previous PD\&E study completed along 22nd Street Causeway/Causeway Boulevard (State Road 676) from State Road (SR) 60 to US 301, in Hillsborough County, Florida. The segment currently being evaluated/advanced is shown as Segment 3 on
Figure 1-1.
The previous study evaluated anticipated conditions for a 2015 Design Year. The FONSI documented the construction of a six-lane roadway to replace the existing 2 - to 4 -lane roadway beginning at SR 60 and extending approximately 7 miles east at US 301 . Since the completion of the 1994 PD\&E Study, Causeway Boulevard has been widened to four-lanes.

The project included a new interchange at US 41/Causeway Boulevard intersection for which the approved concept was a "compressed diamond" interchange with US 41 elevated over Causeway Boulevard. This interchange is also known as a Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI) or a Tight Urban Diamond Interchange (TUDI). The study identified that the US 41 interchange bridge would carry three lanes of traffic in each direction with a barrier wall separating opposing traffic. The study recommended an additional grade separation of US 41 over the CSX railroad crossing south of Causeway Boulevard while the CSX railroad crossing east of US 41 would remain at-grade with Causeway Boulevard. The concept showed the SPUI ramps oriented along US 41 and one-way, one-lane frontage roads were provided in the southeast and northeast quadrants to provide local property access. Five-foot sidewalks and 4 -foot bicycle lanes were proposed along both sides of Causeway Boulevard.

The current study effort being conducted under WPIS\# 440749-1 is evaluating various intersection and operational improvements along Causeway Boulevard east and west of US 41 (SR 45/SR 599) along US 41 from south of the Causeway Boulevard intersection to north of the Causeway Boulevard intersection. These improvements include the construction of a grade separation of US 41 /SR 45 at the CSX railroad crossing located approximately 1,400 south of the Causeway Boulevard intersection. Bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements along US 41 and Causeway Boulevard are also provided.


Figure 1-1. Project Location / Segments Map

### 1.2 PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

## Purpose

The purpose of this project is to reduce traffic delays associated with the CSX railroad crossing, adequately support the safe movement of vehicle traffic, including trucks and freight, and enhance connectivity and safety for bicyclists and pedestrians.

## Need

As expressed in the original 1994 EA/FONSI, the need for the $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street Causeway/Causeway Boulevard improvements was based on the following criteria: System Linkage; Capacity; Transportation Demand; Federal, State, or Local Government Authority; Socioeconomic Demand; Modal Interrelationships; Safety; and Navigation.

For the current segment, US 41 and Causeway Boulevard are vital arterial highways which serve the City of Tampa located in Hillsborough County. The US 41/SR 45 and Causeway Boulevard intersection experiences traffic delays during the AM and PM peak periods with heavy truck traffic (approximately 13\% of the daily volume) traversing through the intersection. The presence of CSX railroad crossings to the south and east of the intersection also further contribute to these traffic delays. The CSX railroad crossing located to the south of the intersection causes traffic delays particularly during the AM peak period. This project will address traffic delays associated with the CSX railroad crossing to the south of the US 41 and Causeway Boulevard intersection and will facilitate the safe movement of vehicle traffic through the project corridor.

In addition, this project will also address multimodal connectivity and safety within the area. Although there sidewalks and dedicated bicycle lanes along both sides of Causeway Boulevard within the project limits, there are only sidewalks and no dedicated bicycle facilities along US 41 within the project limits. Between 2017 and 2021, there were 10 crashes involving bicyclists or pedestrians. These 10 crashes resulted in 1 fatality as well as a total of 8 injuries.

The proposed improvements have been identified in the Hillsborough County Transportation Planning Organization's (TPO) 2045 Adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (under the Hillsborough County Freight Hot Spots), the TPO's Fiscal Year 2022/23-2026/27 Transportation Improvement Program, as well as the FDOT's Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan and Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Adopted $1^{\text {st }} 5$-Year Program. US 41 has also been identified as a Goods Movement Roadway Corridor from I-4 to the Manatee County Line and is a priority project for the National Highway Freight Program.

### 1.3 EXISTING FACILITY AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

### 1.3.1 Existing Facility

The project limits identified along US 41 begin south of Denver Street (MP 22.578) and extend north of the Causeway Boulevard intersection to 23rd Avenue (MP 23.925). The improvements along Causeway Boulevard begin west of 45th Street (MP 3.554) and extend east of the Causeway Boulevard intersection
terminating prior to the CSX crossing (624815B; MP 2.971). US 41 is currently a six-lane roadway throughout the project limits and Causeway Boulevard is currently four-lanes. US 41 and Causeway Boulevard are functionally classified by the FDOT as urban principal arterials. US 41 south of Causeway Boulevard and Causeway Boulevard west of US 41 are part of FDOT's Strategic Intermodal System (SIS), designated as a SIS Connector. The CSX railroad crossing east of US 41 is a designated SIS Railway Corridor and the CSX railroad crossing south of Causeway Boulevard is designated as a SIS Railway Connector. There is one bridge culvert south of Causeway Boulevard for US 41 over Delaney Creek (MP 23.003).

US 41 from south of Denver Street to Causeway Boulevard is a divided 6-lane roadway with a 19-foot median, 10-foot outside travel lanes, 11-foot middle and inside travel lanes, curb and gutter, and a sidewalk on both sides. The inside northbound travel lane from north of St. Paul Street becomes one of the two left-turn lanes for the Causeway Boulevard intersection. The sidewalk on the east side is 6 -foot wide and the sidewalk on the west side varies from 5 -foot to 6 -foot wide.

Along US 41 from north of Causeway Boulevard to just north of S. $23^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue, the existing typical section consists of an undivided 6-lane roadway with asphalt pavement, 11-foot travel lanes, a centered 10-foot bi-directional turn lane, curb and gutter, and 4-foot sidewalk along both sides of the roadway.

Along Causeway Boulevard from S. $45^{\text {th }}$ Street to Sagasta Street, the existing typical section consists of an undivided 4 -lane roadway with concrete pavement, 12 -foot lanes, a centered 14 -foot bi-directional turn lane, curb and gutter, 4-foot bike lanes, and 6-foot sidewalks.

The existing typical section of Causeway Boulevard from Sagasta Street to US 41 consists of a divided 4lane roadway with concrete pavement and 12-foot travel lanes, 4-foot bicycle lanes, and 6-foot sidewalks on both sides.

The existing typical section of Causeway Boulevard from US 41 to the end project limits consists of a divided 4-lane roadway with asphalt pavement, 12-foot outside lanes and 11-foot inside lanes, curb and gutter, 4-foot bicycle lanes and 6-foot sidewalks on both sides.

The majority of the existing ROW along US 41 is 100 feet wide. In the vicinity of the CSX railroad, the ROW width varies from 100 to 332 -feet. CSX Transportation owns a large portion of the adjacent property along both sides of US 41 where the CSX railroad crosses at grade. Causeway Boulevard is 150 feet wide or greater west of S. 45th Street and reduces to 100 feet wide around S. 47th Street. The ROW increases around the US 41 intersection along Causeway Boulevard then reduces to 100 feet wide before the CSX railroad crossing.

### 1.3.2 Proposed Improvements

This Design Change and ROW Authorization Project Development and Environment (PD\&E) Reevaluation study (WPIS\# 440749-1), with a 2046 Design Year, is evaluating various operational improvements along US 41/SR 45/SR 599/S. Tamiami Trail (US 41) from south of the Causeway Boulevard intersection to north of the Causeway Boulevard intersection. The study will evaluate roadway widening/reconstruction, new stormwater management facilities, new bridge overpasses at Delaney Creek, the CSX railroad, and other roadways for local traffic needs. Intersection and operational improvements being evaluated include
signalization and turn lane additions for Hartford Street, US 41/Causeway Boulevard, and 47th Street. In addition to addressing operational improvements, this project will address the need for pedestrian/ bicycle accommodations and improving connectivity and safety for these modes.

