

ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT 9-A7-1

Progress Energy Public Involvement Process

Progress Energy Public Involvement Process

In June of 2007, Progress Energy (PEF) initiated a proactive process to inform the public and obtain public input on the planning for the electric transmission facilities associated with the proposed nuclear plant in Levy County. PEF created the Community Partnership for Energy Planning (CPEP) which is a partnership between PEF and a broad range of stakeholders designed to include all interests within the communities that may be impacted by new transmission facilities. Stakeholders involved in the process include local government, regional planners, land and property owners, environmentalists, agencies for environmental resource agencies, and business owners among others.

Initial Communications and Public Involvement - Early in the planning process, PEF began a broad communication effort to inform the public about the potential for significant new transmission lines within the state, as well as how they could get involved and provide input. Initially, PEF representatives informed respective government officials and staff of the identified counties of its planning process and communication plans. PEF also hired firms that specialize in meeting design and facilitation and have experience in electric utility issues. They assisted PEF in the design and implementation of its comprehensive public involvement process. The Utility Search Conference process, designed to allow an open dialogue between various stakeholders and public interest groups, was utilized as part of the community involvement process.

Leadership Teams of key community leaders were formed between July and September of 2007 in three regions representing Hillsborough, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, Citrus, Hernando, Levy, Lake, Marion and Sumter Counties. These teams assisted PEF in designing and conducting public involvement activities in the three regions. This public involvement activity included two-day Utility Search Conferences that were conducted between September and November in each of the three regions. The leadership teams began a nomination process that identified approximately 80 to 100 potential participants for the two-day conferences. The leadership team selected the final participants for the conferences based on the nominations from the community.

Background Report – Members of the Leadership Team volunteered to participate on a Background Report Committee to oversee the development of a report that would provide objective information about the energy challenges facing Florida. The report was assembled

and has been provided to the participants of the CPEP as well as other community stakeholders and the media. It was also provided to all participants of the Utility Search Conferences in advance of the two-day meetings.

Utility Search Conferences - The conferences included approximately 40 participants during each session. The participants represented eight stakeholder groups including government, business, civic, environmental groups, agencies, utilities and various public interest groups. The participants in the conferences spent two days considering local community issues and the future of electric energy supply in the region. The meetings were open to the public. Public involvement activities involving local media outlets were conducted prior to the Utility Search Conferences.

PEF received recommendations from the participants at the Utility Search Conferences. These recommendations included specific, detailed input on the corridor options PEF was considering, their priorities for siting transmission (i.e. co-location, minimizing environmental impact, etc.) and other recommendations related to future energy planning. Below is the feedback given by each Utility Search Conference on their priorities for transmission line siting.

**Community Criteria for Transmission Infrastructure Siting
(Group A - Hillsborough, Pasco, Pinellas & Polk Counties)**

1. Co-location with other present and future parallel infrastructure
2. Costs: Life Cycle Cost (LCC), alternatives, land availability, distance, who pays?
3. Compatibility with existing and future growth plans and visions (hard and green infrastructure)
4. Coordinate planning, regulatory agency and public participation
5. Avoid environmentally sensitive areas
6. Safety
7. Meet customer demand
8. Easily approved

**Community Criteria for Transmission Infrastructure Siting
(Group B - Citrus, Hernando & Levy Counties)**

1. Co-location (existing transportation, utility easements) – create a “Super Corridor” of utility infrastructure
2. Minimize impacts on environmentally sensitive areas and on communities
3. Utilize best technology and underground where feasible

**Community Criteria for Transmission Infrastructure Siting
(Group C - Lake, Marion & Sumter Counties)**

1. Environmental impact
2. Public and political acceptance (including aesthetics, land use)
3. Constructability
4. Aesthetics
5. Co-location, maximize use of already impacted area
6. Safety – to local community, reliability
7. Cost of improvements
8. The participants felt that PEF should include following additional criteria - Respect for agricultural land/maintaining rural character

Community Working Groups - Subsequent to the Utility Search Conferences, Community Working Groups (CWGs) have been formed in all three regions. These CWGs consist of approximately 25 community representatives many who participated in the Search Conferences. These CWGs are working with PEF to refine the various recommendations from the Utility Search Conferences and plan additional and broad community outreach.

Open Houses - With the guidance of the CWGs, thirteen open houses were planned and conducted during February and March 2008, in all ten counties potentially impacted by the new transmission lines. These open houses were sponsored by the Community Partnership for Energy Planning and PEF. Corridor information evaluated at the Utility Search Conferences was made available at the open houses for review by the broader public. All property owners within these mile wide corridors study areas were invited to the open houses. In addition, government officials, regional planners, homeowners associations, agencies, media and other interested parties identified by the CWGs were invited to these forums. PEF provided approximately 40 subject matter experts at each open house to address community issues and concerns such as siting and acquisition of rights-of-way, construction, EMFs, regulation, community involvement, environmental issues, property values and other key issues.

13 Open Houses Conducted in February and March 2008

- **More than 107,000 letters to property owners**
- **Letters to all local governments identified along corridor study areas**
- **Letters to regional planning organizations, agencies and civic associations**
- **Advertisements ran in all local media outlets**
- **All members of the Community Partnership for Energy Planning were included – Leadership Teams, Utility Search Conference participants, Community Working Groups**

PEF documented public input on the corridor study areas at the open houses via questionnaires. All attendees were encouraged to complete a questionnaire and approximately 60 percent of attendees did so. As a portion of the questionnaire, participants were asked to rank the 12 criteria used to site transmission line corridors.

Open House Questionnaire Results

Questionnaire results from each open house were tabulated by the frequency of the ranks assigned to each criterion. In turn, the percentage of responses assigned to each rank was calculated. To determine the overall ranking for each criterion, a weighted percentage was also calculated. The table below illustrates the criteria which the participants ranked the most important in selecting the location of the proposed transmission line corridor.

All three open house groups surveyed identified the most important factors to consider when selecting the location of a proposed transmission line are: minimize the number of residences in the corridor; the maximum length should be located through an existing transmission line right-of-way (ROW), and the transmission line should be co-located along another linear facility.

OPEN HOUSES – CRITERIA RANKING			
SURVEY CRITERIA	RANKING OF IMPORTANCE		
	Group A	Group B	Group C
Minimum residences in corridor	1	1	1
Maximum length thru existing ROW	2	2	2
Maximum co-locate along other linear facility	3	3	3
Minimum schools in corridor	4	5	6
Minimum number or parcels crossed	5	4	5
Minimum length thru conservation lands	6	6	4
Minimum length thru cultural resources	7	7	8
Minimum length of forested wetlands	8	12	7
Minimum number of protected species	9	8	10
Minimum length of herbaceous wetlands	10	9	9
Minimum number of eagle nests	11	11	12
Minimum cost of construction	12	10	11

Other Outreach Activities - In addition to the open houses, PEF is conducting public meetings with local governments, homeowners associations and special interest groups within the ten counties. Information received from these efforts is being incorporated into the transmission corridor planning process.

ATTACHMENT 9-A7-2

County and Municipal Comprehensive Plans

CITRUS COUNTY FUTURE LAND USE CATEGORIES

- The designation of lower density development outside the urban service areas where the supporting infrastructure is not available or proposed
- Limiting development to low density and intensity uses within the Coastal, Lakes, and Rivers Areas of the County
- Limiting the development of new mobile home parks, hospitals, congregate living facilities, correctional facilities, and similar uses or facilities serving special needs populations within the Coastal High Hazard Area
- Protecting natural and historic resources in the County by designating low intensity and compatible uses adjacent to conservation areas
- Establishment of commercial nodes at appropriate locations to limit strip commercial development, reduce sprawl, take advantage of economies of scale, reduce travel times and distances, increase commercial viability, and to protect the County's rural character between nodes
- Allowing the co-location of residences and businesses on commercial parcels in order to enable property owners to work and live on the same property thereby reducing costs, improving financial stability, improving security, and improving the design and maintenance of commercial property
- Requiring the permanent preservation of open space in all new residential subdivisions and mixed use developments
- Utilization of a County Land Development Code which will set standards for development throughout the County

D. Future Land Use Categories

The land use categories described in this section are illustrated on the Generalized Future Land Use Map. The 1995 Generalized Future Land Use Map was produced at a scale (one inch = one mile) where it was not feasible to show parcels less than 10 acres in size. Thus, the current map is not parcel-specific.

All land uses less than 10 acres not depicted on the map will be recognized based on:

- The residential density limitations set forth in this Plan
- The land use category assigned in the adopted Land Use Atlas
- The zoning designation in the official zoning atlas
- The vested plan of development, if any

With the exception of vested projects, no residential development shall exceed the residential density limitations set forth in this Plan.

The maximum permitted densities for each land use category on the GFLUM is presented in Table 10-22, and the tabulation of acres is in Table 10-23.

The capacity of the GFLUM to accommodate future population is estimated for the maximum permitted densities. If the maximum density by right is applied to all assigned residential categories, the result is a maximum potential population of 603,100 persons (refer to Appendix F).

As noted above, the 1997 GFLUM is not parcel specific which can create problems with analysis and in tracking changes in smaller parcels over time. The County is developing a parcel-based Future Land Use Map and subsequently, will develop a linked database to enable better monitoring of land use changes and to provide sufficient data for detailed land use analyses. The parcel-based map will be adopted along with the EAR-based amendments updating the Comprehensive Plan. Once the parcel attributes are verified for the new database, entirely new existing and future land use analyses will be performed. The results of these analyses will detail vacant and improved properties, calculate potential population growth based upon the number of vacant parcels and allowed densities, and will enable the County to evaluate various development scenarios and the demands they will place upon public facilities and infrastructure.

1. Low Intensity Coastal and Lakes (CL)

This land use category designates those areas having environmental characteristics that are sensitive to development and therefore should be protected. Residential development in this district is limited to a maximum of one dwelling unit per 20 acres and one unit per 40 acres in the Federal Emergency Management Agency's V-zone. All vacant and uncommitted land in the Coastal, Lakes, and Rivers Area will be placed in this category. This land use category also recognizes existing valid unrecorded and recorded subdivisions. Densities in existing, platted subdivisions are based on the existing lot sizes. Higher density development is permitted only if in accordance with the following provisions:

- a. Planned development within the Coastal, Lakes, and Rivers Areas, with the exception of FEMA V-zone areas, may be allowed as an amendment to this Plan, if such development is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies in this Plan and provided that the following requirements are met:
 - A minimum parcel size of 160 acres (smaller parcels may be combined to form a 160 acre parcel) with a common plan of development
 - A gross density not to exceed 0.2 dwelling units per acre (one dwelling unit per five acres)
 - Connection to regional water and sewer facilities is required
 - One hundred percent protection of wetlands must be assured
 - Clustering of units to ensure the preservation of 80 percent of existing uplands for open space is required
 - Stricter standards for stormwater and wildlife protection will be required
 - A 1,000-foot buffer around lands designated as part of the St. Martins Marsh Aquatic Preserve must be provided
- b. Florida Quality Development, pursuant to Chapter 380, F. S., will be allowed without a Comprehensive Plan Amendment at a maximum gross density of one unit per one acre; however, residential dwellings and nonresidential uses

shall be clustered to ensure the preservation of at least 70 percent of the gross site acreage as permanent conservation areas and open space, excluding active recreation areas.

- c. Planned development within the upland areas of the Lakes and Rivers Region may be permitted at a density not to exceed 0.1 dwelling units per acre (one dwelling unit per 10 acres) subject to the following special conditions:
- A minimum of 20 upland acres is required. Documentation of sufficient upland soils on site shall be provided by the applicant based on data from the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), water management district or other appropriate agency.
 - Open Space requirements: Clustering of units to preserve 80 percent of the gross site area as permanent open space is required, consistent with Policy 17.15.11 of this Plan.
 - All projects proposed under this option shall provide a biological survey pursuant to Conservation Element, Policy 3.8.8.

In addition to single family residential development, the following land uses may be allowed provided the permitted use is compatible with the surrounding area, and standards for development are met as specified in the Citrus County Land Development Code (LDC).

- Multifamily residences (in existing platted areas only or in lieu of clustering single family units at a density of one unit per lot of record and requiring the recombination of said lots. For example, a duplex requires two lots to be recombined into a single parcel, a quadruplex four lots, etc.)
- Recreational uses
- Agricultural and Silviculture uses
- Public/Semi-Public, Institutional facilities
- Home occupations
- New railroad rights-of-way, storage facilities, or related structures
- Communication towers
- Utilities
- Commercial fishing and marina related uses
- Commercial uses that are water related, water dependent, or necessary for the support of the immediate population

A development within the Low Intensity Coastal, Lakes, and Rivers District must adhere to the standards for development contained in this Element, as well as any additional standards in the County LDC.

These Districts also include lands developed in the Coastal Area, which have historically supported commercial fishing operations. The Districts were designed to protect unique and irreplaceable assets, which are associated with

the Gulf Coast Area. Commercial fish operations are permitted in the Coastal Area provided the standards and criteria specified in the LDC are met.

2. Rural Residential (RUR)

This land use category primarily represents those areas that are in transition between higher density developments and agricultural or conservation uses. This category encourages the preservation of economically viable agricultural land and large tracts of residential land in order to maintain a rural atmosphere in appropriate areas of the County.

