Appendix F Cultural Resources

F-1: FAA – SHPO Early Coordination Letter

F-2: FAA - Tribal Coordination Letters





Orlando Airports District Office 8427 South Park Circle, Suite 524 Orlando, FL 32819 Phone: (407) 487-7220 Fax: (407) 487-7135

May 28, 2021

[Sent vial e-mail to: compliancepermits@dos.myflorida.com]

Timothy A. Parsons, Ph.D.
Director, Division of Historical Resources & State Historic Preservation Officer R.A. Gray Building 500 South Bronough Street Tallahassee, Florida 32399

RE: Section 106 Consultation for Proposed Runway Extension North Palm Beach County General Aviation Airport (F45) Palm Beach County, Florida

Dear Dr. Parsons.

Palm Beach County has requested approval from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to extend one the runways at the North Palm Beach County General Aviation Airport (F45). The federal actions associated with the proposed development project is an undertaking subject to the *National Historic Preservation Act* and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800. This letter is intended to initiate Section 106 consultation.

Proposed Undertaking

The proposed development project would extend Runway 14-32 from its present length of 4,300 feet to 6,000 feet. The project's purpose is to better accommodate the needs of existing and other users that cannot use the airport or are required to use smaller aircraft when using the airport. Other related improvements include widening the runway from 60 feet to 100 feet, grading and drainage improvements, and relocating a section of the airport's entrance road. The proposed development project is depicted on the enclosed Figure 1. A more descriptive summary of the project elements is included with this letter.

Area of Potential Effect (APE)

The construction and operation of the proposed development project was reviewed to identify an appropriate APE for the evaluation of potential impacts on historic, archaeological, and cultural resources. Based on a review of the proposed project, the Direct Effects portion of the APE includes the areas where ground disturbance is expected to occur. This area would generally be limited to areas associated construction of the proposed runway and taxiway extension, including adjacent runway and taxiway Safety Areas and Object Free Areas; areas associated with relocation of a portion of the airport access road and airport maintenance roads; access road construction; and, construction of a new Airport Traffic Control Tower. The Indirect Effects portion of the APE would encompass an area

around the runway likely to be exposed to increased noise (DNL 65 dB or higher), air emissions, light emissions, etc. The APE is depicted on Figure 2.

Historic and Archaeological Resources in the APE

NRHP Search – A review of information contained in the Florida Master Site File showed no known resources listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) within the APE or near the airport. The nearest National Register-eligible resource is the Seaboard Airline Railroad Station (PB12917), which is located approximately 9 miles east of the airport.

<u>Cultural Resource Assessment Desktop Analysis</u> – Archaeological Consultants, Inc. (ACI) prepared a desktop analysis for the proposed development project. The study included the identification and description of all known archaeological sites and historic resources located within or proximate to the APE¹, as well as a discussion of potential archaeologically sensitive areas. A copy of ACI's report is enclosed with this letter.

Background research indicated that no archaeological sites have been recorded within or near the APE. The report states there is a low probability for aboriginal and historic archaeological site occurrence. This is due to lack of preferred soil types; the areas low, wet setting; and no evidence of hammocks is present. The potential for unrecorded historic period archaeological sites was also assessed and found to be low. A review of the property appraiser data suggests no potential for historic structures and the historic aerial photos and maps revealed no historic buildings or structures. Because there is a low potential for archaeological and historic sites, ACI recommended that a Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS) does not appear to be warranted for this project.

Determination of Effect

Based on a review of the proposed development project and ACI's research and professional opinion, the FAA has determined the undertaking would not affect historic properties. Because the proposed project includes ground disturbance activities, the FAA will require Palm Beach County to implement special conditions regarding unexpected discoveries during construction.

FAA appreciates your review of the enclosed project information and response within 30 days of receipt of this letter, indicating if you concur with the APE and our determination. Please direct correspondence and questions to me at (407) 487-7296 or peter.m.green@faa.gov.

Sincerely,


Peter M. Green, AICP Environmental Protection Specialist


Enclosures

Cc: Gary Sypek, Palm Beach County Department of Airports Amy Paulson, Environmental Science Associates

¹ Subsequent to the completion of ACI's Desktop Survey, the APE was enlarged slightly for FAA's consideration of potential indirect effects (e.g., aircraft noise). The Direct Effects portion of the APE (areas subject to disturbance) remain unchanged.









CULTURAL RESOURCE ASSESSMENT DESKTOP ANALYSIS NORTH PALM BEACH COUNTY GENERAL AVIATION AIRPORT RUNWAY EXTENSION AND CONNECTED ACTIONS PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA

e ed :...