There are multiple typical sections throughout the project limits. From just south of Denver Street to north of Trenton Street, the proposed typical section includes reconstructing US 41 with concrete pavement to accommodate a 6-lane divided urban curbed section with 12-foot lanes, 7-foot buffered bicycle lanes, and 10 -foot sidewalks on both sides. The median width varies from 19-22 feet to provide turn lanes with raised traffic separators between opposing directions of travel. The proposed improvements will require the acquisition of ROW beyond the existing footprint varying from $0-22$ feet along the west side and varying from 0-17 feet along the east side of US 41.

From north of Trenton Street the proposed typical section grade separates US 41 to continue a concrete paved typical section to south of St. Paul Street. The proposed typical section consists of a 6-lane divided urban section with concrete pavement, 12 -foot lanes and 10 -foot inside and outside paved shoulders. A northbound exit ramp connects to $36^{\text {th }}$ Avenue with a t-intersection configuration on the east side of US 41. The proposed concrete ramp consists of a 15-foot travel lane, 7 -foot buffered bicycle lane and a 10foot sidewalk on the eastside. The existing US 41 southbound mainline pavement will be repurposed to accommodate a two-lane undivided frontage road for local access to adjacent properties. The proposed frontage road is an urban curbed section with asphalt pavement, 12-foot travel lanes, and a 10-foot sidewalk on the west side. Bridge overpasses are proposed for the US 41 mainline over Delaney Creek, $36^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, and the at grade CSX Crossing (No 624802A). The proposed improvements will require the acquisition of ROW varying from 29 to 88 feet along the west side and varying from 39 to 200 feet along the east side.

From north of St. Paul Street to the Causeway Boulevard intersection, the proposed typical section along US 41 consists of a 6 -lane divided urban section with concrete pavement, 12 -foot lanes, 10 -foot outside paved shoulders on the west side and a 7 -foot buffered bicycle lane on the east side. The median bifurcates to accommodate three 12 -foot left turn lanes approaching the intersection with one 12-foot right turn lane along the outside in the northbound direction. Milling and resurfacing is proposed for the outside 22 -feet of the existing southbound lanes. This area will be restriped to provide a frontage road with one 15 -foot lane and a 7 -foot buffered bicycle lane on the outside with a new raised curb and 10foot sidewalk. The proposed improvements will require the acquisition of ROW varying from 0 to 160 feet along the east side only.

The proposed typical section for US 41 north of Causeway Boulevard consists of a 6-lane divided urban section with 12 -foot lanes, 7 -foot buffered bike lanes and 6 -foot sidewalks. The northbound lanes will be asphalt and the southbound lanes will be concrete. There are two 12-foot left turn lanes and one 12-foot right turn lane shown in the southbound direction. The proposed improvements will require the acquisition of ROW varying from 30 to 45 feet along the west side and varying from 0 to 45 feet along the east side.

The proposed typical section for Causeway Boulevard from S. 45th Street to US 41 widens the existing concrete pavement to accommodate a 4-lane divided urban section with 11-foot travel lanes, 7-foot buffered bike lanes and 6-foot sidewalks along the outside. Approaching the US 41 intersection, there are two 11-foot left turn lanes and three 11-foot right turn lanes in the eastbound direction. The proposed improvements will require the acquisition of ROW varying from 0 to 44 feet along the north side only.

The proposed typical section for Causeway Boulevard from US 41 to the end project limit just west of the CSX railroad crossing consists of a westbound concrete and eastbound asphalt 4 -lane divided urban section with 11 -foot travel lanes, 7 -foot buffered bike lanes and 6 -foot sidewalks on the outside. Approaching the US 41 intersection, there are two 11-foot left turn lanes and one 11-foot right turn lane in the westbound direction. The proposed improvements will require the acquisition of ROW varying from 0 to 4 feet along the north side only.

### 1.4 REPORT PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide a location hydraulics study for the project, in accordance with 23 CFR 650 Subpart A, Section 650.111. The report utilizes the National Flood Insurance Program maps to determine highway location encroachments. This report evaluates risks associated with the implementation of the project, impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values, the discouragement of incompatible floodplain development, and measures to minimize floodplain impacts. Applicable floodplain management agencies were consulted to determine if the proposed project is consistent with existing floodplain management programs. All elevations referenced within the report are in the North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD 88) unless otherwise noted.

## SECTION 2 DATA COLLECTION

### 2.1 EXISTING ROADWAY CONDITIONS

A dominant feature of the area is the CSX Railroad leading in and out of the Port of Tampa. A single railroad track currently crosses US 41 at grade approximately 1475 ft . south of the intersection and crosses Causeway Boulevard approximately 1400 ft . east of the intersection. These at-grade crossings create long delays to vehicular traffic on both US 41 and Causeway Blvd. A significant portion of this traffic is truck traffic traveling to and from the port.

The functional classification for both US 41 and Causeway Boulevard is Urban Principal Arterial -Other. Both facilities are on the State Highway System and US 41 is on the National Highway System. A portion of the project limits is designated a Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) connector along US 41 from south of the project limits to Causeway Boulevard and along Causeway Boulevard from US 41 to west of the project limits. Both facilities are considered evacuation routes. The posted speed limit is 50 miles per hour (mph) for US 41 and 45 mph for Causeway Boulevard. The context classification for both facilities is listed as C3C.

Existing land uses within the study area include commercial and vacant lots. Commercial businesses have access points to US 41 throughout the corridor. The existing topography is relatively flat within the study area with elevations averaging around 7 ft NAVD. Refer to Figure 2-1 for a topographic map.


Figure 2-1: USGS Topographic Map
The proposed improvements include adding an overpass on US 41 at CSX railroad crossing south of Causeway Blvd and intersection improvements at US 41 and Causeway Blvd with the focus of improving the turning movements at the US 41/Causeway Blvd intersection. Off-site stormwater management facilities will be constructed to treat and attenuate the additional stormwater runoff from the proposed improvements.

### 2.2 FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAPS (FIRMS)

The project is located within Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) 12057C0366J and 12057C0367J effective October 7, 2021 in Hillsborough County. FIRM Panel 12057C0366J covers the project area along Causeway Boulevard west of S $47^{\text {th }}$ Street. FIRM Panel 120570367J covers the project limits along US 41 and on Causeway Boulevard east of $47^{\text {th }}$ Street. US 41 crosses over the Delaney Creek within the project limits on FIRM Panel 12057C0367J. Based on the new effective maps, Delaney Creek is no longer listed as a FEMA Floodway within the project limits. The FEMA FIRMs are provided in Appendix A.

Based on the current effective maps, the entire project area is located within a FEMA Zone AE 100-year floodplain with a base flood elevation (BFE) which ranges between 12 and 13 feet. The FEMA BFE is based
on storm surge. The riverine 100-year flood stage is based on the Delaney Creek Watershed Model and ranges from 4 to 8 feet within the project limits. An isolated Zone A exists on the north side of Causeway Boulevard east of the CSX railroad tracks that appears to be outside of the study limits.

Flood Zones A and AE represent a $1 \%$ annual change of flood, which is commonly referred to as the 100year flood. The receiving water body (Hillsborough Bay) is tidally influenced.

### 2.3 FLOODING HISTORY

There are no active flood investigations documented in the vicinity of the project but there were four past flood investigations.

Investigation \#1003112009174 at 4141 Causeway Boulevard filed in 2006 reported flooding of private property several times per year. The property is 5.1 feet below the FEMA effective 100-year flood elevation and substantial development has occurred in the area since the FDOT system was designed in 1978. A blocked outfall pipe on Port Authority property was identified as the likely problem. No new complaints have been issued for this location.

Investigation \#1005202009518 at 3630 South $50^{\text {th }}$ Street filed in 2005 reported flooding of private property and a building from roadway runoff during larger storm events. The property is located in a low area below the 100-year floodplain with groundwater table estimated 0-1 feet below ground. Poorly maintained private swales were identified as a potential issue. Vegetation around an FDOT ditch bottom inlet was also identified and cleared. No new complaints have been issued for this location.

Investigation \#1006222010167 at 2436 South $50^{\text {th }}$ Street filed in 2009 reported flooding of a business. The complainant did not report a history of flooding and believed the problem could be the recent widening project on Causeway Boulevard. No new complaints have been issued for this location.