This category allows for residential densities of up to one dwelling unit per 10 acres. No Rural Residential land shall be designated in the Planned Service Areas. Higher density developments, up to one unit per five acres, are only permitted if additional standards for development are met. Planned Development is only permitted subject to the following open space preservation requirement:

- Clustering of units to preserve at least 50 percent of the property consistent with Policy 17.15.11 of this Plan

In addition to residential development, the following land uses shall be allowed, provided the permitted use is compatible with the surrounding area, and standards for development are met as specified in the County Land Development Code:

- Recreation Uses
- Agricultural and Silviculture uses
- Public/Semi-Public, Institutional facilities
- Home Occupations
- New railroad rights-of-way, storage facilities, or related structures.
- Communication Towers
- Utilities

3. Low Density Residential (LDR)

This category allows for single family residential development at a maximum density of 2.0 dwelling units per acre. Higher density developments, 2.1 to 6.0 units per acre, are only permitted if additional standards for development are met.

In addition to single family residential development, the following land uses shall be allowed provided the permitted use is compatible with the surrounding area and standards for development are met as specified in the County Land Development Code:

- Attached Housing
- Silviculture Uses
- Recreational Uses

- Public/Semi-Public, Institutional Facilities
- Home Occupations
- Utilities

4. Medium Density Residential (MDR)

This land use category is representative of an urbanizing area. The category allows for single family residential development at a maximum density of up to 4.0 units per acre. Higher density developments, 4.1 to 8.0 units per acre, are only permitted if additional standards for development are met.

In addition to single-family residential development, the following land uses shall be allowed provided the permitted use is compatible with the surrounding area, and standards for development are met as specified in the County Land Development Code:

- Multifamily Residences
- Home Occupations
- Recreational Uses
- Public/Semi-Public, Institutional Facilities
- Utilities
- Professional Services and Offices in association with Housing Developments
- Limited Commercial Use in association with Housing Developments

5. High Density Residential (HDR)

This is the highest density residential land use category and is representative of a compact urban growth area. This category allows for multifamily units and planned developments, all of which must meet development standards. This category allows for a maximum density of 6.0 units per acre. Higher density development, up to 20 units per acre, is only permitted if additional standards for development are met.

In addition to residential development, the following land uses shall be allowed provided the permitted use is compatible with the surrounding area, and standards for development are met as specified in the County Land Development Code:

- Multifamily residential and at a density of 6.0 to 20.0 units per acre
- Home Occupations
- Recreational Uses
- Public/Semi-Public, Institutional Uses
- Utilities
- Professional Services and Offices in association with Housing Developments
- Limited Commercial Use in association with Housing Developments

TABLE 10-22
MAXIMUM PERMITTED DENSITY BY LAND USE CATEGORY

LAND USE DISTRICT		MAXIMUM RESIDENTIAL DENSITY	
		Permitted Density	Planned Development
Low Intensity Coastal and Lakes Residential	CL	1du/20, 1du/40 in "V" zone	1 du/5 acres w/ special PD conditions 1 du/one acre w/ FQD 1 du/10 acres w/ special PD conditions (1)
Rural Residential	RUR	1 du /10 ac	1 du/5 ac
Low Density Residential	LDR	2 du/ac	6 du/ac
Medium Density Residential	MDR	4 du/ac	8 du/ac
High Density Residential	HDR	6 du/ac	20 du/ac
Residential Mixed Use	RMU	As approved	6 du/ac
Central Ridge Residential	CRR	As approved	N/A
Mobile Home Park	MHP	6 du/ac	9 du/ac (4)
Professional Services/Offices	PSO	4 du/ac	10 du/ac
General Commercial	GNC	6 du/ac	10 du/ac
Coastal and Lakes Commercial	CLC	1du/20, 1du/40 in "V" zone (2)	N/A
Rural Activity Center	RAC	2 du/ac (3)	N/A
Recreational Vehicle Park/Campground	RVP	10 pads/ac	14 pads/ac (5)
Industrial	IND	N/A	N/A
Extractive	EXT	N/A	N/A
Public/Semi-Public, Institutional	PSI	4 du/ac	N/A
Transportation, Communications, Utilities	TCU	N/A	N/A
Recreation	REC	N/A	N/A
Agriculture	AGR	1 du/10 ac	1 du/5 ac
Conservation	CON	N/A	N/A

N/A = not applicable

du = dwelling unit

(1) Lakes and Rivers Area Only

(2) Single family dwelling units are allowed on the second floor of buildings or as attached or detached dwelling units behind a business

(3) Single family units are allowed on the second floor of buildings, as attached or detached dwellings behind a business, or on a valid lot of record

(4) Requires preservation of at least 50 percent open space

(5) Additional requirements in environmentally sensitive areas (refer to Policy 17.6.12)

Prepared by: Citrus County Community Development Division, October 2003

**TABLE 10-23
GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE MAP (GFLUM)
TABULATION OF ACREAGE - CITRUS COUNTY**

Land Use District	GFLUM Acres			
	1997		2004	
	Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage
Low Intensity Coastal and Lakes Residential	55,722	15.44%	53,123	14.87%
Rural Residential	47,487	13.15%	46,220	12.94%
Low Density Residential	32,344	8.96%	28,732	8.04%
Medium Density Residential	15,699	4.35%	14,861	4.16%
High Density Residential	199	0.06%	239	0.07%
Residential Mixed Use	48,236	13.36%	41,289	11.56%
Central Ridge Residential	203	0.06%	1,829	0.51%
Mobile Home Park	0	0.00%	172	0.05%
Professional Services/Offices	1,198	0.33%	1,319	0.37%
General Commercial	4,897	1.36%	5,359	1.50%
Coastal and Lakes Commercial	0	0.00%	9	0.00%
Rural Activity Center	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Recreational Vehicle Park/Campground	0	0.00%	189	0.05%
Industrial	2,590	0.72%	2,388	0.67%
Extractive	9,021	2.50%	7,426	2.08%
Public/Semi-Public, Institutional	885	0.25%	1,151	0.32%
Transportation, Communications, Utilities	7,666	2.12%	7,979	2.23%
Recreation	6,558	1.82%	6,714	1.88%
Agriculture	23,034	6.38%	22,922	6.42%
Conservation	105,259	29.16%	115,266	32.27%
TOTAL	361,008	100.00%	357,187	100.00%

Notes:

1997 Figures were based on the proposed GFLUM, 1997, First Cycle, unincorporated area only. 2004 figures were calculated from changes from 1997 through 2004. Total acreages for 1997 and 2004 are not the same due to some differences in estimation techniques. Difference is 1percent. All numbers are approximate

Prepared by: Citrus County Planning Division, October, 1997

Revised by: Citrus County Community Development Division, October, 2003 and February 2004

6. Residential Mixed Use (RMU)

This category is established to provide for integrated planned developments where a mixture of land uses is permitted and encouraged. The maximum permitted residential density is 6.0 dwelling units per acre. This category will replace the PDR category. All new RMU land use shall require a Comprehensive Plan

Amendment. All existing Planned Developments shall be designated as RMU on the GFLUM. No new RMU is permitted in the Central Ridge Area unless it is within the PSA.

Permitted land uses include single family residential, multifamily residential, public/semi-public, recreational, professional services/office, commercial, and limited industrial. Site plan review and approval is required in accordance with the LDC Planned Development Review process.

7. Mobile Home Park (MHP)

This category is established to recognize existing manufactured housing and mobile home parks, as well as, to provide for the development of new ones. This category is intended to encourage compact, affordable, high quality housing with adequate amenities which is compatible with surrounding land uses.

The maximum permitted density is six (6.0) dwelling units per acre. Up to nine (9.0) units per acre may be allowed provided that 50 percent (50%) of the property remains in common open space. Site plan review and approval is required in accordance with the LDC planned development review process. New mobile home parks shall be required to preserve twenty percent (20%) of the gross site area as permanent open space and no individual lot or space shall be larger than one-ninth of an acre (4,840 square feet). Open space shall be preserved through permanent conservation easements or similar legal instruments to preclude future development or further subdivision of the land. Preserved areas shall be owned in common by all residents, a land trust, or an appropriate, legal association and may be used for passive recreation, agriculture, or silviculture. Limited structures such as barns, stables, agricultural buildings, gazebos, and picnic shelters shall be allowed within the preserved areas, but storage areas and sheds, workshops, garages, and similar accessory structures are prohibited.

In addition to residential development, the following land uses, as detailed in the Land Development Code (LDC), shall be allowed provided the permitted use is compatible with the surrounding area, and standards for development are met as specified in the LDC:

- Recreational Uses
- Agricultural and Silvicultural Uses
- Public/Semi-public, Institutional Facilities
- Convenience retail and personal services to serve park residents, up to one percent (1%) of the gross site area, not to exceed 5,000 square feet, located within the development and not accessible from any external road

8. Professional Services/Office (PSO)

This category represents a very limited use of land and designates those areas where professional office development is appropriate. This land use category is representative of a buffer area between commercial and residential development, or as a transitional use between residential areas and major thoroughfares.

In addition to office use, the following land uses shall be allowed provided the permitted use is compatible with the surrounding area, and standards for development are met as specified in the County Land Development Code:

- Recreational Uses
- Public/Semi-Public, Institutional Facilities
- Utilities
- Neighborhood Commercial Development
- Adult and Child Day Care Centers
- Multifamily Residential, up to a maximum of 10.0 units per acre, however, such residential development shall be required to preserve at least twenty percent (20%) of the gross site area as permanent open space, consistent with Policy 17.15.11 of this Plan
- Multifamily Residential is not permitted in the coastal high hazard area pursuant to Policy 17.3.17

9. General Commercial (GNC)

Commercial and office development is permitted in this category; however, if located along any roadway designated as an arterial, development must complete the site plan or development review process in conformance with all corridor planning zone standards.

In addition, multifamily residential development (over six units per acre, but no more than 10 units per acre) shall be allowed in accordance with existing land use/zoning categories; however, such residential development shall be required to preserve at least twenty percent (20%) of the gross site area as permanent open space, consistent with Policy 17.15.11 of this Plan. Single family residential development shall be allowed only if the structure has access to a local residential roadway, and is in a residentially committed area, or is associated with a business owned and operated by the homeowner.

Because the GNC district allows potentially high density/intensity development, it should not be located in areas of the County deemed to be environmentally sensitive areas. No new GNC shall be allowed in the coastal, lakes and rivers region. New GNC shall be limited to the central ridge region.

10. Coastal and Lakes Commercial (CLC)

This category designates those areas suitable for commercial development within the coastal, lakes, and rivers regions. The commercial uses allowed in this category are water related, water dependent, or necessary for the support of the immediate population, that is, neighborhood commercial uses, personal services, and professional services. The designation is generally intended for a single business entity on a single parcel of property. Commercial centers are not allowed, but multiple activities operated by a sole entity may be allowed. This requirement is not intended to limit the number of structures as long as the development meets all the standards of the Land Development Code.

In addition to commercial uses, the category allows for a single family residence associated with the primary commercial use of a lot or parcel. Such single family dwelling units are allowed on the second floor of a building, or as an attached ground floor unit at the rear of the business, or as a detached dwelling unit at the rear of the property. Properties with water dependent or water related businesses may locate residences at the front of the property. Site planning shall ensure residential units are set back sufficiently from side and/or rear property lines to accommodate a yard area and that the residential unit is clearly accessory to the commercial use. CLC designated lands shall not be subdivided for the purpose of increasing residential density beyond the density allowed within the low intensity coastal and lakes region.

11. Rural Activity Centers (RAC)

The Rural Activity Center is intended to further the policies of the Comprehensive Plan by encouraging the in-filling of existing commercial uses and continuing the existing commercial land uses at appropriate locations. Rural Activity Centers shall be depicted within the Future Land Use Map series. The Rural Activity Center provides for a nodal type development pattern of commercial uses at such locations.

Development within these nodes provides for future development consistent with the nodal concept of development rather than linear development outside of the activity center. Development within Rural Activity Centers shall conform to the following standards:

- a. Residential development within the Rural Activity Centers shall be permitted at a density of up to two dwellings per acre (2.0 du/ac).
- b. Nonresidential uses are permitted, but shall be limited to an intensity and scale necessary to provide the immediate rural population with retail and personal services, uses which are generally classified as neighborhood commercial and professional services and offices, including medical offices, clinics, and

pharmacies. The following uses are allowed subject to the standards in the LDC: grocery stores, motor vehicle repair shops, gasoline sales and service, convenience stores with gasoline sales, taverns, retail nurseries, building/trade contractors (with outside storage), veterinary offices/animal hospitals (with outside kennels), and pet grooming/kennels. Other General Commercial uses are not allowed. Such determination should be based on market area radius and minimum population support criteria. Nonresidential uses shall be concentrated at the center of the Rural Activity Center with direct access to a collector or arterial intersection.

c. Location and Size Requirements

- 1) In the case of a Rural Activity Center that occurs at an intersection, the center of the node is determined to be the center of the intersection. The boundaries of the node shall not exceed 1,320 feet (¼ mile) in each direction.
- 2) New Rural Activity Centers will be required to be separated by a distance of at least three miles from the center of one node to the center of the next.
- 3) The RAC must be located on a paved roadway that is maintained by either the State of Florida or Citrus County. For those RAC's that are located at intersections, both of the roadways must be maintained by either the State of Florida or Citrus County.

d. Comprehensive Plan Amendment Required

In order for a newly identified RAC to be indicated upon the Future Land Use Map, the area must meet the conditions specified above, and shall require a Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

- e. The Land Development Code shall be amended to include standards and criteria for development within the RAC.

12. Recreational Vehicle Park/Campground (RVP)

This category is intended to recognize existing Recreational Vehicle (RV) Parks and Campgrounds, as well as to provide for the location and development of new parks for recreational vehicles. Such parks are intended specifically to allow temporary living accommodation for recreation, camping, or travel use.