 $n \qquad n^{\dots} \; en \qquad c \; ence \quad ss \; c^{\times} \; es$

c:: c C n n s nc C te

e

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive	Summary 1
Location a	nd Environmental Setting
	d Research and Literature Review5
Archaeolo	gical and Historical Considerations5
	ns
	s Cited
Figure 1. Figure 2.	LIST OF FIGURES Location of the North Palm Beach County General Aviation Airport
Figure 3. Figure 4. Figure 5.	Soil type distribution
Figure 6. Figure 7.	1845 and 1846 plats of the project APE
	LIST OF TABLES
Table 1. Table 2. Table 3.	CRAS projects conducted proximate to the property

ec i e r

A d sk op a a ysis h No h a m B ach Cou y a A ia io Airpo Ru way sio a d Co ct d Act o s p o c o at d i a m ach Cou t was co uct d by A chaoo ica Co su a s I c ACI) o b alf of E vi o m a Sci c Associat s. The study. co duct d acco da c with S c o 106 o th a nal i ric Pr r at n Ac i c ud h ide i ca io a d desc ptio of al k ow a chaeolo ica si es a h s o ic esou ces ocated wi hi o po ima to h A a of o ial E c s A E as w las a discussio o po al a cha olo icaly se siti a eas ack ou d esea ch i d cated ha o a chaco o ical si es ha e bee eco ded w h o ea he he e is a ow p obab i y o es base o he e o me a se i A eview of th p op ty app ais da a su sts o po ial o histo ic s ructu s a d th his o ic a ia photos a d maps e ea ed o his o ic bui di so st uc u es O 19 6 S ate of Fo a 1 5d, 1 6 S A 953a 1953b S S 19 5 1950. h was a so a ow pot tia 'o archa o o ica a dhi o ic si s a da Cultural R sou c Ass ssm t Su v y C AS o s ot app ar o b wa ra d r his p oj ct. How if o is ui d as par of h p rm t i proc ss, h dwo k should m t th e ui eme s of Chapte s 267 373 a d 72. 5, r da Sa t s F o a s Coastal a a eme o am a d imp eme i sae e u a io s possible e ects o his o ic p ope ies iste o is i , i th RH , o o h wis f h storica , archi c ura o archa o o ica a u , as wel as the s a da ds co ai ed lo da is o of is o ca esou ces / rc anag nt Standard and p rat na an al HR 2 03). h por should a so m t th sp ci ca io s s thi Chap A-6 F r da Ad n s ra i d.

cinndnirnen en

he has a ele a io of s mete s 0 e above mea sea eve. les who the Easte Va y physio aphic io Whi 197). It sud ai by the shely some tsooth lo istoc has a su cially id cdbysh sa and cay orida parm to fE io ma ot ctio FE 2001a 20 1b).

cco di to t e .S. epa m of A cu e S , e is w hi Ri ie a associatio ha is made up of b oad, ow atwoo s a d assy s ou hs i te spe sed wih u e ous assed po ds a d swampy a eas. he a u a e atio s s ash pi c, cabba e pa m, saw pa me to south bayb y, i kb ry pi la d th aw a d o h ati rass s. Cypr ss, p ck w d S. oh swo, co kw d, sa d co d ass a d o h w a d rass s ow i h w a as McCollum t a 197 h a o y th soi typ s wi hi h prop rt R a sa d 0 2 s op s Ri ra sa d, u t y po d d 0-1 slop s a d abasso fi sa d - s op s. h i is but o s depicted o gure (US A 2 1). he Rivic a so s a e ca y eve poo y d ai e, a occu b oad, ow a as a d i d p ss o s. Wabasso sa is poo y ai a occu s th woo s.




Figure 1. Location of the North Palm Beach County General Aviation Airport.



Figure 2. Environmental setting of the APE.



h soils s ppot di v t iv m s, which i provid h bit s th loc l im l pop l io, d h s p ovid ss ti l od so c s. How v r, th soils h v ri bl s i b l ty op d woodl d, d w l d h b ts. h h b t or op l d wildli co sis s of c opl d, p st m dows d r s th t o ow w h ss s h r bs shr bs d v i s. Th s s p od c i d s d c ops r ss s l gum s, d wild h r b c o s pl s Th wildl c ed o h cse e s i cl de bobwhite u i dove sp row h w me dowl eld sp row co o il d c l r . Woodl d wildli h bit i cl d s r of d c d o s pl ts o co i ro s pl s o bo h d ssoci d r ss s le mes d wild h e b ceo s p s. Wildlife t c ed o h cs e s i cl de ey owhee woodpec e s, owls s i r els y o, coo, d ce . The h b bit w l nd w ldl cl d s so op n m s y o sw py s llow w t r s Wildl n h s e s i cl de d c s c e s h e o s i she s, lli o s, d o c rs i d h l et l T b le 6). i vic s d s d ll h b i ts i d p ssio l i s r t ood r w l d h b t s W b sso s d fair r woodl d h b i ts. h y r t d oo or v ry poo r th h b ats o m io d.