Investigation \#1008292016754 identified standing water on $31^{\text {st }}$ Avenue and $34^{\text {th }}$ Avenue beside South $50^{\text {th }}$ Street during a field review for an upcoming sidewalk project under FPID 439038-1. Inadequate drainage systems on the side streets were identified as the likely cause. No new complaints have been issued for these locations.

### 2.4 SOILS DATA AND SEASONAL HIGH GROUNDWATER TABLE DETERMINATION

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey classifies seven soil types along the project limits, which are shown in Figure 2-2 and listed in Table 1.


Figure 2-2: NCRS Soil Survey Information
Table 1: NRCS Soil Survey Information

| Map Unit and Name |  | Drainage Class | Hydrologic <br> Soil Group | Depth to Water <br> Table (ft) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | Basinger, Holopaw, and Samsula <br> soils | Very poorly drained | A/D | $+2.0-1.0$ |
| 29 | Myakka fine sand | Poorly drained | A/D | $0.0-1.0$ |
| 30 | Myakka fine sand | Very poorly drained | A/D | $0.0-1.0$ |
| 38 | Pinellas fine sand | Poorly drained | B/D | $0.0-1.0$ |
| 57 | Winder fine sand | Poorly drained | C/D | $0.0-1.0$ |
| 59 | Winder fine sand | Poorly drained | C/D | $0.0-1.0$ |
| 99 | Water | - | - | - |

Seasonal high groundwater table elevations were determined for the project based on geotechnical investigations and existing surface water information. All elevations are in NAVD88 datum unless otherwise stated.

Tierra, Inc. performed geotechnical soil borings to determine seasonal high groundwater table (SHGWT) elevations along the roadway alignment. A copy of the geotechnical report is provided in Appendix D. The seasonal high water table elevations range between 3.3 and 7.8 feet along the corridor.

## SECTION 3 EXISTING DRAINAGE CONDITIONS

The project study area is located in the Tampa Bay Watershed within the Coastal Hillsborough Bay Tributary Planning Unit. The project is split between WBID 1605D (Delaney Creek Tidal) and WBID 1615 (Drainage to McKay Bay). Both WBIDs are verified as impaired for Enterococci. WBID 1605D is also impaired for lead, copper and iron. Refer to Appendix A for the WBID Map. Along US 41, the stormwater runoff is collected by curb and gutter and conveyed either to Delaney Creek or the unnamed creek located north and south of Causeway Boulevard respectively. Formal water quality is not currently provided along US 41. Causeway Boulevard from the begin project area to east of $47^{\text {th }}$ Street sheet flows to the existing roadside ditches and outfalls directly to East Bay with no formal water quality treatment. Causeway Boulevard from east of $47^{\text {th }}$ Street to the end of the project area is collected by curb and gutter and conveyed to existing FDOT SMFs (ERP 27063.000) located at the northwest and northeast corners of US 41 and Causeway Blvd. intersection.

The project traverses two subwatersheds within the Delaney Creek Watershed. The northern portion of the project is within the Palm River Coastal subwatershed and the southern portion of the project is within the Delaney Creek subwatershed. The Palm River Coastal subwatershed begins north of the project limits and drains southwest to an existing channel south of $24^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and outfalls at McKay Bay. The southern boundary of the subwatershed is Causeway Boulevard. The Delaney Creek subwatershed begins at Causeway Boulevard and drains southwest to Delaney Creek and outfalls to East Bay. The southern boundary of the subwatershed is Santa Fe Road. Both subwatersheds ultimately outfall to Hillsborough Bay. Refer to Figure 3-1 for a map of the existing watersheds.



Figure 3-1 Watershed Map

### 3.1 EXISTING CROSS DRAINS

The Straight Line Diagram (SLD) for US 41 (SR 45/SR 599) and Causeway Blvd. (SR 676/SR 45), existing plans (FPID 439038-1-52-01), The Delaney /Archie Creek Watershed Masterplan, and field reconnaissance were used to identify existing cross drains within the corridor. Runoff crosses US 41 from the east to the west through two existing cross drains (CD-01 and CD-02) and from south to north along Causeway Blvd through one existing cross drain (CD-03). The existing cross drain locations are shown in Table 2. CD-02 was not identified in the SLD. It was within a section not inventoried due to ongoing construction. The locations of the existing cross drains are shown on the Map in Figure 3-1. The cross drain photos and review checklist are located in Appendix E.

Table 2: Summary of Existing Cross Drains

| Cross <br> Drain | Size | Length | Location |  | Road |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CD-01 | (3) $11^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}$ RCBC |  | 23.003 | $71+35$ |  |
| CD-02 | (2) $42^{\prime \prime} R C P$ | 103 ft | 23.735 | $110+00$ | US 41 |
| CD-03 | $24^{\prime \prime} \times 38^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{RCP}$ | 151 ft | 2.918 | $304+00$ | Causeway Blvd. |

## SECTION 4 FLOODPLAIN INVOLVEMENT

### 4.1 FLOODPLAINS

The preferred alternative will have transverse and longitudinal impacts to the existing floodplain. The longitudinal impacts will result from filling the floodplain areas associated with proposed roadway widening and improvements. The transverse impacts will result from the replacement and extension of the existing cross drains and bridge culvert. These impacts cannot be avoided as the entire project is within the floodplain. Coastal transects 76 and 78 are within the project limits and storm surge has a major impact on the project area.

### 4.2 FLOODWAYS

Delaney Creek is not designated as a floodway within the project limits on FEMA FIRM 12057C0367J. According to Hillsborough County Drainage Staff, a "no-rise" certification will not be required for the project.

### 4.3 RISK EVALUATION

There is no significant change in flood "Risk" associated with this project. The encroachments will not have a significant potential for interruption or termination of transportation facilities needed for emergency vehicles or used as an evacuation route. In addition, no significant adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values are anticipated and no significant impacts to highway users are expected. Therefore, the encroachments are considered minimal. Per the FDOT PD\&E Manual Part 2, Chapter 13.2.2.5, the following items must be documented within this report:
A. General description of the project including location, length, existing and proposed typical sections, drainage basins, and cross drains.
Refer to Section 1 of this report for the project description and typical sections. Section 3 of this report discusses the drainage patterns and Section 4 discusses the existing and proposed cross drains.
B. Determination of whether the proposed action is in the base floodplain. The entire project is located within the base floodplain. Refer to Section 4.1 of this report.
C. The history of flooding of the existing facilities and/or measures to minimize any impacts due to the proposed improvements.
The history of flooding within the project is discussed in Section 2.4 of this report. The proposed improvements will be designed in accordance with the latest version of the FDOT Drainage Manual.
D. Determination of whether the encroachment is longitudinal or transverse, and if it is a longitudinal encroachment, an evaluation and discussion of practical avoidance alternatives. Refer to Section 4.1 of this report.
E. The practicability of avoidance alternatives and/or measures to minimize impacts.

The proposed floodplain impacts are unavoidable. The ponds that are to be constructed as part of this project will double as floodplain mitigation for the roadway improvements. The modeled improvements do not show any adverse effects to the roadway corridor or the surrounding areas.
F. Impact of the project on emergency services and evacuation. This project will not have any effect on emergency services or evacuation. The flood stages are not changing in the proposed condition and the profiles along both US 41 and Causeway Boulevard are being raised where feasible.
G. Impacts of the project on the base flood, likelihood of flood risk, overtopping, location of overtopping, backwater.
The proposed project will not impact or change the items mentioned above.
H. Determination of the impact of the project on regulatory floodways, if any, and documentation of coordination with FEMA and local agencies to determine the requirements for the project to be developed consistent with the regulatory floodway.
The project is not located within a FEMA regulatory floodway. Refer to Section 4.2 of this report.
I. The impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values, and measures to restore and preserve the natural and beneficial floodplain values impacted by the project.
There are no adverse impacts proposed to the natural and beneficial floodplain values. The majority of the floodplain is due to the tidal influence and storm surge.
J. Consistency of the project with the local floodplain development plan or the land use elements in the Local Government Comprehensive Plan (LGCP), and the potential of encouraging development within the base floodplain.
The proposed project is mostly comprised of operational improvements within an industrial corridor. There is minimal risk of encouraging additional development adjacent to the corridor within the base floodplain.
K. Measures to minimize floodplain impacts associated with the project, and measures to restore and preserve the natural and beneficial floodplain values impacted by the project.
Bridges and MSE walls were proposed throughout the corridor to minimize impacts to the floodplain. Theexisting intersection at Causeway Boulevard and US 41 will remain in place as will a significant amount of the existing pavement.
L. A map showing project location, and impacted floodplains. A FIRM Map should be used if available. If not, other maps (e.g., US Geological Survey (USGS), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Soil Conservation Service (SCS), Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Forest Service, or best available information from the WMDs) may be used. Copies of applicable maps should be included in the appendix.
Refer to Section 1 and Appendix $\boldsymbol{A}$ of this report.
M. Results of any risk assessments performed.