This category allows recreational vehicle development with a maximum density of 10 ad spaces per acre. Up to 14 pad spaces is allowed provided that at least 50% of the property is maintained as permanent open space.

New RV parks shall be required to preserve thirty percent (30%) of the gross site area as permanent open space, consistent with Policy 17.15.11 of this Plan.

In addition to RV/campsite development, the following land uses as detailed in the Land Development Code, shall be allowed provided the permitted use is compatible with the surrounding area, and standards for development are met as specified in the County Land Development Code:

- Recreational Uses
- Agricultural and Silvicultural Uses
- Public/Semi-Public, Institutional Facilities
- Convenience retail and personal services to serve park visitors and guests, up to one percent of the gross site area, not to exceed 5,000 square feet, located within the development and not accessible from any external road

13. Industrial (IND)

This land use category is intended for manufacturing, processing, storage and warehousing, wholesaling, and distribution. The Industrial category allows for any industrial use or transportation, communication, utility use, which conforms to performance standards as specified in the County Land Development Code.

14. Extractive (EXT)

The Extractive land use category allows for surface mining operations, and encompasses areas rich in limestone and dolomite. This category permits rock quarries, as well as, strip mines such as clay, sand, and gravel. Industrial complexes where the extracted material is refined, packaged, or further processed are also allowed in this category.

In addition to mining, the following land uses shall be allowed provided standards for development are met as specified in the County Land Development Code:

- Limited Recreation Use
- Agricultural Uses
- Rail rights-of-way, including switching, freight, or storage yards
- Communication Towers
- A single Caretaker Residence

15. Public/Semi-Public, Institutional (PSI)

This District definition consists of public or private facilities/uses designed to serve the cultural needs of the County. The facilities are generally owned or operated by public bodies or by nonprofit entities. Public uses mean those owned or operated by a public entity. Semi-Public uses serve the public but are owned or operated by a non-public body such as a nonprofit organization or may include

some private for profit uses fitting into the character and purpose of, for example: hospitals, nursing homes, and theaters. The intent of this District is to provide cultural facilities rather than to provide for commercial uses.

Included within this category are uses and facilities of the categories of 1) educational such as nature centers; 2) government; 3) health/medical; 4) religious; 5) cultural, such as art galleries, museums, theaters, playhouses, and libraries; and 6) limited recreation that fit into the character and purpose of uses such as primitive/summer/scout camps, arboretums, playgrounds, and outdoor ballfields or courts, rather than commercial recreation.

16. Transportation, Communications, and Utilities (TCU)

This land use category allows for those uses directly related to transportation, communications, and utilities; it also accommodates service and storage related facilities necessary to support such uses.

17. Recreation (REC)

This land use category designates those areas, public and private, where outdoor recreation is the primary land use. Other related recreational or supporting ancillary uses are allowed within this land use category including marinas, golf courses, fishing and hunting camps, and recreational vehicle (RV) parks provided RV density is limited to no more than seven units per acre and intensity does not exceed 30 percent of the total recreation site. For example, a 100 acre site that is designated for recreation could include up to a 30 acre RV park component as long as the remaining 70 acres is used for outdoor recreation.

Indoor facilities including enclosed sports stadiums and sports training facilities, as well as amusement parks or similar attractions shall not be considered as a recreational land use or as a supporting or ancillary use.

18. Agriculture (AGR)

This land use category designates those areas suitable for crops, pasture, forestry, and rangeland.

All agricultural uses are permitted, as well as, single family residences at a maximum density of one unit per 10 acres. Higher density developments, up to one unit per five acres, are only permitted if additional standards for development are met. No land within a Planned Service Area may be designated as agriculture. Planned Development is only permitted subject to the following open space preservation requirements.

- Planned Development within this district shall be required to cluster homes and preserve at least fifty percent (50%) of the property, consistent with Policy 17.15.11 of this Plan.

In addition to agricultural and residential use, this category permits the following uses provided the permitted use is compatible with the surrounding area, and standards for development are met as specified in the County Land Development Code:

- Recreational Uses
- Public/Semi-Public, Institutional Uses
- Utilities
- New railroad rights-of-way, storage facilities, or related structures

Silviculture is considered an Agricultural use; however, Silviculture shall be regarded as a separate permitted use in several land use categories.

19. Conservation (CON)

This land use category designated publicly owned lands where management objectives are directed towards the protection and conservation of sensitive land, water, and other natural resources. These areas may also support resource-based recreational development, public water supply wellfields and ancillary facilities essential to their primary purposes. In the event that privately owned property is designated as conservation, it may be developed at a density not to exceed one dwelling unit per lot, parcel, or tract of record as of the date of adoption of the Plan.


20. Central Ridge Residential (CRR)

This category, permitted only within the PSA, allows for single family residential development at a density no greater than the density of the existing subdivision. Planned Developments are not permitted. This category may be assigned to only a portion of a subdivision.

In addition to single family residential development, the following land uses shall be allowed provided the permitted use is compatible with the surrounding area, and standards for development are met as specified in the County Land Development Code, Ordinance No. 90-14, as amended:

- Recreation Uses
- Public/Semi-Public, Institutional facilities
- Utilities

CITRUS COUNTY FUTURE LAND USE MAP



Community Development Division
Working for the future

ADOPTION DATE: April 12, 1985, 7:11 PM
AMENDED:
October 21, 2006, 1:12 PM KATU

ATTACHMENT 9-A7-3

Preliminary Cultural Resources Report

Preliminary Cultural Resources Report
for the
Progress Energy BBW, CB, CCRE, IO, IS and PHP Corridors
in Citrus, Hernando, Hillsborough, Levy, Pinellas, and Polk Counties

Prepared for:

Progress Energy Florida, Inc.
P.O. Box 14042
St. Petersburg, Florida 33733

Prepared by:

Janus Research, Inc.
1300 North Westshore Boulevard, Suite 100
Tampa, Florida 33607

In cooperation with:

Golder Associates, Inc.
5100 West Lemon Street, Suite 114
Tampa, Florida 33609

May 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	1
LIST OF TABLES.....	1
LIST OF ATTACHMENTS	1
INTRODUCTION	2
Location of Corridors.....	2
METHODS	4
RESULTS	5
Previously Conducted Cultural Resource Surveys	5
Previously Recorded Cultural Resources.....	10
Potential Cultural Resources.....	14
AGENCY COORDINATION	17
CLG Coordination	17
FDHR/SHPO Coordination	17
TRIBAL COORDINATION	18
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	20
Summary of Issues.....	20
REFERENCES	22

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Location of Corridors.....	3
Table 2. Previously Conducted Cultural Resource Surveys within the Corridors.....	5
Table 3. Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites within/adjacent to the Corridors.....	10
Table 4. Previously Recorded Historic Structures within/adjacent to the Corridors.....	14

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: USGS Quadrangle Map Locations of Archaeological Sites that are NRHP–Eligible or Potentially NRHP–Eligible, have the Potential for Human Remains, or have Possible Paleoindian Components
Attachment B: FDHR/SHPO Coordination
Attachment C: Selected Pages of the Schedule of Indian Land Cessions Applicable to Citrus, Hernando, Hillsborough, Levy, Pinellas, and Polk Counties with Accompanying Map

INTRODUCTION

Janus Research conducted a detailed desktop analysis for six corridors of the Progress Energy Florida Central Florida Corridor Study (PEFCFCS) from March 2008 through May 2008. These corridors include the ‘230 kV Brookridge Substation – Brooksville West Substation Transmission Line’ (BBW), the ‘230 kV Crystal River Energy Complex – Brookridge Substation Transmission Line’ (CB), the ‘230 kV Proposed Citrus Substation – Crystal River East Substation (2 Transmission Line Circuits)’ (CCRE), the ‘69 kV South Levy Nuclear Plant Construction/Administration Transmission Line’ (IO), the ‘69 kV North Levy Nuclear Plant Construction/Administration Transmission Line’ (IS), and the ‘230 kV Polk-Hillsborough-Pinellas (PHP) Transmission Line (Kathleen Substation – Lake Tarpon Substation)’.

The purpose of this desktop analysis was to identify any previously recorded cultural resources and areas with potential for containing unrecorded cultural resources within these corridors. Previously recorded archaeological sites and historic resources as well as areas with the potential for containing unrecorded resources were identified.

The Principal Investigator, Kathleen S. Hoffman, Ph.D., meets the *Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards* (48 FR 44716).

Location of Corridors

A breakdown of corridor locations is included in Table 1. The corridors are located on the Brooksville (1954 PR 1988), Chassahowitzka (1966 PR 1980), Citrus Park (1956 PR 1969), Crystal River (1954 PR 1988), Homosassa (1954 PR 1988), Oldsmar (1974), Plant City East (1975 PR 1987, minor revision 1993), Plant City West (1975, minor revision 1993), Red Level (1954 PR 1988 with minor revisions in 1992), Socrum (1975), Sulphur Springs (1956 PR 1987), Thonotosassa (1974 PR 1987), Weekiwachee Springs (1954 PR 1988), Yankeetown (1955 PR 1988), and Yankeetown SE (1954) USGS Quadrangle maps. Geographic Information System (GIS) data regarding more detailed location information for these corridors can be provided by Golder Associates.

Table 1. Location of Corridors

Corridor	County	Township / Range / Section
BBW	Hernando	T22S / R18E / S 9, 10, 15, 16, 21, 22, 27, 28, 34
CB	Citrus, Hernando	T17S / R16E / S 25-29, 32-36 T17S / R17E / S 29-33 T18S / R17E / S 3, 4, 10-14, 23-25 T18S / R18E / S 19, 29-32 T19S / R18E / S 5-8, 17-19, 21, 28, 30-32 T20S / R18E / S 4, 5, 8, 9, 16, 17, 20, 21, 28, 29, 32, 33 T21S / R18E / S 4, 5, 8, 9, 16, 17, 20, 21, 28, 29, 32, 33 T22S / R18E / S 4, 5, 8-10, 15-18
CCRE	Citrus	T17S / R16E / S 25 T17S / R17E / S 29-32
IO	Levy	T16S / R17E / S 29-32 T17S / R16E / S 1 T17S / R17E / S 6
IS	Levy	T16S / R16E / S 13
PHP	Hillsborough, Pinellas, Polk	T26S / R23E / S 17-20, 29-32 T27S / R17E / S 34-36 T27S / R18E / S 21-24, 27-31 T27S / R19E / S 19-22, 26, 27, 35, 36 T27S / R20E / S 31 T27S / R23E / S 5-8, 17-20, 29-32 T28S / R16E / S 12, 13 T28S / R17E / S 3-5, 7, 8 T28S / R20E / S 1-6 T28S / R21E / S 1-6 T28S / R22E / S 1-6

METHODS

For the purposes of this desktop analysis, Janus Research defined separate areas of potential effects (APE) keyed to the different types of cultural resources. For archaeological sites, historic structures, and historic cemeteries, resources were noted if they fell within or adjacent to (within a buffer of 100 ft.) the corridors as effects to these resources are usually limited to areas of ground disturbance. Historic bridges and resource groups were noted if they fell within the corridors or within a distance of 1000 ft. to account for direct disturbance, as well as potential indirect effects such as visual effects.

Background research methods included a search of the Florida Master Site File (FMSF) to identify cultural resources that are listed, eligible, or potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and resources with potential or confirmed human remains. The FMSF serves as an archive and repository of information about Florida's recorded cultural resources. It represents an inventory of resources for which available information exists and describes their condition at a particular point of time. Because the inventory of resources is not all-inclusive on a statewide basis, gaps in data may exist. The FMSF is only as accurate and as comprehensive as the information that is submitted and users should be cognizant of the sometimes uneven quality of the information. The FMSF is an important planning tool that assists in identifying potential cultural resources issues and resources that may warrant further investigation and protection. It can be used as guide but should not be used to determine the Florida Division of Historical Resources'/State Historic Preservation Office's (FDHR/SHPO) official position about the significance of a resource.

USGS Quadrangle maps were also reviewed in order to identify potentially historic resources within the vicinity of the corridors. Additionally, a search for pertinent Certified Local Governments (CLG) located within the boundaries of the corridors was also conducted as CLGs often provide information regarding local resources which may not be included in the FMSF. Furthermore, National Park Service (NPS), Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), and United States Congressional documents were reviewed in order to determine the federally and state recognized tribes within Florida and determine if corridors traversed reservation land, land associated with state recognized tribes, or lands once considered to be tribally affiliated.

RESULTS

Previously Conducted Cultural Resource Surveys

The FMSF notes 61 previously conducted cultural resource surveys within the corridors. One previous survey (9193) intersected the BBW Corridor. Four previous surveys (2785, 4387, 8377, and 12807) intersected the BBW and CB corridors. One previous survey (4386) intersected the BBW, CB, CCRE, IS, and PHP corridors. Five previous surveys (104, 4590, 4732, 7108, and 7573) intersected the CB and CCRE corridors. One previous survey (8897) intersected only the IO corridor. Nine previous surveys (1466, 4914, 5012, 6375, 6547, 11562, 12402, 12713, and 13448) intersected only the CB Corridor. The remaining 40 previous surveys solely intersected the PHP Corridor.