rndsrndrr

vi w of p ti t rch olo ic l dhis oric l lit cords dohrdocm ts d d p i i o h l r w s co d c . h c s of his d s op lysis w s o sc in h yp s of c lt l so c s ow h pro c cini s w ll s th po i l o th occ r c of yc cco ded eso ces ese chi c l ded re iew o sites lised i the P d e lo id M s Si Fil FMSF) p il 2 2 l G S pd) mi io th P lm B ch o ty Prop ty pp se s d soil s vey i o m ion pl p, cld otes d t c boo eco ds historic eri l pho os o le w h he Public tio o chiv l ib y d se m te i ls P M) c io l p his o i s his o s d si loc io pr dicti mod ls nd r l nt R S r por s nd m n scrip s.

r i ndis ri Cnsdrins

h ch olo ic l b c o d r s rc dic t d th t o ch olo c l sit s loc d with h PE d h o ly wo sit s w thi . ilom rs m l s) PB1

V v s) is c mpsi s blish d r r so c p oc r m t M ows d Lo o 05). h s b de crmi ed po e i lly eli ible o lisi i e P by he S te istoric P ese io O ce SHPO). PB Lo Slo h) is lso list d s proc r m sit h lso h s bo l c m cs. w s eco ded d i eco n iss ce s vey o h c ee Slou h thou h o copy o the epo s l ble he MS povides list f he Spoecs co duc ed p o im e to he P.

Flo id l ic iv rsi y compil d th rch olo ic l d t wih P lm B ch o y d loo d h dis ib io o ch olo ic l sit s w hi di t colo ic l sys ms Th s syst ms we e he divided i o hi h med m, d low ob bili y re s i ter s o bo i i l si e loc tio. s o hi h po i l co sis d o low d t op c l h mmoc s d h co st l d d str d r s. Mode e o es o ch colo ic l pote ti l co sisted o pi e o es s p i cs, d d y m shes. The low p ob bili y e s co sisted of wet p i ies s mps m rshes, po ds, d Florid sc ub en edy c l l l 5) O e o he m i cto s i si e selec io w s the bi ity o the l d o p oduced od so ces no i e ms o icult l prod ce b n t lly occ r i pl s d im ls. he si es po d so h of L O chob, i h B ll Gl d r w r loc t d i ood pro s, b w lly p o im o st m, d co sis d of midd s, mo ds d mo ds w h l r id s K dy l. 7). Th s si loc io s w chos by b acc ss o t c od r so c s. sho ld b o d h h s l m t p o d b low c ot b ppl d to sit s of th P l o d ly ch ic pe iods, which precede he o et o mode e vio e t co ditio s.




Figure 4. Location of the previously recorded cultural resources proximate to the APE.

Table 1. CRAS projects conducted proximate to the property.

REFERENCE	PROJECT	# of Newly Recorded Resources	# of Previously Recorded Resources
2807 / (Fuhrmeister and Hardin 1991)	A Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the Proposed Crane-Bridge-Plumosus 230 KV Transmission Line Project Corridor, Palm Beach and Martin Counties, Florida	0	0
6173 (Ambrosino and Estabrook 2000)	A Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of Eight Alternative Routes for State Road 7 from Okeechobee Boulevard (SR 704) to the Beeline Highway (SR 710) Palm Beach County, Florida	0	0
12752 (Mankowski and Longo 2005)	A Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Vavrus North Parcel, Palm Beach County, Florida	1	0
9061 (Labadia et al. 2003)	Phase I Cultural Resource Survey and Archaeological Inventory of the Onshore Florida Portion of the Proposed Seafarer U.S. Pipeline System Project in Palm Beach and Martin Counties, Florida	2	2
10954 / (Labadia et al. 2004)	Phase I Cultural Resources Survey and Archaeological Inventory of the Onshore Florida Portion of the Proposed Seafarer US Pipeline System Project in Palm Beach County, Florida	2	2
12730 (Carr and Longo 2005)	A Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Vavrus South Parcel, Palm Beach County, Florida	0	0
19570 (Janus Research 2012)	Cultural Resources Assessment Survey SR 710 (Beeline Highway) Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study from Approximately One Mile East of SR 76 (Kanner Highway) to SR 708 (Blue Heron Blvd), in Martin and Palm Beach Counties	3	4
27198 / (Davenport and Green 2013)	Letter Report of Findings: Sandhill Crane West Restoration Project, Palm Beach County, Florida	0	0

ACI examined the site data in terms of distance to water and soil types using the April 2020 FMSF data, specifically looking at the distribution of sites withing the Easter Valley physiographic region. There are 144 sites recorded in this area with confirmed site locations and aboriginal in nature; historic sites were not included in this analysis. **Table 2** shows the distribution of the sites by water type and distance. As can been seen over 90% of the sites are within 100 m (328 ft) of a water sources, of which 55% are associated with swamps or wetlands. Creeks and sloughs account for another 27% of the sites. Over 7% are located along a river with another 7% being along the shore of Lake Worth.

Table 2. Site distribution by water type and distance.