Refer to Section 4 of this report.

### 4.4 PROJECT CLASSIFICATION

The floodplain encompasses the entire project area. Based on preliminary modeling efforts, there are no rises to the flood stages associated with the preferred alternative. There will still be minimal impacts to Delaney Creek and the unnamed creek due to the replacement and extension of the existing cross drains. Minimal encroachments on a floodplain occur when there is floodplain involvement, but the impacts on human life, transportation facilities, and natural and beneficial floodplain values are not significant and can be resolved with minimal efforts. Normally, these minimal efforts to address the impacts will consist of applying the Department's drainage design standards and following the Water Management District's procedures to achieve results that will not increase or significantly change the flood elevations and/or limits.

The proposed structures will perform hydraulically in a manner equal to or greater than the existing structures, and backwater surface elevations are not expected to increase. Thus, there will be no significant or adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values. There will be no significant change in flood risk, and there will not be a significant change in the potential for interruption ortermination of emergency service or emergency evacuation routes. Therefore, it has been determined that this encroachment is not significant.


## APPENDICES

Appendix A - Exhibits
Appendix B-Geotechnical Investigation and Soil Analysis
Appendix C - Cross Drain Pictures and Review Checklist




















FLOOD HAZARD INFORMATION

 HTTPS://MSC.FEMA.GOV

| SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREAS | W81 | Without Base Mood Elevation (BFL) <br> With BFE or Depth Zone $A E, A O, A H, V E, A R$ <br> Regulatory Floodway |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | nWerl | $0.2 \%$ Annual Chance Flood Hazard, Areas of $1 \%$ annual chance flood with average depth less than one foot or with drainage Future Conditions $1 \%$ Annual $\qquad$ |
|  | cret | Area with Reduced Flood Risk due to Levee See Notes. Zone X |
|  | ces | Area with Food Risk due to leve |
|  | NoSCreen | Area of Wininal Flood Hazard Zone X |
| ${ }_{\text {cher }}^{\text {OTHER }}$ |  | rea of Undetemined fioa |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Geverfal } \\ \text { Trivcrurs } \end{gathered}$ |  | Channel, Culvert, or Storm Sew Levee, Dike, or Floodwall |
|  | (E) ${ }^{182}$ | Crose Sections with 1\% Annual Chance Water Surface Elevation |
|  | (8)-.... | Coastal Transect <br> Coastal Transect Baseline |
|  |  | Profile Basaline |
|  | $\cdots \mathrm{msp}$ | Base floded Elevation Line (BFE) |
| $\underset{\substack{\text { OTHER } \\ \text { Featres }}}{ }$ |  | Limit of Study Jurisdiction Bound |
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February 18, 2021
Rummel Klepper \& Kahl 14055 Riveredge Drive, Suite 301
Tampa, Florida 33637

Attn: Mr. Erik Fleming, P.E.

RE: Seasonal High Groundwater Table Estimates
US 41/SR 45/SR 599 from South of the SR 676/Causeway Boulevard Intersection to North of the SR 676/Causeway Boulevard Intersection Hillsborough County, Florida
FPID Nos.: 440749-1-22-01 and 440749-1-32-01
Tierra Project No.: 6511-18-025
Mr. Fleming:
Tierra, Inc. has estimated Seasonal High Groundwater Tables (SHGWTs) along the project roadway alignment and preliminary pond alternative sites associated with the above referenced project. The seasonal high groundwater level estimates are presented as an attachment to this letter.

## Review of Available Data

As part of our study, Tierra reviewed published soils information obtained from the "Soil Survey of Hillsborough County, Florida" published by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and topographic information obtained from the Tampa, Florida Quadrangle Map published by the United States Geological Survey (USGS).

## Seasonal High Groundwater Estimates

SHGWT estimates were completed at select locations along the roadway alignments typically on alternating sides of the existing roadway and at intervals of approximately 200 to 400 feet. SHGWT borings were also completed within the preliminary pond alternatives. The SHGWT estimates were based on soil stratigraphy, measured groundwater levels from the borings as well as the Hillsborough County, Florida USDA Soil Survey information. A Summary of Seasonal High Groundwater Table Estimates is presented as an attachment with this letter.

Tierra, Inc. appreciates the opportunity to be of service to Rummel Klepper \& Kahl on this project. If you have any questions or comments regarding this information, please contact our office at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

## TiERRA, inc.



Juan M. Navarrete II, E.I.
Geotechnical Engineer Intern


Kevin W. Lo, P.E.
Chief Geotechnical Engineer Florida License No. 56959

## Attachments:

Summary of Seasonal High Groundwater Table Estimates
Joseph R. Antinori, P.E.
Geotechnical Engineer
Florida License No. 73176
FPID Nos.: 440749-1-22-01 and 440749-1-32-01 Tierra Project No. 6511-18-025

| Boring Name | Boring Location ${ }^{(1)}$(C/L Const) |  | Boring Location <br> State Plane Coordinates |  | Ground Elevation ${ }^{(1)}$ (ft., NAVD88) | Boring Depth (feet) | MeasuredGroundwater Table |  |  | USDA Soil Survey |  | Estimated SHGWT ${ }^{(4)}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sation | Offset | Northing | Easting |  |  | Date Recorded | Depth ${ }^{(2)}$ <br> (ft.) | Elevation (ft., NAVD88) | Map Symbol | SHGWT <br> Depth ${ }^{(3)}$ <br> (ft.) | Depth <br> (ft.) | Elevation (ft., NAVD88) |
| US 41 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SH-59R | $59+93$ | 102 RT | 1300904 | 526470 | 0 | 3.5 | 10/20/20 | 1.5 | 3.5 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 0.8 | 4.2 |
| SH-60L2 | $59+94$ | 87 LT | 1300907 | 526280 | 5.8 | 5.0 | 02/02/21 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.5 | 4.3 |
| SH - 62R2 | $62+11$ | 126 RT | 1301122 | 526494 | 6.6 | 5.0 | 02/02/21 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.0 | 4.6 |
| SH-63L | $63+34$ | 135 LT | 1301246 | 526234 | 5.8 | 5.0 | 10/22/21 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 29 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.5 | 4.3 |
| SH-66L2 | $68+15$ | 68 LT | 1301728 | 526304 | 5.6 | 5.0 | 02/02/21 | 3.6 | 2.0 | 29 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.8 | 3.8 |
| SH-68R | $68+47$ | 68 RT | 1301759 | 526439 | 6.5 | 5.0 | 10/20/20 | 5.0 | 1.5 | 29 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.8 | 3.7 |
| SH-70L | $70+49$ | 83 LT | 1301962 | 526290 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 10/22/20 | GNE | $\leq 0.3$ | 30 | 0.0-0.5 | 2.0 | 3.3 |
| SH-71R | $71+63$ | 193 RT | 1302074 | 526567 | 5.4 | 5.0 | 02/02/21 | 3.2 | 2.2 | 30 | 0.0-0.5 | 2.0 | 3.4 |
| SH-74R | $74+01$ | 66 RT | 1302312 | 526441 | 7.6 | 7.0 | 10/21/20 | 6.0 | 1.6 | 30 | 0.0-0.5 | 4.0 | 3.6 |
| SH-75L | $74+97$ | 52 LT | 1302409 | 526323 | 6.4 | 5.0 | 10/22/20 | 4.0 | 2.4 | 30 | 0.0-0.5 | 2.5 | 3.9 |
| SH-77L | $77+27$ | 83 LT | 1302639 | 526294 | 6.3 | 5.0 | 10/22/20 | 4.5 | $1.8$ | 29/30 | 0.5-1.5/0.0-0.5 | 2.2 | 4.1 |
| SH-77R | $77+62$ | 75 RT | 1302674 | 526452 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 02/02/21 | 5.4 | 1.8 | 30 | 0.0-0.5 | 3.0 | 4.2 |
| SH-79R1 | $78+99$ | 54 RT | 1302811 | 526432 | 7.1 | 5.0 | 10/21/20 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 29 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.5 | 4.6 |
| SH-79R2 | $80+08$ | 201 RT | 1302919 | 526579 | 6.2 | 5.0 | 10/21/20 | 3.5 | 2.7 | 29 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.5 | 4.7 |
| SH-80L | $80+48$ | 78 LT | 1302961 | 526300 | 6.3 | 5.0 | 10/22/20 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 29 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.8 | 4.5 |
| SH-81R | $81+18$ | 53 RT | 1303030 | 526432 | 6.8 | 5.0 | 10/21/20 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 29 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.0 | 4.8 |
| SH-85R1 | $84+52$ | 59 RT | 1303364 | 526439 | 7.3 | 4.5 | 10/21/20 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 29 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.3 | 5.0 |
| SH-85L | $84+89$ | 63 LT | 1303402 | 526317 | 6.5 | 6.0 | 02/02/21 | 4.9 | 1.6 | 29/38 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.0 | 4.5 |
| SH-85R2 | $85+13$ | 202 RT | 1303424 | 526583 | 5.3 | 3.0 | 10/22/20 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 29 | 0.5-1.5 | 0.5 | 4.8 |