Please note that some of these surveys occur within multiple corridors. While a total of 61 cultural resource surveys have been previously conducted within the corridors, large portions of the corridors have never been surveyed for cultural resources. These surveys were conducted between 1974 and 2006. The scopes of work vary and particularly, the early surveys may not meet current legal requirements or professional standards. It is likely that the FDHR/SHPO will require a cultural resource assessment survey (CRAS) of the final route within the corridors that meets the requirements of Chapter 1A-46 (Archaeological and Historical Report Standards and Guidelines), Florida Administrative Code. Once a final route is selected, continued coordination with FDHR/SHPO is recommended to determine the appropriate scope of work. The FMSF survey number, survey title, author, and publication date for each of the 61 surveys is included in Table 2.

Table 2. Previously Conducted Cultural Resource Surveys within the Corridors

Survey #	Survey Name, Author(s), and Date
99	A Cultural Resource Survey of the Northdale / North Lakes Subdivision, Hillsborough County, Florida (Grange and Williams 1978)
104	Archaeological-Historical Survey of Lake Rousseau to Crystal River Power Plant Water Supply Pipeline and Transmission Corridor Access Road, Citrus County, Florida (Willis 1978)
108	An Archaeological and Historical Survey of Seven Proposed Recreation Resource Sites in the Lower Hillsborough River Flood Detention Area [Hillsborough County, Florida] (FDHR 1979)
139	An Archaeological and Historical Survey of the Lake Thonotosassa By-Pass Canal Right-of-Way [Hillsborough County, Florida] (Deming and Williams 1976)
272	A Phase 2 Archaeological Assessment Survey of the Deltona Corporation's Tampa Palms Development in Northeastern Hillsborough County (Rom 1979)
517	An Archaeological Survey of the Pass-a-Grille Beach and Oldsmar USGS Quadrangle Map Areas [Pinellas County, Florida] (Williams 1974)

Survey #	Survey Name, Author(s), and Date
816	A Preliminary Archaeological and Historical Survey of the Tampa-Hillsborough 201 Plan (Miller 1979)
848	Archaeological Survey of the Central Florida-Kathleen 500KV Transmission Line Right-of-Way, Sumter and Polk Counties, Florida (Piper Archaeological Research 1982)
1001	Archaeological and Historical Survey of Tampa Bay Park of Commerce DRI, Sections 1, 12-14, T28S-R16E [Pinellas County, Florida] (Burger 1984)
1466	An Environmental-Archaeological Survey of the Rock Crusher Road Site, Citrus County, Florida (Marsh 1985)
1631	Archaeological Resource Assessment Survey, US 41 from CR 582A to SR 52, Hillsborough and Pasco Counties, Florida (Ballo 1988)
2377	Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the Proposed Lexington Park DRI, Phase One, Development Sites, Polk County, Florida (Estabrook 1990)
2534	Preliminary Cultural Resource Assessment of the Florida Power Corporation's Lake Tarpon to Kathleen 500kV Transmission Line (Piper Archaeological Research 1990)
2785	Excerpts from the Hernando County Comprehensive Plan, Historical and Archaeological Element (Hernando County Department of Planning 1990)
2827	An Archaeological and Historical Survey of the Unincorporated Areas of Pinellas County, Florida (Piper Archaeological Research 1991a)
2875	Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the Florida Power Corporation's Lake Tarpon-Kathleen 500 kV Transmission Corridor, Pinellas, Hillsborough, Pasco and Polk Counties, Florida (Piper Archaeological Research 1991b)
2965	A Phase I Study of the Deltona Corporation Property on State Road 581 in Hillsborough County, Florida (Fryman et al. 1979)
3366	Archaeological Survey of Three Borrow Pit Areas in Section 5 of Township 28 South, Range 17 East, Hillsborough County, Florida (Williams 1992)
3618	A Cultural Resources Survey of State Road 39 From I-4 to US 301 In Hillsborough and Pasco Counties (Archaeological Consultants, Inc. [ACI] 1992)
4384	Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation of the Proposed 22-inch-diameter St. Petersburg Lateral Loop of the Florida Gas Transmission Company Phase III Expansion Pipeline Corridor (R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates 1993)
4386	Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation of the West Leg Mainline Portion of the Proposed Florida Gas Transmission Company Phase III Expansion Project [Draft Report]; App. I Maps, Illustrations, Photo's; App. II Materials Recovered; App. III Site Forms (R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates 1994a)
4387	Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation of the West Leg Reroute Portion on the Proposed Florida Gas Transmission Company Phase III Expansion Project [Draft Report] (R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates 1994b)

Survey #	Survey Name, Author(s), and Date
4470	A Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of Interstate 275/75 (SR 93) PD&E Study Section 2 from Bearss Avenue to New SR 54, Hillsborough and Pasco Counties, Florida (ACI 1995b)
4590	Cultural Resource Assessment Survey for the Suncoast Parkway - Project 2, Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study, Citrus County, Florida (Janus Research 1996)
4732	A Cultural Resources Assessment Survey of Holnam / HCR Limestone Crystal River Quarry Expansion Project, Citrus County, Florida (ACI 1995a)
4914	Cultural Resource Assessment Survey, US 98 from the North Suncoast Expressway to US 19, Citrus and Hernando Counties, Florida (ACI 1995c)
4987	Cultural Resource Assessment Survey, Technical Memorandum, Bruce B. Downs Boulevard from Bearss Avenue To Tampa City Limits and Tampa City Limits to Hunter's Green Entrance Bicycle/Pedestrian Facility, City of Tampa & Hillsborough County, Florida (ACI 1997)
5012	Cultural Resource Assessment Addendum Technical Memorandum, Suncoast Parkway Project 2 PD&E Study, Pine 3 Alternative In Citrus County SP# 97020-1300; WPI# 7159000 (Janus Research 1997)
5409	Hillsborough County Historic Resources Survey Report (Hillsborough County Planning Commission [HCPC] 1998)
5832	Cultural Resources Assessment Report of Northwest Hillsborough Expressway - Interstate I-275 To SR 597 (Dale Mabry Highway) Hillsborough County, Florida (ACI 1985)
5840	Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the Proposed Buccaneer Gas Pipeline, Florida [V. 1:Final Report of Findings; V. 2:Appendices] (Panamerican Consultants, Inc [PCI] 2000b)
6060	Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Update Technical Memorandum, S.R. 39 from I-4 to U.S. 301, Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study, Hillsborough and Pasco Counties, Florida (ACI 1999)
6120	Cultural Resource Assessment Survey, North-Central Hillsborough Intertie Contract 2, Hillsborough County, Florida (Southeastern Archaeological Research, Inc. [SEARCH] 2000)
6295	Cultural Resources Survey and Inventory, Florida Gas Transmission Phase V Expansion, Gulf Power Lateral, Palmetto Power Lateral, Loop C, Loop D, Loop E, Loop G, Loop H, St. Petersburg Lateral, Loop I St. Petersburg Lateral Jacksonville Loop, & FP&L L (R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates 1994)
6375	Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Technical Memorandum Proposed Pond Sites and CR 480 Realignment US 98 from Suncoast Parkway to US 19, Citrus County (ACI 2000a)
6547	Withlacoochee State Forest Archaeological Modeling Study for Citrus, Hernando, Sumter and Pasco Counties (Gulf Archaeological Research Institute 1998)

Survey #	Survey Name, Author(s), and Date
6796	Cultural Resources Assessment Survey Technical Memorandum Addendum I-275/75 (SR 93) from US 41 To SR 56 Hillsborough and Pasco Counties, Florida Five Proposed (New) Pond Sites (ACI 1998)
6800	Cultural Resource Follow-Up Surveys for Lines 500 and 600 (Supplemental Report 5) (Janus Research 2002)
7108	Cultural Resource Assessment Survey, Project Development and Environment Study US 19 (SR 55) from South of US 98 to CR 488, Citrus County, Florida WPI Segment No. 405822 1; FAP No. 1852 007 P (ACI 2002)
7316	Identification and Evaluation of Historic Properties within the Half-Mile Area of Potential Effects of the Proposed 150-Foot Westchase-Highland Park Telecommunications Tower, Hillsborough County, Florida (Parker 2002)
7389	Cultural Resource Reconnaissance Survey/Section 106 Review Proposed Cellular Tower Site: Citrus Park 2145 Paglen Road, Tampa, Hillsborough County, Florida (ACI 2001)
7573	Archaeological Site Assessment Survey for the Red Level Cell Tower Project In Citrus County (PCI 2000a)
7683	Cultural Resource Reconnaissance Survey / Section 106 Review, Proposed Cellular Tower Sites: Ranchero Acres (FL-3424-B) 4401 Cooper Road, Plant City, Hillsborough County, Florida (ACI 2000b)
7712	A Cultural Resources Assessment Survey of Race Track Road, Hillsborough County, Florida (SEARCH 2002)
8377	Archaeological Investigation Report Engineering Evaluation / Cost Analysis Former Brooksville Turret Gunnery Range Hernando County, Florida (Parsons Engineering Science 2001)
8897	Phase I Archaeological Survey of Proposed CR 40 Sidewalk from Schoolcraft Drive to Spillway Road, Levy County Florida (SEARCH 2003)
9193	Final Cultural Resource Assessment Survey S.R. 50 Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Reevaluation from U.S. 19 (S.R. 55) to the East S.R. 50/50A Intersection, Hernando County, Florida (ACI 2003b)
9198	I-75 PD&E Study Cultural Resource Assessment I-75 (SR 93A) from South of Fowler Avenue to South of CR 54 Hillsborough and Pasco Counties (ACI 2003c)
9259	Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Project Development & Environment Study East-West Road from I-275 to Commerce Park Boulevard City of Tampa and Hillsborough County (Janus Research 2003)
9575	An Archaeological and Historical Survey of the Sassa Trail Project Area in Hillsborough County, FL (PCI 2003)

Survey #	Survey Name, Author(s), and Date
9908	Final Cultural Resource Assessment Survey, CR 581 (Bruce B. Downs Boulevard) Project Development & Environment Study from Bearss Avenue To SR 54, Hillsborough and Pasco Counties, Florida; WPI Segment No.: 405492 1; Federal Aid Program No.: 7585 006 S (ACI 2003a)
11173	[DRAFT] Historic Assessment, Terrestrial and Submerged Resources Survey of Hollomans Branch, Hillsborough River, Hillsborough County, Florida (PCI 2004a)
11562	A Cultural Resource Survey of the Seville Tract, Hernando County, Florida (Environmental Services, Inc. 2005)
11836	Historic Assessment, Terrestrial and Submerged Resources Survey of Hollomans Branch, Hillsborough River, Hillsborough County, Florida (PCI 2004b)
12402	Section 106 Report, New Tower Submission Packet: FCC Form 620, Grove-FL2917B Telecommunications Facility, 5078 West Grover Cleveland Blvd, Homosassa, Citrus County, Florida (KCI Technologies, Inc. 2006)
12713	An Archaeological and Historical Survey of the Lake Hideaway Project Area in Hernando County, Florida (PCI 2006b)
12717	Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Eagle's Crest Hillsborough County, Florida (ACI 2004)
12807	A Phase 1 Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the Florida Gas Transmission Company Phase VII Expansion Project (SEARCH 2005)
13448	An Archaeological and Historical Survey of the County Road 486 Widening from State Road 44 to Forest Ridge Boulevard in Citrus County, Florida (PCI 2006a)
13824	Cultural Resource Assessment Survey, Project Development & Environment Study, East-West Road from I-275 to West of Commerce Park Boulevard, City of Tampa and Hillsborough County [Florida] (Janus Research 2006)
14392	Final Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Report, Veterans Expressway (SR589) Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study from Memorial Highway to Van Dyke Road, Hillsborough County, Florida (ACI 2005)

During 1990 and 1991 the “Preliminary Cultural Resource Assessment of the Florida Power Corporation's Lake Tarpon to Kathleen 500kV Transmission Line,” (Piper Archaeological Research 1990) and the “Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the Florida Power Corporation's Lake Tarpon-Kathleen 500 kV Transmission Corridor, Pinellas, Hillsborough, Pasco, and Polk Counties, Florida,” (Piper Archaeological Research 1991b) were conducted. Portions of the PHP Corridor between the western-most point of the corridor and Section 20 of Township 27 South, Range 17 East, are located within the areas included in these previous surveys. The “Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation of the Proposed 22-inch-diameter St. Petersburg Lateral Loop of the Florida Gas Transmission Company Phase III Expansion Pipeline Corridor” (R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates 1993) was also conducted within the eastern portion of the Kathleen to Lake Tarpon Preferred Corridor. As the project

progresses, these surveys should be further examined to determine appropriate levels of re-evaluation and to evaluate their use in the development of survey strategy.

Previously Recorded Cultural Resources

Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites

Coordination was conducted with the FDHR/SHPO to identify previously recorded archaeological sites and historic resources and to determine the potential for unrecorded resources within the BBW, CB, CCRE, IO, IS, and PHP corridors. This coordination included a detailed search of the FMSF, which is the official inventory of previously documented archaeological sites and historic resources, and a guide to NRHP-listed and eligible resources in the state. This search included an analysis of the most current GIS data, which includes both a spatial and tabular representation of previously recorded cultural resources within the state.

The FMSF search identified 45 previously recorded archaeological sites within or adjacent to (within 100 ft. of) the corridors. Two previously recorded archaeological sites (8HE352 and 8HE353) are located within the common area of the BBW and CB corridors. Eight previously recorded archaeological sites (8HE354 and 8HE357-8HE363) are located within the remaining area of the BBW Corridor. Eight previously recorded archaeological sites (8CI789, 8CI790, 8CI800, 8CI1028, 8CI1037, 8CI1039, 8HE564, and 8HE565) are located within the remaining area of the CB Corridor. One archaeological site (8CI1005) falls within the CCRE Corridor and three archaeological sites (8LV600-602) fall within the IO corridor. The remaining 23 of these 45 archaeological sites (8HI43, 8HI380, 8HI381, 8HI428, 8HI495, 8HI496, 8HI539, 8HI4056-8HI4065, 8HI4079, 8HI6771, 8HI6772, 8HI7842, 8HI9672, and 8HI9673) fall within the PHP Corridor.