	<100 m (328 ft)		≤200 m (656 ft)		>200 m (656 ft)		Total	
Water type	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Creek/slough	37	25.69%	1	0.69%	1	0.69%	39	27.08%
Lake	1	0.69%		0.00%		0.00%	1	0.69%
Lake Worth	10	6.94%		0.00%		0.00%	10	6.94%
Ocean	3	2.08%		0.00%	(<u> </u>	0.00%	3	2.08%
River	10	6.94%	1	0.69%		0.00%	11	7.64%
Swamp/wetland	74	51.39%	2	1.39%	4	2.78%	80	55.56%
Total	135	93.75%	4	2.78%	5	3.47%	144	100.00%

Soil types and their drainage characteristics can also be used to assess the likelihood for aboriginal site occurrence (Almy 1978). However, it should be noted that this may not provide an accurate representation of their distribution. While we know the percentage of sites for each soil type, we do not know the percentage of each soil type that has been examined for archaeological resources. There are 43 soil types within the Eastern Valley of Palm Beach County; 33 of which have recorded archaeological sites (Table 3). It should be noted that many of these soil types are not suitable as site predictors, these are included in the "Other" category, which accounts for 8.3% of the area. These include varieties of made land, urban areas where soil types cannot be ascertained, and water bodies. Although water is a site predictor, one does not expect to find many sites in water, although they are known to occur. Many of the sites occurred on more than one soil type. This analysis only included the four types covering the greatest acreage for each site, which totaled 851 soil type occurrences. Column "1" indicates that this soil type had the greatest area of the site, and so on down the line, so that column "4" had the smallest site acreage. Within this study area, the poorly drained soils account for 58.7% of the area, with another 30.2% of the soils being very poorly drained. The remaining lands include 1.72% excessively drained, 0.75% moderately well drained, 0.25% somewhat poorly drained, and 0.06% well drained.

Table 3. Site distribution by drainage class and soil type.

DD 4 IV 4 CP (C-11 - 0/ -1	% of		Soi			DECEMBER 1	% of sites	difference
DRAINAGE/Soil type, % slopes	arca	1	2	3	4	Total		
	EXCES:	SIVEL	Y DRA	INED				
Palm Beach-Urban land complex, 0-8%	0.06%	2				2	0.98%	0.92%
St. Lucie-Paola-Urban land complex, 0-8%	1,66%	2	2			4	1,96%	0.30%
Total	1.72%	4	2	0	0	6	2.94%	1.22%
	IODERAT	ELY W	ELLI	RAIN	ED			
Pomello fine sand, 0-5%	0.75%	6			100	6	2.94%	2.19%
Total	0.75%	6	0	0	0	6	2.94%	2.19%
	POO	RLY D	RAIN	ED		10-0	- and	
Basinger fine sand, 0%-2%	4.87%		2		1	3	1.47%	-3,40%
Basinger-Urban land complex	0.78%				- 6	0	0.00%	-0.78%
Beaches	0.00%					0	0.00%	0.00%
Boca fine sand, 0%-2%	4.54%	5	2		- 8	7	3.43%	-1.11%
Hallandale fine sand, 0%-2%	1.18%	3		1		4	1.96%	0.78%
Holopaw fine sand, 0%-2%	2.25%	4				4	1,96%	-0.29%
Immokalee fine sand, 0%-2%	5.18%	10	1			11	5.39%	0.21%
Jupiter fine sand, 0%-2%	0.02%	1	1			2	0.98%	0.96%
Myakka fine sand, 0%-2%	7.11%		1	- 1		2	0.98%	-6.13%
Myakka-Urban land complex	0.61%			- 1	- 0	0	0.00%	-0.61%
Oldsmar sand, 0%-2%	2.29%		1			1	0.49%	-1.80%
Pineda fine sand, 0%-2%	4.04%	1	1		- 8	2	0.98%	+3,06%
Pinellas fine sand	2.23%	17	1	- 1		19	9.31%	7.09%
Pompano fine sand, 0%-2%	0.39%			3		0	0.00%	-0.39%
Riviera fine sand, 0%-2%	18.11%	25	10			35	17.16%	-0.96%
Riviera-Urban land complex	0.11%				- 4	0	0.00%	-0.11%
Wabasso fine sand	3.24%		- 1			1	0.49%	-2.75%
Winder fine sand, 0%-2%	1.75%	24	2	2		28	13.73%	11.97%
Total	58.70%	90	23	5	1	119	58.33%	-0.37%
	OMEWHA	T POC	RLYE	RAIN	ED			· Inner
Canaveral-Urban land complex	0.25%	5	1			6	2.94%	2.69%
Total	0.25%	5	1	0	0	6	2.94%	2.69%