${ }^{(1)}$ Boring locations and elevations were provided by the project surveyor. The state plane coordinates reference Florida West NAD 1983.
${ }^{(2)}$ Depth below existing grades at time of augering
${ }^{3}$ Seasonal high groundwater table depth estimated based on the Hillsborough County, Florida USDA Soil Survey information
${ }^{(4)}$ Seasonal high groundwater table estimated based on historic soil stratigraphy, measured groundwater levels, and USDA Soil Survey.

| Summary of Seasonal High Groundwater Table Estimates <br> US 41/SR 45/SR 599 from South of the SR 676/Causeway Boulevard Intersection to North of the SR 676/Causeway Boulevard Intersection <br> Hillsborough County, Florida <br> FPID Nos.: 440749-1-22-01 and 440749-1-32-01 <br> Tierra Project No. 6511-18-025 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boring Name | Boring Location ${ }^{(1)}$ (C/L Const) |  | Boring Location <br> State Plane Coordinates |  | Ground Elevation ${ }^{(1)}$ (ft., NAVD88) | Boring Depth (feet) | MeasuredGroundwater Table |  |  | USDA Soil Survey |  | Estimated SHGWT ${ }^{(4)}$ |  |
|  | Sation | Offset | Northing | Easting |  |  | Date Recorded | Depth ${ }^{(2)}$ (ft.) | Elevation (ft., NAVD88) | Map Symbol | SHGWT <br> Depth ${ }^{(3)}$ <br> (ft.) | Depth <br> (ft.) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Elevation } \\ & \text { (ft., NAVD88) } \end{aligned}$ |
| US 41 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SH-86L | $86+16$ | 55 LT | 1303529 | 526327 | 6.8 | 5.0 | 10/22/20 | 4.0 | 2.8 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.0 | 4.8 |
| SH-86R | $86+43$ | 227 RT | 1303554 | 526608 | 7.3 | 5.0 | 10/22/20 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 29 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.3 | 5.0 |
| SH-90R | $90+59$ | 71 RT | 1303971 | 526455 | 7 | 4.0 | 10/22/20 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.3 | 4.9 |
| SH-92L | $92+47$ | 91 LT | 1304160 | 526294 | 7.3 | 4.5 | 10/28/20 | 4.5 | 2.8 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.5 | 4.8 |
| SH-92R1 | $92+64$ | 62 RT | 1304176 | 526447 | 7.2 | 4.5 | 10/22/20 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.3 | 4.9 |
| SH-95R | $94+96$ | 74 RT | 1304408 | 526460 | 7.0 | 4.0 | 10/22/20 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.0 | 5.0 |
| SH-96L | $96+22$ | 58 LT | 1304535 | 526328 | 6.7 | 4.0 | 02/02/21 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.7 | 5.0 |
| SH-98R | $99+02$ | 221 RT | 1304813 | 526609 | 7.6 | 5.0 | 02/02/21 | 4.8 | 2.8 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.5 | 5.1 |
| SH-103L | $103+65$ | 63 LT | 1305179 | 526328 | 5.6 | 5.0 | 11/03/20 | 4.0 | 1.6 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.3 | 4.3 |
| SH-104R | $104+47$ | 61 RT | 1305260 | 526452 | 6.3 | 5.0 | 10/22/20 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.0 | 4.3 |
| SH-106L2 | $106+19$ | 68 LT | 1305433 | 526324 | 6.9 | 5.0 | 02/02/21 | 4.0 | 2.9 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.5 | 4.4 |
| SH-107R | $107+71$ | 45 RT | 1305584 | 526438 | 7.2 | 5.0 | 11/02/20 | 5.0 | 2.2 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.7 | 4.5 |
| SH-110R | $110+20$ | 46 RT | 1305833 | 526440 | 6.5 | 5.0 | 11/02/20 | 4.0 | 2.5 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.0 | 4.5 |
| SH-110L | $110+35$ | 59 LT | 1305849 | 526335 | 6.2 | 3.5 | 11/02/20 | GNE | $\leq 2.7$ | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.8 | 4.4 |
| SH-114L | $114+13$ | 44 LT | 1306227 | 526350 | 7.1 | 4.0 | 11/02/20 | GNE | $\leq 3.1$ | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.0 | 5.1 |
| SH-119L | $118+82$ | 83 LT | 1306696 | 526311 | 8.8 | 6.5 | 11/02/20 | 6.0 | 2.8 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 3.7 | 5.1 |
| ${ }^{(1)}$ Boring locations and elevations were provided by the project surveyor. The state plane coordinates reference Florida West NAD 1983. <br> ${ }^{(2)}$ Depth below existing grades at time of augering. <br> ${ }^{(3)}$ Seasonal high groundwater table depth estimated based on the Hillsborough County, Florida USDA Soil Survey information. <br> ${ }^{(4)}$ Seasonal high groundwater table estimated based on historic soil stratigraphy, measured groundwater levels, and USDA Soil Survey. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Summary of Seasonal High Groundwater Table Estimates <br> US 41/SR 45/SR 599 from South of the SR 676/Causeway Boulevard Intersection to North of the SR 676/Causeway Boulevard Intersection <br> Hillsborough County, Florida <br> FPID Nos.: 440749-1-22-01 and 440749-1-32-01 <br> Tierra Project No. 6511-18-025 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boring Location ${ }^{(1)}$ (C/L Const) |  | Boring Location <br> State Plane Coordinates |  | Ground Elevation ${ }^{(1)}$ (ft., NAVD88) | Boring Depth (feet) | MeasuredGroundwater Table |  |  | USDA Soil Survey |  | Estimated SHGWT ${ }^{(4)}$ |  |
| Name | Sation | Offset | Northing | Easting |  |  | Date Recorded | Depth ${ }^{(2)}$ <br> (ft.) | Elevation (ft., NAVD88 ) | Map Symbol | SHGWT <br> Depth ${ }^{(3)}$ <br> (ft.) | Depth <br> (ft.) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Elevation } \\ & \text { (ft., NAVD88) } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ausew | ulevard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SH-258R | $257+91$ | 30 RT | 1304901 | 522180 | 6.4 | 5.0 | 11/25/20 | 4.5 | 1.9 | 30 | 0.0-0.5 | 2.5 | 3.9 |
| SH-265L | $266+13$ | 102 LT | 1305029 | 523002 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 11/25/20 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 30 | 0.0-0.5 | 1.0 | 3.5 |
| SH-266R | $266+65$ | 37 RT | 1304890 | 523054 | 3.8 | 5.0 | 11/25/20 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 30 | 0.0-0.5 | 0.3 | 3.5 |
| SH-270L | $269+99$ | 102 LT | 1305027 | 523388 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 11/25/20 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 30 | 0.0-0.5 | 1.5 | 3.5 |
| SH-275L | $275+43$ | 94 LT | 1305016 | 523933 | 4.8 | 3.5 | 11/25/20 | 2.0 | 2.8 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.0 | 3.8 |
| SH-276R | $276+42$ | 46 RT | 1304876 | 524031 | 4.8 | 4.5 | 12/07/20 | 1.5 | 3.3 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.0 | 3.8 |
| SH-282L | $282+46$ | 95 LT | 1305015 | 524635 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 11/03/20 | 3.5 | 1.8 | 30 | 0.0-0.5 | 1.5 | 3.8 |
| SH-283R | $283+22$ | 47 RT | 1304873 | 524711 | 5.2 | 5.0 | 12/07/20 | 2.0 | 3.2 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.5 | 3.7 |
| SH-285L | $285+33$ | 55 LT | 1304974 | 524922 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 11/03/20 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 30 | 0.0-0.5 | 1.2 | 3.8 |