All 45 previously recorded archaeological resources are described in Table 3. The locations of the NRHP-eligible and potential NRHP-eligible archaeological sites, sites with potential human remains, and sites with possible Paleoindian components are illustrated on USGS Quadrangle maps in Attachment A.

Table 3. Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites within/adjacent to the Corridors

FMSF #	Site Name	Property Type / Resource Type	NRHP Evaluation ¹
8CI789	No Name	Archaeological Site / Low Density Nineteenth Century-American Artifact Scatter	Ineligible
8CI790	No Name	Archaeological Site / Low Density Pre- Columbian Lithic and Ceramic Scatter	Ineligible
8CI800	27-1	Archaeological Site / Nineteenth to Twentieth Century-American Glass (Isolated Find)	Ineligible

FMSF #	Site Name	Property Type / Resource Type	NRHP Evaluation ¹
8CI1005	Dixon	Archaeological Site / Nineteenth to Twentieth Century-American Homestead, Well, and Low Density Artifact Scatter	Ineligible
8CI1028	Toll Plaza	Archaeological Site / Pre-Columbian Lithic (Isolated Find)	Ineligible
8CI1037	Shamrock Acres	Archaeological Site / Variable Density Pre-Columbian Lithic and Ceramic Scatter	Ineligible
8CI1039	Emerald Oaks	Archaeological Site / Pre-Columbian Lithic (Isolated Find)	Ineligible
8HE352	No Name	Archaeological Site / Twentieth Century-American Turpentine Sherds (Isolated Find)	Ineligible
8HE353	No Name	Archaeological Site / Pre-Columbian Lithic (Isolated Find)	Ineligible
8HE354	No Name	Archaeological Site / Twentieth Century-American Turpentine Sherd (Isolated Find)	Ineligible
8HE357	42-1	Archaeological Site / Twentieth Century-American Low Density Turpentine Sherd Scatter	Ineligible
8HE358	42-2	Archaeological Site / Nineteenth to Twentieth Century-American Turn Mold / Paste Mold Glass Sherd (Isolated Find)	Ineligible
8HE359	42-3	Archaeological Site / Pre-Columbian Lithics (Isolated Find)	Ineligible
8HE360	42-4	Archaeological Site / Twentieth Century-American Turpentine Sherd (Isolated Find)	Ineligible
8HE361	42-5	Archaeological Site / Historic Glass Sherd (Isolated Find)	Ineligible
8HE362	42-6	Archaeological Site / Twentieth Century-American Turpentine Sherds (Isolated Find)	Ineligible
8HE363	42-7	Archaeological Site / Low Density Twentieth Century-American Turpentine Sherd Scatter	Ineligible
8HE564	Squirrel Away	Archaeological Site / Twentieth Century-American Herty Cup Sherds; Pre-Columbian Campsite	Ineligible
8HE565	Obscure	Archaeological Site / Pre-Columbian Campsite	Ineligible

FMSF #	Site Name	Property Type / Resource Type	NRHP Evaluation ¹
8HI43	Flint Creek (also known as James Harris, 301 Site, and K-11)	Archaeological Site / Multi-component Pre-Columbian Extractive Site and Artifact Scatter; Twentieth Century-American Building Materials	Ineligible
8HI380	Trout Creek Road	Archaeological Site / Archaic and Possible Paleoindian Lithic Scatter	Insufficient Information
8HI381	Fish Pond	Archaeological Site / Multi-component Paleoindian, Archaic, and Transitional Campsite	Eligible
8HI428	Crawford	Archaeological Site / Pre-Columbian Lithic Scatter	No Evaluation
8HI495	Cow House East Head	Archaeological Site / Pre-Columbian Burial Mounds	No Evaluation
8HI496	Cow House West Head	Archaeological Site / Pre-Columbian Lithic Scatter	No Evaluation
8HI539	Dam	Archaeological Site / Archaic and Possible Paleoindian Lithic Scatter	Insufficient Information
8HI4056	Double Branch	Archaeological Site / Dense Pre-Columbian Artifact Scatter	Potentially-Eligible
8HI4057	Tower 21	Archaeological Site / Variable Density Pre-Columbian Artifact Scatter	Ineligible
8HI4058	Hixon Lake	Archaeological Site / Pre-Columbian Pottery (Isolated Find)	Ineligible
8HI4059	Fairy Lake	Archaeological Site / Variable Density Pre-Columbian Artifact Scatter	Ineligible
8HI4060	TECO	Archaeological Site / Pre-Columbian Lithic Scatter	Ineligible
8HI4061	Dale Mabry	Archaeological Site / Low Density Pre-Columbian Artifact Scatter	Ineligible
8HI4062	Saddleback Lake	Archaeological Site / Pre-Columbian Lithic Scatter	Ineligible
8HI4063	Simmons Road	Archaeological Site / Variable Density Pre-Columbian Artifact Scatter	Ineligible
8HI4064	Lake Leonides	Archaeological Site / Dense Pre-Columbian Artifact Scatter	Ineligible
8HI4065	Tower 76	Archaeological Site / Dense Pre-Columbian Artifact Scatter	Ineligible
8HI4079	Tower 80	Archaeological Site / Dense Pre-Columbian Artifact Scatter	Ineligible
8HI6771	H2-02	Archaeological Site / Pre-Columbian Non-Quarry Lithic Scatter	Ineligible
8HI6772	H8-01	Archaeological Site / Pre-Columbian Habitation and Low Density Twentieth Century-American Artifact Scatter	Ineligible

FMSF #	Site Name	Property Type / Resource Type	NRHP Evaluation ¹
8HI7842	East-West 4	Archaeological Site / Pre-Columbian Lithic Scatter	Ineligible
8HI9672	Grass Not Hay	Archaeological Site / Pre-Columbian Campsite	Ineligible
8HI9673	Carlton Grove Pasture	Archaeological Site / Pre-Columbian Campsite	Ineligible
8LV600	Gulf Hammock Southeast Drainage Site	Archaeological Site / Dense St. Johns II (AD 800-1500) Ceramic and Lithic Scatter	Ineligible
8LV601	Melissa Band Site	Archaeological Site / Pre-Columbian Lithic Scatter	Ineligible
8LV602	Dan's Drive Site	Archaeological Site / Dense Pre-Columbian Lithic Scatter	Ineligible

¹ As recorded in the FMSF; may require re-evaluation

One NRHP-eligible archaeological site (8HI381) and one potentially NRHP-eligible archaeological site (8HI4056) were identified in the FMSF within the PHP corridor. Site 8HI381, Fish Pond, is a pre-Columbian multi-component site with possible Paleoindian components. The site includes a prehistoric campsite, lithic scatter, and subsurface features. Site 8HI4056, Double Branch, consists of a dense scatter of pre-Columbian lithics and pottery. The locations of these sites within the PHP corridor are illustrated on USGS Quadrangle maps in Attachment A.

While these resources are not officially listed in the NRHP, they are afforded the same considerations as properties listed in the NRHP (as per 36 CFR 60.4 of the *National Historic Preservation Act of 1966*). Avoidance of these sites is recommended. If avoidance is not feasible, then appropriate minimization or mitigation measures will be developed in coordination with the FDHR/SHPO.

One resource with the potential for human remains (8HI495) was identified in the FMSF within the PHP Corridor. Site 8HI495, Cow House East Head, is a pre-Columbian burial mound site that has not been evaluated for NRHP-eligibility by the FDHR/SHPO.

Please note that any investigations regarding sites with potential, or confirmed, human remains are subject to the provisions of Chapter 872 of the Florida Statutes. Chapter 872 requires coordination with the State Archaeologist and federally recognized Native American tribes prior to any archaeological investigations. Furthermore, if human remains are encountered, further coordination must be conducted with the State Archaeologist and the federally recognized Native American tribes. Chapter 872 grants authority to the State Archaeologist in determining the disposition of the remains (i.e. whether to avoid or re-inter the remains). This coordination can be time consuming, costly, and controversial. Therefore, avoidance of known or potential burials is recommended.

Three archaeological sites (8HI380, 8HI381, and 8HI539) are noted as having possible Paleoindian (12,000 - 8,500 years ago) components. These sites are located within the PHP Corridor. Please note that sites with Paleoindian components may require re-evaluation and further testing as there are relatively few Paleoindian sites recorded within the State of Florida. The small number of these sites and their potential to yield information regarding the prehistory of Florida may warrant eligibility for listing in the NRHP.

Previously Recorded Historic Structures

Two previously recorded historic structures were identified in the FMSF within or adjacent to (within 100 ft. of) the corridors. Previously recorded structure 8CI340 is located within the common area of the CB and CCRE corridors and previously recorded structure 8HI1032 is located within the PHP Corridor. These structures are listed in Table 4.

Table 4. Previously Recorded Historic Structures within/adjacent to the Corridors

FMSF #	Property Type / Name / Address	NRHP Evaluation ¹
8CI340	Historic Structure / Red Level Baptist Church / West of US 19	Not Evaluated
8HI1032	Historic Structure / L.E. Mobley House / 1098 S. Mobley Road	Not Evaluated

¹ As recorded in the FMSF; may require re-evaluation

Previously Recorded Historic Cemeteries

No previously recorded historic cemeteries were identified within or adjacent to (within 100 ft. of) the corridors.

Previously Recorded Resource Groups

No previously recorded resource groups were identified within or adjacent to (within 100 ft. of) the corridors.

Previously Recorded Historic Bridges

No previously recorded historic bridges were identified within 1000 ft. of the corridors.

Previously Recorded Historic Districts

No previously recorded historic districts were identified within 1000 ft. of the corridors. A search for clusters of previously recorded historic structures (ten or more) indicative of a potential unrecorded historic district within 1000 ft. of the corridors identified no potential historic districts.

Potential Cultural Resources

Review of USGS Quadrangle Maps

A preliminary review of the USGS Quadrangle maps was completed in order to identify areas that may contain potential historic resources including districts, structures, cemeteries, and bridges.

Potential Historic Districts

This preliminary review of the USGS Quadrangle maps identified several concentrations of potential historic structures that may represent unrecorded potential historic districts. All of these potential areas fall within 1000 ft. of the PHP corridor.

There is the potential for a historic district on the Citrus Park (1956 PR 1969) USGS Quadrangle map in the northwest quarter of Section 31 of Township 27 South, Range 18 East, with 12 potential historic structures located adjacent to Halfmoon Lake. There is also the potential for a historic district on the Sulphur Springs (1956 PR 1987) USGS Quadrangle map in Sections 19 and 22-24 of Township 27 South, Range 18 East, with over 30 potential historic structures in the vicinity of the existing transmission line corridor. Another area with the potential for a historic district was identified on the Thonotosassa (1974 PR 1987) USGS Quadrangle map in the northwest quarter of Section 31 of Township 27 South, Range 20 East, with 11 potential historic structures in the vicinity of the existing transmission line corridor.

The northeast quarter of Section 5 of Township 28 South, Range 20 East on the Thonotosassa (1974 PR 1987) USGS Quadrangle map illustrates 10 potential historic structures located within 1000 ft. of the existing transmission line corridor along Morris Bridge Road. The potential for another historic district exists on the Thonotosassa (1974 PR 1987) USGS Quadrangle map in the southeast quarter of Section 4 of Township 28 South, Range 20 East, with over 50 potential historic structures located within the vicinity of the existing transmission line corridor in Thonotosassa near US 301.

The potential exists for a historic district on the Plant City East (1975 PR 1987, minor revision 1993) USGS Quadrangle map along Deeson Road near Kathleen where the corners of Sections 19, 20, 29, and 30 meet in Township 27 South, Range 23 East. There is the potential for a historic district on the Plant City West (1975, minor revision 1993) USGS Quadrangle map in the southwest quarter of Section 6 of Township 28 South, Range 21 East, with over 10 potential historic structures including the Thonotosassa Church.

Be advised that this information has not yet been verified through the County Property Appraisers. A cultural resource reconnaissance survey is recommended to identify any unrecorded historic districts within the corridors and to manage any NRHP concerns before final routes are established within the corridors.

Potential Historic Structures

Numerous potential historic structures were identified throughout the corridors on the USGS quadrangle maps. A potential historic structure, the Thonotosassa Church, was identified within 1000 ft. of the PHP corridor. This potential historic structure is located to the south of Knights Road on the Plant City West (1975, minor revision 1993) USGS Quadrangle map in the southwest quarter of Section 6 of Township 28 South, Range 21 East.

While not necessarily indicative of potential historic districts, several areas of higher concentrations of potential historic structures were identified during the preliminary review

of the USGS Quadrangles maps. Both the Plant City West (1975, minor revision 1993) USGS Quadrangle map and the Socrum (1975) USGS Quadrangle map suggest potential historic structures within 1000 ft. of the PHP corridor. These potential historic structures are located in the vicinity of Knights Road extending from Sections 2-6 of Township 28 South, Range 21 East, and the southeastern quarter of Section 17 of Township 28 South, Range 23 East, respectively.

Be advised that this information has not yet been verified through the County Property Appraisers. Again, a cultural resource reconnaissance survey is recommended to identify any unrecorded historic structures within the corridors, and to manage any NRHP concerns before final routes are established within the corridors.