DD AIN ACE IS THE OF A	% of Soils		Torot	% of	A100			
DRAINAGE/Soil type, % slopes	arca	1	2	3	4	Total	sites	difference
	VERY P	POORL	Y DRA	INED				
Anclote fine sand	0.46%		2	1		3	1.47%	1.01%
Basinger and Myakka sands, depressional	3.07%	3	1	1	ĵ	5	2.45%	-0.62%
Chobee fine sandy loam	0.33%		1	- 1		2	0.98%	0.65%
Floridana fine sand, frequently ponded (fp), 0%-1%	0,55%	3	1			4	1.96%	1.42%
Kesson mucky sand, tidal	0.10%	-1	- 1			2	0.98%	0.88%
Okeelanta muck, drained, fp, 0%- 1%	1.12%	2	2	1		- 5	2.45%	1.33%
Pahokee muck, drained, fp, 0%-1%	0.02%					. 0	0.00%	-0.02%
Riviera fine sand, fp, 0%-1%	22.87%	13	- 8	- 1		22	10.78%	+12.08%
Sanibel muck	0.23%		1	1		2	0.98%	0.75%
Tequesta muck, fp, 0%-1%	1.36%	1	1	3		2	0.98%	-0.38%
Terra Ceia muck, drained, fp, 0%- 1%	0.07%					0	0.00%	-0.07%
Torry muck	0.01%					0	0.00%	-0.01%
Wulfert and Durbin muck, tidal	0.03%					0	0.00%	-0.03%
Total	30.22%	2.3	18	6	0	47	23.04%	-7.18%
	WI	ELL DE	RAINE	D	-			
Canaveral-Urban land complex	0.25%	5	1			6	2.94%	2.69%
Total	0.25%	5	1	0	0	6	2.94%	2.69%
		ОТН	ER					
Arents-Urban land complex, 0%- 5%	2.60%	4				4	1.96%	-0.64%
Arents-Urban land complex, organic substratum	0.57%	2				2	0.98%	0.41%
Pits, (1%-5%	0.53%	- 1	- 1		- 8	2	0.98%	0.45%
Quartzipsamments, shaped, 0%- 5%	0.77%	5	1			6	2.94%	2.17%
Udorthents, 2%-35%	0.35%					0	0.00%	-0.35%
Urban land	0.85%		1			- 1	0.49%	-0.36%
Water	2.62%	- 1				- 1	0.49%	-2.13%
Total	8.31%	13	3	0	0	16	7.84%	-0.46%
Grand Total	100.00%	538	233	60	20	851	100.00%	0.00%

As can been seen in the table, there is a relatively normal distribution of sites across the landscape. The more interesting differences are highlighted in red (preferred soils) or blue (less preferable). This is calculated by the percentage of sites minus the percent of area; anything with a difference of 2% or more is highlighted. The moderately well and somewhat poorly drained soils have a positive correlation with sites, but not nearly as high as some of the poorly drained soils. Winder sand has a 12% difference and Pinellas sand has a 7.1% difference. The very poorly drained soils overall have a negative correlation with sites, which is not unexpected. Specifically, the frequently ponded Riviera sand has a -12.1% difference. The other four avoided soils are Myakka (-6.1%), Basinger (-3.4%) and Pineda (-3.1%).

In addition to the soil and water factors, it has been determined that oak/palm hammocks, with a slightly higher terrain than the surrounding lands have a high potential for archaeological sites. A review of the 1953 aerial, which shows much of the APE as undeveloped, was conducted to ascertain whether such features were present. Figure 5 shows those areas that may have been small hammocks;

hese ve ll been des royed d ring irpor ons r ion. o h mmo ks ppe wi hin e re proposed r new ons r ion.




Figure 5. Lo on o he poten al hammo s w th he 1 aer al


Based on the environmental setting, the project APE was considered to have a low probability for aboriginal archaeological site occurrence. The preferred soil types are absent, and no evidence of hammocks is present. The potential for yet unrecorded historic period archaeological sites was also assessed and found to be low. The project area was initially surveyed in the 1845 by A.H. Jones and George MacKay (State of Florida 1845a, 1845b, 1845c). The plats depict no development within or near the APE (State of Florida 1845d, 1846) (Figure 6). It was described as 2nd rate pine covered with sawpalmetto and interspersed with ponds and savannahs (State of Florida 1845a:547, 1845b:309-310). All of Sections 2, 3, and 11, and the east half of Section 34 were deeded to the Florida Coast Line Canal and Transportation Company in 1906; the west half of Section 34 was deeded to the Jacksonville, Tampa, and Key West Railway Company in 1881 (State of Florida n.d.:191-192). It is unlikely that either of these companies did anything with these tracts.



Figure 6. 1845 and 1846 plats of the project APE.

A review of the historic aerial photos available from the PALMM indicated that in 1953, the northwest portion of the APE appears to have been cleared for row crops or possible pines. No development of the remainder of the APE occurred until the construction of the airport. Although several dirt trails crossed the APE as of 1986 (FDOT 1986; USDA 1953a, 1953b).