| SH-287R2 | $287+58$ | 60 RT | 1304858 | 525146 | 5.0 | 7.5 | 02/02/21 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 30/38 | 0.0-0.5/0.5-1.5 | 1.2 | 3.8 |
| SH-290L | $290+77$ | 72 LT | 1304988 | 525466 | 5.3 | 3.5 | 11/03/20 | 3.5 | 1.8 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.5 | 3.8 |
| SH-291R | $291+34$ | 72 RT | 1304844 | 525523 | 5.6 | 5.0 | 02/02/21 | 3.0 | 2.6 | - 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.5 | 4.1 |
| SH-295L | $295+48$ | 77 LT | 1304991 | 525937 | 6.6 | 4.5 | 11/03/20 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.0 | 4.6 |
| SH-297R | $295+93$ | 61 RT | 1304853 | 525982 | 6.4 | 4.0 | 12/07/20 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.8 | 4.6 |
| SH-302L | $302+58$ | 95 LT | 1305006 | 526647 | 7.7 | 5.0 | 11/03/20 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.5 | 5.2 |
| SH-303R | $303+23$ | 31 RT | 1304880 | 526712 | 7.9 | 5.0 | 12/07/20 | 3.0 | 4.9 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 2.5 | 5.4 |
| SH-308R | $307+71$ | 49 RT | 1304860 | 527160 | 8.5 | 5.0 | 12/07/20 | 3.0 | 5.5 | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.5 | 7.0 |
| SH-310R | $310+55$ | 48 RT | 1304859 | 527444 | 9.3 | 5.0 | 12/07/20 | 2.0 | $7.3$ | 38 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.5 | 7.8 |
| ${ }^{(1)}$ Boring locations and elevations were provided by the project surve <br> ${ }^{(2)}$ Depth below existing grades at time of augering. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{(3)}$ Seasonal high groundwater table depth estimated based on the Hillsborough County, Florida USDA Soil Survey information. <br> ${ }^{(4)}$ Seasonal high groundwater table estimated based on historic soil stratigraphy, measured groundwater levels, and USDA Soil Survey. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Summary of Seasonal High Groundwater Table Estimates <br> US 41/SR 45/SR 599 from South of the SR 676/Causeway Boulevard Intersection to North of the SR 676/Causeway Boulevard Intersection <br> Hillsborough County, Florida <br> FPID Nos.: 440749-1-22-01 and 440749-1-32-01 <br> Tierra Project No. 6511-18-025 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boring Name | Boring Location <br>  <br> (B/L <br> Survey US 41) Boring Location ${ }^{(1)}$ <br> State Plane Coordinates  |  |  |  | Approximate Ground Elevation ${ }^{(1)}$ (ft., NAVD88) | Boring Depth ${ }^{(2)}$ (ft.) | MeasuredGroundwater Table |  |  | USDA Soil Survey SHGWT ${ }^{(3)}$ |  | Estimated SHGWT ${ }^{(4)}$ |  |
|  | Station (ft.) | Offset (ft.) | Northing | Easting |  |  | Date Recorded | Depth ${ }^{(2)}$ <br> (ft.) | Elevation (ft., NAVD88) | Map Symbol | Depth <br> (ft) | Depth <br> (ft.) | Elevation (ft., NAVD88) |
| SMF 1A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PBA - SMF 1A-1 | 66+03 | 528 RT | 1301512 | 526899 | 6.2 | 4.0 | 02/02/21 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 29 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.5 | 4.7 |
| SMF 1B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PBA - SMF 1B-1 | 68+42 | 166 LT | 1301755 | 526206 | 5.2 | 5.5 | 02/02/21 | 4.5 | 0.7 | 29 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.5 | 3.7 |
| SH-66L2 | 68+15 | 68 LT | 130172 | 526304 | 5.6 | 5.0 | 02/02/21 | 3.6 | 2.0 | 29 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.8 | 3.8 |
| Note: Several attempts to complete hand augers within the footprint of SMF 1C were terminated due to refusal on fill material (rocks, brick, etc.). The depth of the fil grades was not determined. It is recommended that the SHGWT reported by the USDA be used for preliminary evaluation. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PBA - SMF 1C-1 | --- | --- | --- |  | -- |  | --- |  | --- | 30 | 0.0-0.5 |  | etermined fill material |
| SMF 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SH-79R2 | 80+08 | 201 RT | 1302919 | 526579 | 6.2 | 5.0 | 10/21/20 | 3.5 | 2.7 | 29 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.5 | 4.7 |
| PBA - SMF 2A-1 | 80+37 | 270 RT | 1302947 | 526649 | 5.8 | 4.5 | 02/02/21 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 29 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.0 | 4.8 |
| SMF 2B <br> Note: Site was inaccessible due to locked gates and signs stating, "Contaminated Area Avoid Contact with Soil and Water". It is recommended that the SHGWT repor the estimated SHGWT at adjacent pond boring PBASMF 2A-1 be used for preliminary evaluation. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PBA - SMF 2A-1 | $80+37$ | 270 RT | 1302947 | 526649 | 5.8 | 4.5 | 02/02/21 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 29 | 0.5-1.5 | 1.0 | 4.8 |
| SMF 2C <br> Note: Site was inaccessible due to locked gates and signs stating, "Contaminated Area Avoid Contact with Soil and Water". It is recommended that the SHGWT rep the estimated SHGWT at adjacent roadway boring SH-74R be used for preliminary evaluation. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SH-74R | 74+01 | 66 RT | 1302312 | 526441 | 7.6 | 7.0 | 10/21/20 | 6.0 | 1.6 | 30 | 0.0-0.5 | 4.0 | 3.6 |
| ${ }^{(1)}$ Boring locations and elevations were provided by the project surveyor. The state plane coordinates reference Florida West NAD 1983. <br> ${ }^{(2)}$ Depth below existing grades at time of augering. <br> ${ }^{(3)}$ Seasonal high groundwater table depth estimated based on the Hillsborough County, Florida USDA Soil Survey information. <br> ${ }^{(4)}$ Seasonal high groundwater table estimated based on historic soil stratigraphy, measured groundwater levels, and USDA Soil Survey. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Preface

Soil surveys contain information that affects land use planning in survey areas. They highlight soil limitations that affect various land uses and provide information about the properties of the soils in the survey areas. Soil surveys are designed for many different users, including farmers, ranchers, foresters, agronomists, urban planners, community officials, engineers, developers, builders, and home buyers. Also, conservationists, teachers, students, and specialists in recreation, waste disposal, and pollution control can use the surveys to help them understand, protect, or enhance the environment.
Various land use regulations of Federal, State, and local governments may impose special restrictions on land use or land treatment. Soil surveys identify soil properties that are used in making various land use or land treatment decisions. The information is intended to help the land users identify and reduce the effects of soil limitations on various land uses. The landowner or user is responsible for identifying and complying with existing laws and regulations.