Potential Historic Bridges and Historic Cemeteries

No historic bridges or historic cemeteries were identified during the preliminary review of the USGS quadrangle maps.

AGENCY COORDINATION

CLG Coordination

Hillsborough County is the only county in which the corridors are located that is included on the February 2008 list of CLG posted on the FDHR website (FDHR 2008). In accordance with Chapter 1A-46 (Archaeological and Historical Report Standards and Guidelines), Florida Administrative Code, coordination with the Hillsborough County Historic Preservation Planner will need to be conducted.

The February 2008 list of CLG does not include any additional counties in which the corridors are located (Citrus, Hernando, Levy, Pinellas, and Polk counties) and does not include any additional municipalities within one mile of the corridors.

However, counties through which the corridors travel may include county specific plans for managing historic resources. It is recommended that as this project progresses and routes are established within the corridors, that these guidelines should be reviewed and coordination should be conducted with the appropriate staff.

FDHR/SHPO Coordination

A teleconference was held between Janus Research employees and Ms. Laura Kammerer, FDHR/SHPO Bureau of Historic Preservation Compliance Review Supervisor / Deputy SHPO. The teleconference familiarized Ms. Kammerer with the details of the PEFCFCS project confirmed the level of work conducted for the preliminary corridor analysis report was appropriate as required by FDHR/SHPO, and established the need to conduct a CRAS prior to construction once routes within the corridor have been finalized. Coordination will be ongoing, and Ms. Kammerer requested a meeting to discuss the results of this preliminary corridor analysis report prior to any formal submittal. Typed meeting minutes from this teleconference have been included in Attachment B.

Additionally, a meeting with Laura Kammerer, FDHR / SHPO Bureau of Historic Preservation Compliance Review Supervisor / Deputy SHPO and April Westerman, FDHR/SHPO Bureau of Historic Preservation Compliance Review Historic Sites Specialist was held with Janus Research employees. FDHR recommended avoidance of known sites and requested that transmission line poles not be placed within the established boundaries of these sites. If this is not feasible, then further coordination will need to occur with FDHR regarding appropriate avoidance or minimization strategies. Typed meeting minutes have been included in Attachment B.

TRIBAL COORDINATION

The Native American Consultation Database (NACD) (NPS 2006), BIA GIS data (2002), NPS compiled tables of Native American land cessions (2008), and the United States Congressional Serial Set regarding Native American land cessions available through the Library of Congress American Memory Project (56th Congress, 1st Session 1899:704-705, 734-735) were reviewed in order to determine the federally and state recognized tribes within Florida. This was done to determine whether the corridors traverse reservation land, land associated with state recognized tribes, or lands once considered to be tribally affiliated.

The NACD (NPS 2006) identified five federally-recognized tribes affiliated with Florida. They include the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida, the Muscogee (Creek) Nation of Oklahoma, the Poarch Band of Creek Indians of Alabama, the Seminole Nation of Oklahoma, and the Seminole Tribe of Florida. Two of these tribes, the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida and the Seminole Tribe of Florida, are resident and have reservations in the State of Florida. None of the corridors cross reservation land. The locations of Tribal Reservations are defined by GIS data digitized by the BIA (2002) and were obtained through the Florida Geographic Data Library (FGDL). With the exception of the Seminole Reservation in Tampa (the Seminole Hard Rock Hotel and Casino) which is over 5.5 miles from the PHP Corridor, the resident tribes' reservation lands are located in the southern part of the state, and the corridors do not traverse the counties in which they are located.

This GIS data also depicts the location of land associated with one state recognized tribe, the Eastern Band of Creek Indians. Their land is located in the western panhandle of Florida, a distance of at least 100 miles from the corridors. Additionally, the FMSF listed no defined traditional cultural properties within the corridors.

However, the corridors are located within lands that at one time were considered to be tribally affiliated. The second part of a two part publication entitled *Eighteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1896-1897* was assembled by Charles C. Royce. This publication included an inventory of Native American land cessions and an accompanying 67 maps illustrating the described cession of land.

The NPS (2008) under the United States Department of Interior, created a collection of tables based on Royce's information which lists the map number, the Native American tribe named within the treaty, and the present-day tribes applicable for the land cession conducted between 1784 and 1894 by county. Additionally, through the Library of Congress' American Memory Project, the United States Congressional Serial Set (56th Congress, 1st Session 1899:704-705, 734-735) regarding the Indian Land Cessions (Attachment C) in the United States between 1784 and 1894 are available online with an accompanying map of the lands ceded within Florida (Attachment C).

Combining the pertinent pages and map available from the Library of Congress with the tables provided by the NPS, it was established that the corridors traverse land that was ceded from the 'Florida Tribes' (present day Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida and Seminole Tribe of Florida) and the 'Seminole' (present day Seminole Tribe of Florida and Seminole Nation of Oklahoma) to the United States. The land ceded by the 'Florida Tribes' is designated on the map as number 118 and land ceded by the 'Seminole' is designated on the map as number 173 (Attachment C).

Tribal coordination will be initiated during the route selection process in order to identify concerns not readily available through the background research. The Tribal Historic Preservation Officer or (THPO) or Section 106 representatives for the appropriate federally-recognized Native American tribes culturally affiliated with Florida will be consulted throughout the route selection process and during any subsequent CRAS.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that a comprehensive pre-screening analysis and reconnaissance level survey be conducted to assist in the selection of a final route within each corridor that will have minimum or no impact to significant cultural resources and to develop an appropriate work plan for conducting a CRAS that will meet the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act; Chapter 267 F.S.; and Chapter 1A-46 (Archaeological and Historical Report Standards and Guidelines), Florida Administrative Code. It is also recommended that continued consultation with the FDHR/SHPO and the Native American Tribes be conducted regarding the results of this preliminary corridor analysis report and the cultural resource reconnaissance survey prior to the finalization of routes within the corridor.

Summary of Issues

- Once final routes are selected within the corridors, continued coordination with FDHR/SHPO is recommended to determine the appropriate scope of work.
- Tribal coordination is recommended throughout this project in order to identify and address any concerns prior to the selection of final routes within the corridors.
- One previously recorded archaeological site (8HI495) within the PHP Corridor is listed within the FMSF as potentially containing human remains. If human remains are encountered, further coordination must be conducted with the State Archaeologist and the Native American Tribes. This coordination can be time consuming, costly, and controversial. Therefore, avoidance of known or potential burials is recommended.
- Regarding sites with potential or confirmed human remains, Chapter 872 of the Florida Statutes requires coordination with the State Archaeologist and federally-recognized Native American tribes PRIOR to any archaeological investigations.
- Within the PHP Corridor, one previously recorded archaeological site (8HI381) was listed in the FMSF as having been determined eligible for listing in the NRHP by the FDHR/SHPO and one previously recorded archaeological site (8HI4056) was listed in the FMSF as having been determined potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP by the FDHR/SHPO. While these resources are not officially listed in the NRHP, they are afforded the same considerations as properties listed in the NRHP (as per 36 CFR 60.4 of the *National Historic Preservation Act of 1966*).
- Within the PHP Corridor, three archaeological sites (8HI380, 8HI381, and 8HI539) are noted in the FMSF as having possible Paleoindian components. These sites may require further testing as there are relatively few Paleoindian sites within the State of Florida. The small number of these sites and their potential to yield information regarding the prehistory of Florida may warrant eligibility for listing in the NRHP.

- FDHR/SHPO recommended avoidance of known sites and requested that transmission line poles not be placed within the established boundaries of these sites. If this is not feasible, then further coordination will need to occur with FDHR/SHPO regarding appropriate avoidance or minimization strategies.
- There is the potential for unrecorded historic structures and districts within the vicinity of the corridors. A cultural resource reconnaissance survey is recommended to identify any unrecorded resources and to manage any NRHP concerns before corridor routes are finalized.
- Hillsborough County is listed on the February 2008 list of CLGs posted on the FDHR website. As this project progresses and routes are established within the corridors, coordination with the Hillsborough County Historic Preservation Planner will need to be conducted in accordance with Chapter 1A-46 (Archaeological and Historical Report Standards and Guidelines), Florida Administrative Code.
- As this project progresses and routes are established, it is recommended that county-specific guidelines for historic and cultural resources be reviewed and that coordination be conducted with the appropriate staff.

REFERENCES

56th Congress, 1st Session

1899 Indian Land Cessions in the United States, 1784 to 1894. *S. Doc. No. 4015*. Electronic document, <http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/amlaw/lwss-ilc.html>, accessed February 21, 2008.

Archeological Consultants, Inc. (ACI)

2005 Final Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Report, Veterans Expressway (SR589) Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study from Memorial Highway to Van Dyke Road, Hillsborough County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

2004 Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Eagle's Crest Hillsborough County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

2003a Final Cultural Resource Assessment Survey, CR 581 (Bruce B. Downs Boulevard) Project Development & Environment Study from Bearss Avenue To SR 54, Hillsborough and Pasco Counties, Florida; WPI Segment No.: 405492 1; Federal Aid Program No.: 7585 006 S. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

2003b Final Cultural Resource Assessment Survey S.R. 50 Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Reevaluation from U.S. 19 (S.R. 55) to the East S.R. 50/50A Intersection, Hernando County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

2003c I-75 PD&E Study Cultural Resource Assessment I-75 (SR 93A) from South of Fowler Avenue to South of CR 54 Hillsborough and Pasco Counties. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

2002 Cultural Resource Assessment Survey, Project Development and Environment Study US 19 (SR 55) from South of US 98 to CR 488, Citrus County, Florida WPI Segment No. 405822 1; FAP No. 1852 007 P. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

2001 Cultural Resource Reconnaissance Survey/Section 106 Review Proposed Cellular Tower Site: Citrus Park 2145 Paglen Road, Tampa, Hillsborough County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

2000a Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Technical Memorandum Proposed Pond Sites and CR 480 Realignment US 98 from Suncoast Parkway to US 19, Citrus County. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

2000b Cultural Resource Reconnaissance Survey / Section 106 Review, Proposed Cellular Tower Sites: Ranchero Acres (FL-3424-B) 4401 Cooper Road, Plant City, Hillsborough County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

1999 Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Update Technical Memorandum, S.R. 39 from I-4 to U.S. 301, Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study, Hillsborough and Pasco Counties, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

- 1998 Cultural Resources Assessment Survey Technical Memorandum Addendum I-275/75 (SR 93) from US 41 to SR 56 Hillsborough and Pasco Counties, Florida Five Proposed (New) Pond Sites. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 1997 Cultural Resource Assessment Survey, Technical Memorandum, Bruce B. Downs Boulevard from Bearss Avenue To Tampa City Limits and Tampa City Limits to Hunter's Green Entrance Bicycle/Pedestrian Facility, City of Tampa & Hillsborough County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 1995a A Cultural Resources Assessment Survey of Holnam/HCR Limestone Crystal River Quarry Expansion Project, Citrus County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 1995b A Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of Interstate 275/75 (SR 93) PD&E Study Section 2 from Bearss Avenue to New SR 54, Hillsborough and Pasco Counties, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 1995c Cultural Resource Assessment Survey, US 98 from the North Suncoast Expressway to US 19, Citrus and Hernando Counties, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 1992 A Cultural Resources Survey of State Road 39 From I-4 to US 301 In Hillsborough and Pasco Counties. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 1985 Cultural Resources Assessment Report of Northwest Hillsborough Expressway - Interstate I-275 To SR 597 (Dale Mabry Highway) Hillsborough County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Ballo, George R.

- 1988 Archaeological Resource Assessment Survey, US 41 from CR 582A to SR 52, Hillsborough and Pasco Counties, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

- 2002 Indian Lands and Native Entities in Florida. Electronic data, <http://www.fgdl.org/metadataexplorer/explorer.jsp>, accessed February 21, 2008.

Burger, Brad W.

- 1984 Archaeological and Historical Survey of Tampa Bay Park of Commerce DRI, Sections 1, 12-14, T28S-R16E [Pinellas County, Florida]. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Deming, Joan G. and J. Raymond Williams

- 1976 An Archaeological and Historical Survey of the Lake Thonotosassa By-Pass Canal Right-of-Way [Hillsborough County, Florida]. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Environmental Services, Inc.

- 2005 A Cultural Resource Survey of the Seville Tract, Hernando County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Estabrook, Richard W.

- 1990 Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the Proposed Lexington Park DRI, Phase One, Development Sites, Polk County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Florida Department of Historical Resources (FDHR)

- 2008 List of Certified Local Governments (CLG). Electronic document, http://dhr.dos.state.fl.us/preservation/compliance/local/docs/CLG_list.doc, accessed March 3, 2008.
- 1979 An Archaeological and Historical Survey of Seven Proposed Recreation Resource Sites in the Lower Hillsborough River Flood Detention Area [Hillsborough County, Florida]. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Fryman, Mildred, Robert T. Grange Jr., and J. Raymond Williams

- 1979 A Phase I Study of the Deltona Corporation Property on State Road 581 in Hillsborough County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Grange, Robert T., Jr. and J. Raymond Williams

- 1978 A Cultural Resource Survey of the Northdale / North Lakes Subdivision, Hillsborough County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Gulf Archaeological Research Institute

- 1998 Withlacoochee State Forest Archaeological Modeling Study for Citrus, Hernando, Sumter and Pasco Counties. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Hernando County Department of Planning

- 1990 Excerpts from the Hernando County Comprehensive Plan, Historical and Archaeological Element. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Hillsborough County Planning Commission [HCPC]

- 1998 Hillsborough County Historic Resources Survey Report. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Janus Research

- 2007 Cultural Resource Assessment Addendum Technical Memorandum, Suncoast Parkway Project 2 PD&E Study, Pine 3 Alternative In Citrus County SP# 97020-1300; WPI# 7159000. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 2006 Cultural Resource Assessment Survey, Project Development & Environment Study, East-West Road from I-275 to West of Commerce Park Boulevard, City of Tampa and Hillsborough County [Florida]. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 2003 Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Project Development & Environment Study East-West Road from I-275 to Commerce Park Boulevard City of Tampa and Hillsborough County. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 2002 Cultural Resource Follow-Up Surveys for Lines 500 and 600 (Supplemental Report 5). Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 1996 Cultural Resource Assessment Survey for the Suncoast Parkway - Project 2, Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study, Citrus County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

KCI Technologies, Inc.