Background research indicated that no recorded historic (50 years of age or more) resources (buildings, structures, cemeteries, bridges) are located within or adjacent to the APE. The Seaboard Air Line Railroad corridor (8PB12917) is located northwest of the APE. Although it has been determined eligible for listing in the NRHP, the proposed undertaking will have no direct or indirect affects to qualities that have been used to determine its significance. A review of the historic aerial photos available from the PALMM, historic quad maps, and the Palm Beach County property appraiser's data suggests no potential for historic resources within the APE (FDOT 1986; Jacks 2021; USDA 1953a, 1953b; USGS 1945, 1950) (see Figure 5, Figure 7).



Conclusions

heb kgroud ese hreeled ore de heologi Isites o histori resou es nh AP AI hough he solo po i borigh I dhistor heologi Isites o o poel heologi es as esult, AS mey obe ne essey but frequired duighe permeter perme

1

References Cited

my Ma o M.

he chaeolo cal Po en al of So Su vey Repo s *The Florida Anthropologist* 1 75 91.

mb os o James . a d R cha d W Es ab o

Cul u a Resou ce ssessme S vey of h l e a ve Rou es S a e Road om O eechobee Bouleva d SR 7) o he Beel e H way SR 71) Palm Beac Cou y, F o da. Pa ame ca Co ul a nc., a pa. MS 17

Ca Robe S. ad V co o o

Phase chaeo o ca Su vey of the Va vus Sou h Pa cel Palm Beach Cou y Fo da. chaeo o cal a d o c l Co se va cy a c. S# 73.

Dave po Ch s a a d Je ee

2 1 e e Repo of F d s Sand Il C a e Wes Resto a on P o ec Palm Beac Cou y F o da. Pa m eac Plan n epa men Wes Palm Beach S#2719.

F P Flo da epa me of vome a P cc o

- 2 la Geology (Environmental). Flo da o aph c a a b a a esv le.
- 2 1b Surficial Geology. Fo da eo aph c ata bay a csvlle.

FD R Flo da vso of Hso cal Resouces

2 Cultural Resource Management Standards and Operational Manual. Flo da so o H so cal Resou ces, allahassee.

F O Flo da epa me of a spo a o)

19 e al Pho o aphs - 4-2 - P 2 - - 4-1. O le P M a e v l e.

Fuh me se ha es a d Ke eth W. a d

Cul u al Resou ce ssessme Suevey o he P oposed a e-B d e-Plumosus 2 KV a sm ss o e P o cc Co o Palm Beach a d a Count es, Flo da. Ja us Resea ch ., ampa. MS# 7.

acks, Do o hy

2 21 Records Search. Palm Beach Cou P ope y pp a se Wes Palm Beac. h ps maps.co.palm-beach us cw s papa.h ml ccessed

Ja us Resea ch

Cul u a Resou ce ssessme Survey SR 7 Beel e H ay) Pro ec Deve opme a d v o me P & S udy o pp o ma e y O e M le s o SR 7 Kan e H hway o SR 7 (Blue Hero Boulevard) Miam a d Palm Beach Cou es Flo da. Ja us Resea , ., am a MS 19 7.

Ke edy ll am J. Cha les Robe s, Sh h-lu S a a d Rya Whee e

Peh so c Resou ces Palm Beach Cou ty Pre m a y P ed c ve S udy.

Depa me of opolo y Flo d A l c vers ty Boca Ra o . S l.

- Labadia, Catherine, Katy Coyle, Eric Vogelheim, Jeremy Pincoske, David George, and William P. Athens
 - 2004 Phase I Cultural Resources Survey and Archaeological Inventory of the Onshore Florida Portion of the Proposed Seafarer U.S. Pipeline System Project in Palm Beach County, Florida. R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., New Orleans. MS# 10954.
- Labadia, Catherine, Katy Coyle, Eric Vogelheim, Jeremy Pincoske, David R. George, and William P. Athens
 - 2003 Phase I Cultural Resource Survey and Archaeological Inventory of the Onshore Florida Portion of the Proposed Seafarer U.S. Pipeline System Project in Palm Beach and Martin Counties, Florida. R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., New Orleans. MS# 9061.
- Liudahl, Kenneth, David J. Belz, Lawrence Carey, Robert W. Drew, Steve Fisher, and Robert Pate 1998 Soil Survey of Collier County Area, Florida. USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service.
- Mankowski, Joseph F. and Victor Longo
 - 2005 A Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Vavrus North Parcel, Palm Beach County, Florida. AHC Technical Report 623. Archaeological and Historical Conservancy, Davie. MS# 12752.
- McCollum, Samuel H., Orlando E. Cruz, Leon T. Stern, William H. Wittstruck, Richard D. Ford, and Frank C. Watts
 - 1978 Soil Survey of Palm Beach County Area, Florida. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Washington, D.C.
- State of Florida, Department of Environmental Protection
 - 1845a Field Notes. A. H. Jones. Volume 75.
 - 1845b Field Notes. A.H. Jones. Volume 111.
 - 1845c Field Notes. George MacKay. Volume 84.
 - 1845d Plat. Township 41 South, Range 41 East. A. H. Jones and George MacKay.
 - 1846 Plat. Township 42 South, Range 41 East. A. H. Jones and George MacKay.
 - n.d. Tract Book, Volume 30.
- USDA (U.S. Department of Agriculture)
 - 1953a Aerial Photograph 11-27-53, BUM-2L-96. On file, PALMM, Gainesville.
 - 1953b Aerial Photographs 11-27-53, BUM-2L-161, 163. On file, PALMM, Gainesville.
 - 2018 Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) Database for Florida September 2018. USDA, NRCS, Fort Worth, TX.
- USGS (U.S. Geological Survey)
 - 1945 Delta, Fla.
 - 1950 Delta, Fla., PR 1967, PR 1973, PR 1984,.
 - 2013 Delta, Fla. USA_Topo_Maps.
- White, William A.
 - 1970 Gcomorphology of the Florida Peninsula. *Geological Bulletin* 51. Florida Department of Natural Resources, Bureau of Geology, Tallahassee.