Although soil survey information can be used for general farm, local, and wider area planning, onsite investigation is needed to supplement this information in some cases. Examples include soil quality assessments (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/ portal/nrcs/main/soils/health/) and certain conservation and engineering applications. For more detailed information, contact your local USDA Service Center (https://offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app?agency=nrcs) or your NRCS State Soil Scientist (http.//www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/contactus/? cid=nrcs142p2_053951).

Great differences in soil properties can occur within short distances. Some soils are seasonally wet or subject to flooding. Some are too unstable to be used as a foundation for buildings or roads. Clayey or wet soils are poorly suited to use as septic tank absorption fields. A high water table makes a soil poorly suited to basements or underground installations.

The National Cooperative Soil Survey is a joint effort of the United States Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies, State agencies including the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and local agencies. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has leadership for the Federal part of the National Cooperative Soil Survey.
Information about soils is updated periodically. Updated information is available through the NRCS Web Soil Survey, the site for official soil survey information.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or a part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require
alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.
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## How Soil Surveys Are Made

Soil surveys are made to provide information about the soils and miscellaneous areas in a specific area. They include a description of the soils and miscellaneous areas and their location on the landscape and tables that show soil properties and limitations affecting various uses. Soil scientists observed the steepness, length, and shape of the slopes; the general pattern of drainage; the kinds of crops and native plants; and the kinds of bedrock. They observed and described many soil profiles. A soil profile is the sequence of natural layers, or horizons, in a soil. The profile extends from the surface down into the unconsolidated material in which the soil formed or from the surface down to bedrock. The unconsolidated material is devoid of roots and other living organisms and has not been changed by other biological activity.
Currently, soils are mapped according to the boundaries of major land resource areas (MLRAs). MLRAs are geographically associated land resource units that share common characteristics related to physiography, geology, climate, water resources, soils, biological resources, and land uses (USDA, 2006). Soil survey areas typically consist of parts of one or more MLRA.
The soils and miscellaneous areas in a survey area occur in an orderly pattern that is related to the geology, landforms, relief, climate, and natural vegetation of the area. Each kind of soil and miscellaneous area is associated with a particular kind of landform or with a segment of the landform. By observing the soils and miscellaneous areas in the survey area and relating their position to specific segments of the landform, a soil scientist develops a concept, or model, of how they were formed. Thus, during mapping, this model enables the soil scientist to predict with a considerable degree of accuracy the kind of soil or miscellaneous area at a specific location on the landscape.

Commonly, individual soils on the landscape merge into one another as their characteristics gradually change. To construct an accurate soil map, however, soil scientists must determine the boundaries between the soils. They can observe only a limited number of soil profiles. Nevertheless, these observations, supplemented by an understanding of the soil-vegetation-landscape relationship, are sufficient to verify predictions of the kinds of soil in an area and to determine the boundaries.
Soil scientists recorded the characteristics of the soil profiles that they studied. They noted soil color, texture, size and shape of soil aggregates, kind and amount of rock fragments, distribution of plant roots, reaction, and other features that enable them to identify soils. After describing the soils in the survey area and determining their properties, the soil scientists assigned the soils to taxonomic classes (units). Taxonomic classes are concepts. Each taxonomic class has a set of soil characteristics with precisely defined limits. The classes are used as a basis for comparison to classify soils systematically. Soil taxonomy, the system of taxonomic classification used in the United States, is based mainly on the kind and character of soil properties and the arrangement of horizons within the profile. After the soil
scientists classified and named the soils in the survey area, they compared the individual soils with similar soils in the same taxonomic class in other areas so that they could confirm data and assemble additional data based on experience and research.

The objective of soil mapping is not to delineate pure map unit components; the objective is to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. Each map unit is defined by a unique combination of soil components and/or miscellaneous areas in predictable proportions. Some components may be highly contrasting to the other components of the map unit. The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The delineation of such landforms and landform segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.
Soil scientists make many field observations in the process of producing a soil map. The frequency of observation is dependent upon several factors, including scale of mapping, intensity of mapping, design of map units, complexity of the landscape, and experience of the soil scientist. Observations are made to test and refine the soil-landscape model and predictions and to verify the classification of the soils at specific locations. Once the soil-landscape model is refined, a significantly smaller number of measurements of individual soil properties are made and recorded. These measurements may include field measurements, such as those for color, depth to bedrock, and texture, and laboratory measurements, such as those for content of sand, silt, clay, salt, and other components. Properties of each soil typically vary from one point to another across the landscape.
Observations for map unit components are aggregated to develop ranges of characteristics for the components. The aggregated values are presented. Direct measurements do not exist for every property presented for every map unit component. Values for some properties are estimated from combinations of other properties.
While a soil survey is in progress, samples of some of the soils in the area generally are collected for laboratory analyses and for engineering tests. Soil scientists interpret the data from these analyses and tests as well as the field-observed characteristics and the soil properties to determine the expected behavior of the soils under different uses. Interpretations for all of the soils are field tested through observation of the soils in different uses and under different levels of management. Some interpretations are modified to fit local conditions, and some new interpretations are developed to meet local needs. Data are assembled from other sources, such as research information, production records, and field experience of specialists. For example, data on crop yields under defined levels of management are assembled from farm records and from field or plot experiments on the same kinds of soil.

Predictions about soil behavior are based not only on soil properties but also on such variables as climate and biological activity. Soil conditions are predictable over long periods of time, but they are not predictable from year to year. For example, soil scientists can predict with a fairly high degree of accuracy that a given soil will have a high water table within certain depths in most years, but they cannot predict that a high water table will always be at a specific level in the soil on a specific date.
After soil scientists located and identified the significant natural bodies of soil in the survey area, they drew the boundaries of these bodies on aerial photographs and
identified each as a specific map unit. Aerial photographs show trees, buildings, fields, roads, and rivers, all of which help in locating boundaries accurately.


## Soil Map

The soil map section includes the soil map for the defined area of interest, a list of soil map units on the map and extent of each map unit, and cartographic symbols displayed on the map. Also presented are various metadata about data used to produce the map, and a description of each soil map unit.

Custom Soil Resource Report
Map Scale: 1:8,930 if printed on A portrait ( $8.5^{\prime \prime} \times 11$ ") sheet
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# Map Unit Legend 

| Map Unit Symbol | Map Unit Name | Acres in AOI | Percent of AOI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 29 | Myakka fine sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes | 3.0 | 16.7\% |
| 30 | Myakka fine sand, frequently flooded | 1.8 | 10.3\% |
| 38 | Pinellas fine sand | 13.1 | 73.1\% |
| Totals for Area of Interest |  | 17.9 | 100.0\% |

The map units delineated on the detailed soil maps in a soil survey represent the soils or miscellaneous areas in the survey area. The map unit descriptions, along with the maps, can be used to determine the composition and properties of a unit.
A map unit delineation on a soil map represents an area dominated by one or more major kinds of soil or miscellaneous areas. A map unit is identified and named according to the taxonomic classification of the dominant soils. Within a taxonomic class there are precisely defined limits for the properties of the soils. On the landscape, however, the soils are natural phenomena, and they have the characteristic variability of all natural phenomena. Thus, the range of some observed properties may extend beyond the limits defined for a taxonomic class. Areas of soils of a single taxonomic class rarely, if ever, can be mapped without including areas of other taxonomic classes. Consequently, every map unit is made up of the soils or miscellaneous areas for which it is named and some minor components that belong to taxonomic classes other than those of the major soils.
Most minor soils have properties similar to those of the dominant soil or soils in the map unit, and thus they do not affect use and management. These are called noncontrasting, or similar, components. They may or may not be mentioned in a particular map unit description. Other minor components, however, have properties and behavioral characteristics divergent enough to affect use or to require different management. These are called contrasting, or dissimilar, components. They generally are in small areas and could not be mapped separately because of the scale used. Some small areas of strongly contrasting soils or miscellaneous areas are identified by a special symbol on the maps. If included in the database for a given area, the contrasting minor components are identified in the map unit descriptions along with some characteristics of each. A few areas of minor components may not have been observed, and consequently they are not mentioned in the descriptions, especially where the pattern was so complex that it was impractical to make enough observations to identify all the soils and miscellaneous areas on the landscape.
The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The objective of mapping is not to delineate pure taxonomic classes but rather to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. The
delineation of such segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, however, onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

An identifying symbol precedes the map unit name in the map unit descriptions. Each description includes general facts about the unit and gives important soil properties and qualities.
Soils that have profiles that are almost alike make up a soil series. Except for differences in texture of the surface layer, all the soils of a series have major horizons that are similar in composition, thickness, and arrangement.
Soils of one series can differ in texture of the surface layer, slope, stoniness, salinity, degree of erosion, and other characteristics that affect their use. On the basis of such differences, a soil series is divided into soil phases. Most of the areas shown on the detailed soil maps are phases of soil series. The name of a soil phase commonly indicates a feature that affects use or management. For example, Alpha silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is a phase of the Alpha series.