- 2006 Section 106 Report, New Tower Submission Packet: FCC Form 620, Grove-FL2917B Telecommunications Facility, 5078 West Grover Cleveland Blvd, Homosassa, Citrus County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Marsh, Robert G.

- 1985 An Environmental-Archaeological Survey of the Rock Crusher Road Site, Citrus County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Miller, James J.

- 1979 A Preliminary Archaeological and Historical Survey of the Tampa-Hillsborough 201 Plan. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

National Park Service (NPS)

- 2008 FLORIDA—Present-Day Tribes Associated with Indian Land Cessions 1784-1894, Electronic document, http://www.nps.gov/history/nagpra/onlinedb/land_cessions/index.htm, accessed February 21, 2008.
- 2006 Native American Consultation Database. Electronic document, <http://home.nps.gov/nacd>, accessed February 21, 2008.

Panamerican Consultants, Inc [PCI]

- 2006a An Archaeological and Historical Survey of the County Road 486 Widening from State Road 44 to Forest Ridge Boulevard in Citrus County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 2006b An Archaeological and Historical Survey of the Lake Hideaway Project Area in Hernando County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 2004a [DRAFT] Historic Assessment, Terrestrial and Submerged Resources Survey of Hollomans Branch, Hillsborough River, Hillsborough County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 2004b Historic Assessment, Terrestrial and Submerged Resources Survey of Hollomans Branch, Hillsborough River, Hillsborough County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 2003 An Archaeological and Historical Survey of the Sassa Trail Project Area in Hillsborough County, FL. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 2000a Archaeological Site Assessment Survey for the Red Level Cell Tower Project In Citrus County. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 2000b Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the Proposed Buccaneer Gas Pipeline, Florida [V. 1: Final Report of Findings; V. 2: Appendices]. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Parker, Brian T.

- 2002 Identification and Evaluation of Historic Properties within the Half-Mile Area of Potential Effects of the Proposed 150-Foot Westchase-Highland Park Telecommunications Tower, Hillsborough County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Parsons Engineering Science

- 2001 Archaeological Investigation Report Engineering Evaluation / Cost Analysis Former Brooksville Turret Gunnery Range Hernando County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Piper Archaeological Research

- 1991a An Archaeological and Historical Survey of the Unincorporated Areas of Pinellas County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 1991b Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the Florida Power Corporation's Lake Tarpon-Kathleen 500 kV Transmission Corridor, Pinellas, Hillsborough, Pasco and Polk Counties, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 1990 Preliminary Cultural Resource Assessment of the Florida Power Corporation's Lake Tarpon to Kathleen 500kV Transmission Line. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

- 1982 Archaeological Survey of the Central Florida-Kathleen 500KV Transmission Line Right-of-Way, Sumter and Polk Counties, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates

- 2000 Cultural Resources Survey and Inventory, Florida Gas Transmission Phase V Expansion, Gulf Power Lateral, Palmetto Power Lateral, Loop C, Loop D, Loop E, Loop G, Loop H, St. Petersburg Lateral, Loop I St. Petersburg Lateral Jacksonville Loop, & FP&L L. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 1994a Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation of the West Leg Mainline Portion of the Proposed Florida Gas Transmission Company Phase III Expansion Project [Draft Report]; App. I Maps, Illustrations, Photo's; App. II Materials Recovered; App. III Site Forms. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 1994b Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation of the West Leg Reroute Portion on the Proposed Florida Gas Transmission Company Phase III Expansion Project [Draft Report]. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 1993 Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation of the Proposed 22-inch-diameter St. Petersburg Lateral Loop of the Florida Gas Transmission Company Phase III Expansion Pipeline Corridor. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Rom, Lance

- 1979 A Phase 2 Archaeological Assessment Survey of the Deltona Corporation's Tampa Palms Development in Northeastern Hillsborough County. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Southeastern Archaeological Research, Inc. [SEARCH]

- 2005 A Phase 1 Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the Florida Gas Transmission Company Phase VII Expansion Project. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 2003 Phase I Archaeological Survey of Proposed CR 40 Sidewalk from Schoolcraft Drive to Spillway Road, Levy County Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 2002 A Cultural Resources Assessment Survey of Race Track Road, Hillsborough County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 2000 Cultural Resource Assessment Survey, North-Central Hillsborough Intertie Contract 2, Hillsborough County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Williams, J. Raymond


- 1992 Archaeological Survey of Three Borrow Pit Areas in Section 5 of Township 28 South, Range 17 East, Hillsborough County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.
- 1974 An Archaeological Survey of the Pass-a-Grille Beach and Oldsmar USGS Quadrangle Map Areas [Pinellas County, Florida]. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

Willis, Raymond F.

- 1978 Archaeological-Historical Survey of Lake Rousseau to Crystal River Power Plant Water Supply Pipeline and Transmission Corridor Access Road, Citrus County, Florida. Copies available from Florida Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee.

ATTACHMENT A:

**USGS QUADRANGLE MAP LOCATIONS OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES
THAT ARE NRHP-ELIGIBLE OR POTENTIALLY NRHP-ELIGIBLE,
HAVE THE POTENTIAL FOR HUMAN REMAINS, OR HAVE POSSIBLE
PALEOINDIAN COMPONENTS**



USGS Quadrangles: Oldsmar (1974 PR 1987),
Citrus Park (1956 PR 1987)

--- PHP Corridor Boundary
● Archaeological Sites

(HR) :Potential Human Remains
(NR) :NRHP-Eligible or Potentially Eligible
(PI) :Potential Paleoindian Component



--- PHP Corridor Boundary
 ● Archaeological Sites

(HR) :Potential Human Remains
 (NR) :NRHP-Eligible or Potentially Eligible
 (PI) :Potential Paleoindian Component

ATTACHMENT B:
FDHR/SHPO COORDINATION

TELECONFERENCE MINUTE REPORT
PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA CENTRAL FLORIDA CORRIDOR STUDY (PEFCFCS)

Person Called/Agency: Laura Kammerer, FDHR / SHPO Bureau of Historic Preservation
Compliance Review Supervisor / Deputy SHPO

Janus Staff: Kate Hoffman, Janus Research
Adam Schieffer, Janus Research

Date of Teleconference: January 29, 2008

Teleconference Summary:

1. Familiarized Ms. Kammerer with the PEFCFCS project due to the large area traversed by the project corridors.
2. Established that a complete cultural resource assessment survey (CRAS) would be needed for the final routes established within the corridors.
3. Confirmed or established the scope of work required by FDHR for both the preliminary corridor analysis and the final routes once selected.

Meeting Minutes: A summary of the PEFCFCS project and proposed application submittal dates were provided to Ms. Kammerer by Janus Research.

Ms. Kammerer confirmed that the detailed desktop review was an appropriate level of work of the preliminary corridor analysis, given the width of the corridors (up to one mile wide).

The need for a CRAS once final routes are finalized within the corridors was established.

Ms. Kammerer requested a meeting at least one week in advance of the Site Certification Application (SCA) submittal to discuss the findings of the preliminary corridor report.

Important Issues: The teleconference confirmed the level of work conducted for the preliminary corridor analysis and the need to conduct a CRAS once final routes within the corridors are established and prior to construction.

Follow-up:

1. Coordination will be ongoing
2. Ms. Kammerer requested a meeting at least one week prior to the SCA submittal to discuss pertinent cultural resource issue results.
3. A meeting will be held to establish appropriate scope of work once routes are established within the corridors.

MEETING MINUTE REPORT
PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA CENTRAL FLORIDA CORRIDOR STUDY (PEFCFCS)

Person /Agency: Laura Kammerer, FDHR / SHPO Bureau of Historic Preservation
Compliance Review Supervisor / Deputy SHPO
April Westerman, FDHR/SHPO Bureau of Historic
Preservation Compliance Review Historic Sites Specialist

Janus Staff: Kate Hoffman, Janus Research
Jim Pepe, Janus Research

Date of Meeting: April 29, 2008

Meeting Summary: Discussed SCA report reviewer comment regarding
recommendation to avoid sites versus avoid placing poles and
fill in previously undisturbed areas of sites. FDHR will
recommend avoidance and that transmission line poles not be
placed within the boundaries of sites. If this is not feasible,
then coordination will need to take place with FDHR
regarding appropriate avoidance or minimization
strategies.

Important Issues: N/A

Follow-up: N/A

ATTACHMENT C:

**SELECTED PAGES OF THE SCHEDULE OF INDIAN LAND CESSIONS
APPLICABLE TO CITRUS, HERNANDO, HILLSBOROUGH, LEVY, PINELLAS,
AND POLK COUNTIES WITH ACCOMPANYING MAP**

SCHEDULE OF INDIAN

<i>Date</i>	<i>Where or how concluded</i>	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Description of cession or reservation</i>
1821 Aug. 29	Chicago, Illinois.	Stat. L., VII, 218.	Ottawa, Chippewa, and Potawatomi.	said tract, then such line shall be continued until it strikes the western boundary of the tract ceded to the U. S. by treaty of Detroit in 1807, and from the termination of the said line, following the boundaries of former cessions, to the main branch of the Grand river of Lake Michigan, should any of the said lines cross the said river, but if none of the said lines should cross the said river, then to a point due E. of the source of the said main branch of the said river, and from such point due W. to the source of the said principal branch, and from the crossing of the said river or from the source thereof, as the case may be, down the said river on the N. bank thereof to the mouth; thence following the shore of Lake Michigan to the S. bank of the said river St Joseph at the mouth thereof and thence with the said S. bank to the place of beginning. From the foregoing cession the said Indians reserve for their use the following tracts, viz: 1. One tract at Mang-ach-qua village, on the river Peble, of 6 miles square. 2. One tract at Mick-ke-saw-be of 6 miles square. 3. One tract at the village of Na-to-wa-se-pe of 4 miles square. 4. One tract at the village of Prairie Ronde of 3 miles square. 5. One tract at the village of Match-e-be-narh-she-wish, at the head of the Kekalamazoo river. The U. S. grants from above cession 26 sections of land to individuals of Indian descent.
1823 Mar. 3	Act of Congress.	Stat. L., III, 749.	Moravian or Christian Indians.	Congress, by the provisions of this act, appropriated \$1,000 with which to purchase and extinguish the Indian title to three tracts of land, containing 4,000 acres each, lying on Muskingum river, in Tuscarawas county, Ohio. These tracts were as follows: 1. One tract of 4,000 acres at Shoenbrun 2. One tract of 4,000 acres at Gnadenhutzen 3. One tract of 4,000 acres at Salem
Sept. 18	Camp on Moultrie creek in Florida territory.	Stat. L., VII, 224.	Florida tribes.	The Florida tribes cede to the U. S. all claim or title which they have to the whole territory of Florida, with the exception of such district of country as shall herein be allotted to them. The Florida tribes will hereafter be concentrated and confined to the following metes and boundaries: Commencing 5 miles N. of Okehumke, running in a direct line to a point 5 miles W. of Setarky's settlement, on the waters of the Amazura (or Withlahuchie river), leaving said settlement 2 miles S. of the line; from thence in a direct line to the S. end of the Big Hammock, to include Chickuchate; continuing in the same direction for 5 miles beyond the said Hammock, provided said point does not approach nearer than 15 miles the seacoast of the Gulf of Mexico; if it does the said line will terminate at that distance from the seacoast; thence S. 12 miles; thence in a S. 30° E. direction until the same shall strike within 5 miles of the main branch of Charlotte river; thence in a due E. direction to within 20 miles of the Atlantic coast; thence N. 15° W. for 50 miles, and from this last to the beginning point. The Indians having objected to being concentrated within the limits above described, for fear there was insufficient good land to subsist them, the U. S. agree that should said territory, after examination, be found to contain insufficient good land, then the N. line, as above defined, shall be removed so far N. as to embrace a sufficient quantity of good tillable land.

Schedule of Indian Land Cessions (56th Congress, 1st Session 1899:704) Describing Land Cession Number 118: Lands Ceded by the 'Florida Tribes' (Present-Day present day Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida and Seminole Tribe of Florida)

LAND CESSIONS—Continued.