Orlando Airports District Office 8427 South Park Circle, Suite 524 Orlando, FL 32819 Phone: (407) 487-7220 Fax: (407) 487-7135

July 27, 2021

[Sent via e-mail: section106@mcn-nsn.gov]

Ms. Corrain Loe-Zepeda Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Historic and Cultural Preservation Department Muscogee (Creek) Nation Cultural Preservation PO Box 580 Okmulgee, Oklahoma 74447

RE: Project Notice and Invitation for Consultation Proposed Runway Extension and Related Improvements North Palm Beach County General Aviation Airport (F45) Palm Beach County, Florida

Dear Ms. Loe-Zepeda,

Palm Beach County has requested approval from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to extend Runway 14-32 at the North Palm Beach County General Aviation Airport (F45). The federal actions associated with the proposed development project is an undertaking subject to the *National Historic Preservation Act* (Section 106) and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800. This letter is to inform the Muscogee (Creek) Nation of the proposed project and invite your Tribe to consult on the project.

Proposed Undertaking

The proposed development project would extend Runway 14-32 from its present length of 4,300 feet to 6,000 feet. The project's purpose is to better accommodate the needs of existing and other users that cannot use the airport or are required to use smaller aircraft when using the airport. Other related improvements include widening the runway from 60 feet to 100 feet, grading and drainage improvements, and relocating a section of the airport's entrance road. The proposed development project is depicted on the enclosed Figure 1. A more descriptive summary of the project and its individual elements is included with this letter.

Area of Potential Effect (APE)

The construction and operation of the proposed development project was reviewed to identify an APE for the evaluation of potential impacts on historic, archaeological, and cultural resources. Based on a review of the proposed project, the Direct Effects portion of the APE includes all areas where ground disturbance is expected to occur. This portion of the APE would those areas associated with runway and taxiway construction, the relocation of airport access and maintenance roads, and select removal of vegetation (e.g., trees) within the Runway Object Free Area and Runway Protection Zones. A majority of the Direct Effects portion of the APE was disturbed when the airport was

developed in the mid- to late 1980s. The Indirect Effects portion of the APE encompass an area around the runway likely to be exposed to increased noise (DNL 65 dB or higher), air emissions, light emissions, etc. The APE is depicted on Figure 2.

Historic and Archaeological Resources in the APE

NRHP Search – A review of information contained in the Florida Master Site File showed no known resources within the APE or near the airport that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The nearest National Register-eligible resource is the Seaboard Airline Railroad Station (PB12917), which is located approximately 9 miles east of the airport.

<u>Cultural Resource Assessment Desktop Analysis</u> – Archaeological Consultants, Inc. (ACI) prepared a desktop analysis for the proposed development project. The study included the identification and description of known archaeological sites and historic resources located within or proximate to the APE¹, as well as an evaluation of potential archaeologically sensitive areas. A copy of ACI's report is enclosed with this letter.

Background research did not identify any recorded archaeological sites within or near the APE. The report states there is a low probability for aboriginal and historic archaeological site occurrence in the APE. This is due to lack of preferred soil types; the area's low, wet setting; and no evidence of remaining hammocks in the APE. The potential for unrecorded historic period archaeological sites was also assessed and found to be low. A review of property appraiser data and aerial photographs and maps showed no indication historic buildings or structures. Because there is a low potential for archaeological and historic sites, ACI recommended that a Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS) does not appear to be warranted for this project. However, it was recommended that because the proposed project includes ground disturbance activities, special conditions be in place regarding unexpected discoveries during construction.