Some map units are made up of two or more major soils or miscellaneous areas. These map units are complexes, associations, or undifferentiated groups.

A complex consists of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas in such an intricate pattern or in such small areas that they cannot be shown separately on the maps. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar in all areas. Alpha-Beta complex, 0 to 6 percent slopes, is an example.
An association is made up of two or more geographically associated soils or miscellaneous areas that are shown as one unit on the maps. Because of present or anticipated uses of the map units in the survey area, it was not considered practical or necessary to map the soils or miscellaneous areas separately. The pattern and relative proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar. Alpha-Beta association, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.
An undifferentiated group is made up of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas that could be mapped individually but are mapped as one unit because similar interpretations can be made for use and management. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas in a mapped area are not uniform. An area can be made up of only one of the major soils or miscellaneous areas, or it can be made up of all of them. Alpha and Beta soils, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example. Some surveys include miscellaneous areas. Such areas have little or no soil material and support little or no vegetation. Rock outcrop is an example.

## Hillsborough County, Florida

## 29-Myakka fine sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes

## Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 2s3Ig
Elevation: 0 to 130 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 42 to 56 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 68 to 77 degrees $F$
Frost-free period: 350 to 365 days
Farmland classification: Farmland of unique importance

## Map Unit Composition

Myakka and similar soils: 85 percent Minor components: 15 percent Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

## Description of Myakka

## Setting

Landform: Drainageways on flatwoods on marine terraces
Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread, dip, talf
Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear, concave
Parent material: Sandy marine deposits
Typical profile
A - 0 to 6 inches: fine sand
$E-6$ to 20 inches: fine sand
Bh - 20 to 36 inches: fine sand
C-36 to 80 inches; fine sand
Properties and qualities
Slope: 0 to 2 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Natural drainage class: Poorly drained
Runoff class: High
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to high ( 0.57 to $5.95 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ )
Depth to water table: About 6 to 18 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Salinity, maximum in profile: Nonsaline to very slightly saline (0.0 to 2.0
mmhos/cm)
Sodium adsorption ratio, maximum in profile: 4.0
Available water storage in profile: Low (about 5.7 inches)
Interpretive groups
Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 4w
Hydrologic Soil Group: A/D
Forage suitability group: Sandy soils on flats of mesic or hydric lowlands
(G155XB141FL)
Other vegetative classification: South Florida Flatwoods (R155XY003FL)
Hydric soil rating: No

## Minor Components

## Basinger

Percent of map unit: 5 percent
Landform: Depressions on marine terraces
Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread, dip
Down-slope shape: Concave, linear
Across-slope shape: Concave, linear
Hydric soil rating: Yes

## Wabasso

Percent of map unit: 4 percent Landform: Flatwoods on marine terraces Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread, talf Down-slope shape: Linear, convex Across-slope shape: Linear Other vegetative classification: South Florida Flatwoods (R155XY003FL) Hydric soil rating: No

## Cassia

Percent of map unit: 3 percent
Landform: Knolls on marine terraces, rises on marine terraces
Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread, talf
Down-slope shape: Convex
Across-slope shape: Linear
Other vegetative classification: Sand Pine Scrub (R155XY001FL)
Hydric soil rating: No

## Immokalee

Percent of map unit: 2 percent
Landform: Flatwoods on marine terraces
Landform position (three-dimensional): Riser, talf
Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear
Other vegetative classification: South Florida Flatwoods (R155XY003FL)
Hydric soil rating: No

## Satellite

Percent of map unit: 1 percent
Landform: Rises on marine terraces, flatwoods on marine terraces
Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread, rise, talf
Down-slope shape: Linear, convex
Across-slope shape: Linear
Other vegetative classification: Sand Pine Scrub (R155XY001FL)
Hydric soil rating: No

## 30-Myakka fine sand, frequently flooded

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 1j72h

Mean annual precipitation: 48 to 56 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 70 to 77 degrees F
Frost-free period: 324 to 354 days
Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

## Map Unit Composition

Myakka, frequently flooded, and similar soils: 90 percent
Minor components: 10 percent
Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

## Description of Myakka, Frequently Flooded

## Setting

Landform: Tidal marshes on marine terraces Landform position (three-dimensional): Talf Down-slope shape: Linear Across-slope shape: Linear Parent material: Sandy marine deposits

## Typical profile

A - 0 to 5 inches: fine sand E-5 to 22 inches: fine sand Bh-22 to 40 inches: fine sand C-40 to 80 inches: fine sand

Properties and qualities
Slope: 0 to 1 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Natural drainage class: Very poorly drained
Runoff class: High
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to high ( 0.57 to $5.95 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ )
Depth to water table: About 0 to 6 inches
Frequency of flooding: Frequent
Frequency of ponding: None
Salinity, maximum in profile: Strongly saline ( 16.0 to 32.0 mmhos/cm)
Sodium adsorption ratio, maximum in profile: 4.0
Available water storage in profile: Low (about 5.7 inches)
Interpretive groups
Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 8
Hydrologic Soil Group: A/D
Forage suitability group: Sandy soils on stream terraces, flood plains, or in depressions (G155XB145FL)
Other vegetative classification: Salt Marsh (R155XY009FL)
Hydric soil rating: Yes

## Minor Components

## Samsula

Percent of map unit: 10 percent
Landform: Depressions on marine terraces
Landform position (three-dimensional): Dip
Down-slope shape: Concave
Across-slope shape: Concave
Other vegetative classification: Freshwater Marshes and Ponds (R155XY010FL)

Hydric soil rating: Yes

## 38-Pinellas fine sand

## Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 1j72q
Elevation: 20 to 100 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 48 to 56 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 70 to 77 degrees F
Frost-free period: 324 to 354 days
Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

## Map Unit Composition

Pinellas and similar soils: 91 percent
Minor components: 9 percent
Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

## Description of Pinellas

Setting
Landform: Plains on marine terraces
Landform position (three-dimensional): Talf
Down-slope shape: Convex
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Sandy and loamy marine deposits
Typical profile
A - 0 to 4 inches: fine sand
$E-4$ to 11 inches: fine sand
Bk-11 to 22 inches: fine sand
Btg - 22 to 27 inches: sandy clay loam
Cg-27 to 80 inches: loamy sand
Properties and qualities
Slope: 0 to 2 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Natural drainage class: Poorly drained
Runoff class: Very high
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to high ( 0.57 to $1.98 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ )
Depth to water table: About 6 to 18 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Calcium carbonate, maximum in profile: 20 percent
Salinity, maximum in profile: Nonsaline to very slightly saline ( 0.0 to 2.0 mmhos/cm)
Sodium adsorption ratio, maximum in profile: 4.0
Available water storage in profile: Low (about 3.8 inches)
Interpretive groups
Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified

Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 3w
Hydrologic Soil Group: B/D
Forage suitability group: Sandy over loamy soils on flats of hydric or mesic lowlands (G155XB241FL)
Other vegetative classification: Cabbage Palm Flatwoods (R155XY005FL)
Hydric soil rating: No

## Minor Components

## Malabar

Percent of map unit: 5 percent
Landform: Drainageways on marine terraces Landform position (three-dimensional): Dip Down-slope shape: Linear Across-slope shape: Concave Other vegetative classification: Slough (R155XY011FL) Hydric soil rating: Yes

## Wabasso

Percent of map unit: 4 percent Landform: Flatwoods on marine terraces Landform position (three-dimensional): Talf Down-slope shape: Convex Across-slope shape: Linear Other vegetative classification: South Florida Flatwoods (R155XY003FL)
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