<i>Historical data and remarks</i>	<i>Designation of cession on map</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Location</i>
This reserve was ceded to the U. S. by treaty of Sept. 19, 1827. The boundaries were never ascertained. This reserve was ceded to the U. S. by treaty of Sept. 19, 1827 This reserve was ceded to the U. S. by treaty of Sept. 27, 1833 This reserve was ceded to the U. S. by treaty of Sept. 19, 1827. This reserve was ceded to the U. S. by treaty of Sept. 19, 1827.	See 138 See 188	Michigan 1.
An ordinance of Congress of Sept. 3, 1788, set apart three tracts of 4,000 acres each at Shoenbrun, Gnadenhutzen, and Salem, on Muskingum river, for the Society of United Brethren, to be used in propagating the gospel among the heathen. By act of Congress approved June 1, 1796, provision was made for surveying and patenting these tracts to the society in question, in trust for the benefit of the Christian Indians. Under the provisions of the act of Mar. 3, 1823, Lewis Cass was appointed to negotiate for the relinquishment of the title to the U. S. This he secured and transmitted the relinquishment of both the society and the Indians to the War Department, under date of Nov. 19, 1823, and by act of May 26, 1824, Congress made provision for the disposition of the lands.	See 4 See 5 See 6	Ohio.
	118	Florida.
The boundaries of this reserve were partly surveyed and the remainder approximated by Colonel Gadsden in 1824. They are shown by yellow lines. Colonel Gadsden recommended an addition to the reserve to include more tillable land. This addition was made by Executive order, July 29, 1824, and is shown by a crimson line. A second addition was made for a like purpose by the President, and Maj. J. A. Coffee surveyed the same in 1826. This second enlargement is shown by green lines. The reserve as thus enlarged was ceded to the U. S., May 9, 1832.	See 173	Florida.
This was done in 1824 and again in 1826 by Executive order, as set forth above.		

Schedule of Indian Land Cessions (56th Congress, 1st Session 1899:705) Describing Land Cession Number 118: Lands Ceded by the 'Florida Tribes' (Present-Day present day Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida and Seminole Tribe of Florida)

SCHEDULE OF INDIAN


<i>Date</i>	<i>Where or how concluded</i>	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Description of cession or reservation</i>
1831 Aug. 30	Miami bay of Lake Erie.	Stat. L., VII, 359.	Ottawa (residing in Ohio).	With a view to removing to the country W. of the Mississippi the band of Ottoways residing on Blanchard's fork of the Great Auglaize river and at Oquanoxie's village on the Little Auglaize river cede to the U. S. the following tracts of land reserved for them, respectively, by the sixth article of the treaty of Sept. 29, 1817: 1. A tract of land on Blanchard's fork of the Great Auglaize river, to contain 5 miles square, the center of which tract shall be where the old trace crosses said fork. 2. A tract to contain 3 miles square on the Little Auglaize river, to include Oquanoxie's village. The band of Ottoway Indians residing at and near the places called Roche de Boeuf and Wolf Rapids, on the Miami river of Lake Erie, wishing to become parties to this treaty and not being willing at this time, to stipulate for their removal W. of the Mississippi agree, in consideration of the stipulations herein made for them by the U. S., to cede to the U. S. the following tracts of land reserved to them by the treaty of Nov. 17, 1807, viz: 1. A tract of 6 miles square above Roche de Boeuf, to include the village where Tondagonie (or Dog) formerly lived. 2. A tract of 3 miles square at the Wolf Rapids aforesaid, which was substituted for the 3 miles square granted, by the treaty of Nov. 17, 1807, to the said Ottoways, to include Presque Isle, but which could not be granted, as stipulated in said treaty, in consequence of its collision with the grant of 12 miles square to the U. S. by the treaty of Greenville in 1795. The U. S. agree to cause the band of Ottoways residing on Blanchard's fork and at Oquanoxie's village, numbering about 200 souls, to be removed to the western side of the Mississippi river, and will grant by patent in fee simple to them and their heirs forever, as long as they shall exist as a nation and remain upon the same, a tract of land to contain 34,000 acres, to be located adjoining the S. or W. line of the reservation granted to the Shawnees of Missouri and Ohio, on the Kansas river and its branches, by treaty of Nov. 7, 1825. The U. S. agree to grant to the band of Ottoways residing at Roche de Boeuf and Wolf Rapids, by patent in fee simple, 40,000 acres of land W. of the Mississippi, adjoining the lands assigned to the Ottoways of Blanchard's fork and Oquanoxie's village, or in such other situation as they may select on the unappropriated lands in the district of country designed for the emigrating Indians of the U. S. Whenever said band shall accept of said grant, the U. S. agree to remove and subsist them in the same manner as is provided by this treaty for the removal of the Ottoways of Blanchard's fork and Oquanoxie's village.
1832 Jan. 19	McCutchensville, Crawford county, Ohio.	Stat. L., VII, 364.	Wyandot (band residing at Big Spring).	The band of Wyandots residing at the Big Spring, in the county of Crawford in the state of Ohio, cede to the U. S. the reservation of 16,000 acres, granted to them by article 2 of the treaty of Sept. 17, 1818, described in said treaty as follows: "There shall be reserved for the use of the Wyandots residing at Solomon's town and on Blanchard's fork 16,000 acres of land, to be laid off in a square form on the head of Blanchard's fork; the center of which shall be at the Big Spring on the road leading from Upper Sandusky to Fort Findlay."
Mar. 24	Washington, D. C.	Stat. L., VII, 366.	Creek.....	The Creek tribe of Indians cede to the U. S. all their land E. of the Mississippi river.
May 9	Payne's Landing, Florida territory.	Stat. L., VII, 368.	Seminole.....	The Seminole Indians relinquish to the U. S. all claim to lands occupied by them in the territory of Florida and agree to emigrate to the country W. of the Mississippi river. The U. S. agree that an additional extent of territory for the Seminoles, proportioned to their numbers, shall be added to the Creek country, and that the Seminoles will be received as a constituent part of the Creek nation.

Schedule of Indian Land Cessions (56th Congress, 1st Session 1899:734) Describing Land Cession Number 173: Lands Ceded by the 'Seminole' (Present Day Seminole Tribe of Florida and Seminole Nation of Oklahoma)

LAND CESSIONS—Continued.

<i>Historical data and remarks</i>	<i>Designation of cession on map</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Location</i>
	167	Ohio (detail).
	168	
	169	
	170	
These bands became confederated after their removal to the reservations assigned them by this treaty, and by a subsequent treaty of June 24, 1862, they made a joint cession of the reserves to the U. S. On Kansas map 2 of this schedule the entire reserve of both bands is colored yellow and numbered 435. The tract originally assigned to the Ottawa of Blanchard's fork and Oquanoxa's village is shown within the red lines.	See 435.	Kansas 2.
	171	Ohio (detail).
	172	Alabama.
See note concerning this tract under treaty of Sept. 18, 1823, with the Florida Indians. The boundaries of this tract are defined in the treaty of Mar. 28, 1833. (See also treaty of Jan. 4, 1845, with the Creeks and the Seminole for modification of this provision; again modified by treaty of Aug. 7, 1856.)	173	Florida.

Schedule of Indian Land Cessions (56th Congress, 1st Session 1899:735) Describing Land Cession Number 173: Lands Ceded by the 'Seminole' (Present Day Seminole Tribe of Florida and Seminole Nation of Oklahoma)



Cropped View of Map (56th Congress, 1st Session 1899) Illustrating Cession Number 118: Lands Ceded by the 'Florida Tribes' (Present-Day present day Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida and Seminole Tribe of Florida) and Cession Number 173: Lands Ceded by the 'Seminole' (Present Day Seminole Tribe of Florida and Seminole Nation of Oklahoma)

ATTACHMENT 9-A7-4

Habitat Descriptions

Habitat Descriptions — 230-kV CCRE Corridor

Improved Pastures (FLUCCS 211)

Improved pastures are typically utilized for cattle grazing which has been cleared, tilled, and reseeded with specific grass types and improved with brush control and fertilizers, or are undeveloped land within urban areas and inactive land with street patterns but no structures (FDOT, 1999). Dominant vegetative species observed include grasses such as bahia grass (*Paspalum notatum*), crab grass (*Digitaria* spp.), and bluestem (*Andropogon virginicus*), shrubs such as saw palmetto (*Serenoa repens*) and wax myrtle (*Myrica cerifera*), and occasional trees such as longleaf pine (*Pinus palustris*), loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*), water oak (*Quercus nigra*), and live oak (*Quercus virginiana*).

Shrub and Brushland (FLUCCS 320)

Shrub and brushland areas are mostly dominated by saw palmetto intermixed with a wide variety of other woody scrub plant species, as well as various types of short herbs and grasses. The canopy component is typically sparse (FDOT, 1999). In addition to the saw palmetto understory, other common species observed within shrub and brushland areas include sparse areas of slash pine (*Pinus elliotii*), Chapman's oak (*Quercus chapmanii*), sand live oak (*Quercus geminata*), laurel oak (*Quercus laurifolia*), persimmon (*Diospyros virginiana*), cabbage palm (*Sabal palmetto*), water oak, live oak, winged sumac (*Rhus copallinum*), gallberry (*Ilex glabra*), common ragweed (*Ambrosia artemisiifolia*) and muscadine grape (*Vitis rotundifolia*).

Longleaf Pine - Xeric Oak (FLUCCS 412)

This forest type is dominated by longleaf pines and is distinguishable from longleaf dominated pine flatwoods by the presence of a subcanopy of sand live oak, live oak, and bluejack oak (*Quercus incana*) with a ground cover dominated by saw palmetto (FDOT, 1999).

Xeric Oak (FLUCCS 421)

Areas of xeric oak found along the corridor may have historically been longleaf – xeric oak habitat, but due to heavy silvicultural operations longleaf pines have since been reduced if not removed altogether. In these areas, longleaf pine is present but not dominant. Other species include live oak, sand live oak, laurel oak, bluejack oak, sand live oak, and post oak (*Quercus stellata*). Ground cover is characterized by saw palmetto, runner oak (*Quercus margarettiae*), wiregrass (*Aristida stricta* var. *beyrichiana*), and deerberry (*Vaccinium stamineum*).

Hardwood-Conifer Mixed Forests (FLUCCS 434)

Hardwood-coniferous mixed forest habitats are areas in which neither upland conifers nor hardwoods achieve at 66 percent crown canopy dominance (FDOT, 1999). The canopy is dominated by a mixture of loblolly pine, longleaf pine,

laurel oak, live oak, sand live oak, and black cherry (*Prunus serotina*). Common shrub species include saw palmetto, gallberry, and wax myrtle, while groundcover plants and vines include wiregrass and greenbrier (*Smilax* spp.).

Coniferous Plantations (FLUCCS 441)

These habitats are discussed together due to their similarity in species composition and function. These areas are characterized by monocultures of planted loblolly pine, slash pine, or sand pine (*Pinus clausa*) in uniform age classes and in rows. Some areas of planted pines in the lower wetter areas of the corridor also may contain volunteer red maple (*Acer rubrum*), swamp bay (*Persea palustris*), slash pine, water oak, and laurel oak.

Lakes/Reservoirs (FLUCCS 520/530)

These habitats are discussed together due to their similarity in species composition and function. Several small lakes and reservoirs were observed along the corridor, mostly in improved pasture areas. Dominant vegetation observed within or adjacent to these surface water bodies include red maple, swamp bay, pond cypress (*Taxodium ascendans*), coastal plain willow (*Salix caroliniana*), cattail (*Typha* spp.), common buttonbush (*Cephalanthus occidentalis*), false-willow (*Baccharis angustifolia*), Peruvian primrose willow (*Ludwigia peruviana*), maidencane (*Panicum hemitomon*), smartweed (*Polygonum hydropiperoides*), and lance-leaved arrowhead (*Sagittaria lancifolia*).

Streams and Lake Swamps (Bottomland) (FLUCCS 615)

Typically stream and lake swamp habitats are dominated by a variety of hardwood species tolerant of occasional inundation and hydric soils (FDOT, 1999). Species observed include pond cypress, laurel oak, red maple, swamp bay, dahoon holly (*Ilex cassine*), common buttonbush, coinwort (*Centella asiatica*), cinnamon fern (*Osmunda cinnamomea*), and Virginia chain fern (*Woodwardia virginica*).

Wetland Forested Mixed (FLUCCS 630)

Mixed wetland forests are habitats in which neither hardwoods nor conifers achieve a 66 percent dominance of the crown canopy composition (FDOT, 1999). The canopy is typically dominated by a mixture of red maple, laurel oak, slash pine, cabbage palm, live oak, cypress, sweetgum and pignut hickory (*Carya glabra*). Shrub, understory, and vine species include saw palmetto, eastern false-willow (*Baccharis halimifolia*), wax myrtle, coastal plain willow, Virginia chain fern, royal fern (*Osmunda regalis*), and greenbrier.

Freshwater Marshes (FLUCCS 641)

Several areas of freshwater marsh are located within the corridor. Freshwater marshes are typically dominated by shrub and herbaceous species (FDOT, 1999), including common buttonbush, maidencane, redroot (*Lachnanthes caroliniana*), buttonweed (*Diodia virginiana*), marsh fern (*Thelypteris palustris*), Virginia chain fern, smartweed, lance-leaved arrowhead, soft rush (*Juncus effusus*), marshpennywort (*Hydrocotyle* spp.), pickerelweed (*Pontederia cordata*), flat sedges (*Cyperus* spp.) and caric sedges (*Carex* spp.).

Wet Prairies (FLUCCS 643)

Wet prairie is an infrequently inundated wetland habitat with predominantly herbaceous vegetation occurring upon hydric soils (FDOT, 1999). Dominant vegetation includes bushy bluestem (*Andropogon glomeratus*), soft rush, dogfennel (*Eupatorium capillifolium*), coinwort, torpedo grass (*Panicum repens*), meadow beauty (*Rhexia* spp.), St. John's-wort (*Hypericum* sp.), camphorweed (*Pluchea* spp.), bog button (*Lachnocaulon* spp.), maidencane, and marshpennywort.