Consultation

Based on site conditions, a review of the proposed development project, and the research conducted, the FAA's preliminary determination is the undertaking would not affect historic properties or cultural resources. However, we are interested in knowing if the Muscogee (Creek) Nation has any concerns or interests related to the proposed project and would like to enter into Section 106 consultation. We welcome your knowledge and opinion on the APE, whether additional study is needed for this undertaking, and the effects of the proposed project. FAA appreciates your review of the enclosed project information and response within 30 days of receipt of this letter. Please direct correspondence and questions to me at (407) 487-7296 or peter.m.green@faa.gov.

Sincerely,

Peter M. Green, AICP

Environmental Protection Specialist

Enclosures

¹ Subsequent to the completion of ACI's Desktop Survey, the APE was enlarged slightly for FAA's consideration of potential indirect effects (e.g., aircraft noise). The Direct Effects portion of the APE (areas subject to disturbance) remain unchanged.

From: Section106

To: <u>Green, Peter M (FAA)</u>

Subject: Re: Section 106 Consultation - North Palm Beach County GA Airport Runway Extension

Date: Wednesday, September 08, 2021 10:29:20 AM

Good morning Mr. Green,

Thank you for sending the correspondence regarding the proposed extension of Runway 14-32 located at the North Palm Beach County General Aviation Airport in Palm Beach County, Florida. Palm Beach County is located within the Muscogee (Creek) Nation's historic area of interest and is of importance to us. After review, the Muscogee (Creek) Nation is unaware of any Muscogee sacred sites, burial grounds, or significant cultural resources located within the immediate project area. The Muscogee Nation concurs that there should be **no effects to any known historic properties** and that work should continue as planned. However, due to the historic presence of Muscogee people in the project area, inadvertent discoveries of cultural resources, human remains and related NAGPRA items may occur, even in areas of existing or prior development. Should this occur, the Muscogee (Creek) Nation requests that all work cease and our office as well as other appropriate agencies be notified immediately. Please feel free to contact me if there are any questions or concerns.

Thank you,

Robin Soweka, Jr.

Cultural Resource Specialist, Historic and Cultural Preservation Department
The Muscogee Nation
P.O. Box 580 | Okmulgee, OK 74447
T 918.732.7726 | F 918.758.0649
rosoweka@MuscogeeNation.com
MuscogeeNation.com



From: Green, Peter M (FAA) <peter.m.green@faa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 2:08 PM

To: Section106 < Section106@muscogeenation.com>

Subject: Section 106 Consultation - North Palm Beach County GA Airport Runway Extension

Dear Ms. Loe-Zepeda

Palm Beach County (Florida) has requested approval from the Federal Aviation Administration to extend Runway 14-32 at the North Palm Beach County General Aviation Airport (F45). The federal actions associated with the proposed development project require consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. FAA appreciates your review of the project and letting us know if the Muscogee (Creek) Nation has an interest in the project area and would like to participate

in the Section 106 consultation process.

Best regards,

Peter Green

Peter M. Green, AICP
Environmental Protection Specialist
Orlando Airports District Office
Federal Aviation Administration
8427 SouthPark Circle
Orlando, Florida 32819
407-487-7296

peter.m.green@faa.gov



Orlando Airports District Office 8427 South Park Circle, Suite 524 Orlando, FL 32819 Phone: (407) 487-7220 Fax: (407) 487-7135

July 27, 2021

[Sent via e-mail: THPOCompliance@semtribe.com]

Mr. Bradley Mueller Compliance Review Supervisor Tribal Historic Preservation Office Seminole Tribe of Florida 30290 Josie Billie Highway, PMB 1004 Clewiston, Florida 33440

RE: Project Notice and Invitation for Consultation

Proposed Runway Extension and Related Improvements North Palm Beach County General Aviation Airport (F45)

Palm Beach County, Florida

Dear Mr. Mueller,

Palm Beach County has requested approval from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to extend Runway 14-32 at the North Palm Beach County General Aviation Airport (F45). The federal actions associated with the proposed development project is an undertaking subject to the *National Historic Preservation Act* (Section 106) and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800. This letter is to inform the Seminole Tribe of Florida of the proposed project and invite your Tribe to consult on the project.

Proposed Undertaking

The proposed development project would extend Runway 14-32 from its present length of 4,300 feet to 6,000 feet. The project's purpose is to better accommodate the needs of existing and other users that cannot use the airport or are required to use smaller aircraft when using the airport. Other related improvements include widening the runway from 60 feet to 100 feet, grading and drainage improvements, and relocating a section of the airport's entrance road. The proposed development project is depicted on the enclosed Figure 1. A more descriptive summary of the project and its individual elements is included with this letter.

Area of Potential Effect (APE)

The construction and operation of the proposed development project was reviewed to identify an APE for the evaluation of potential impacts on historic, archaeological, and cultural resources. Based on a review of the proposed project, the Direct Effects portion of the APE includes all areas where ground disturbance is expected to occur. This portion of the APE would those areas associated with runway and taxiway construction, the relocation of airport access and maintenance roads, and select removal of vegetation (e.g., trees) within the Runway Object Free Area and Runway Protection Zones. A majority of the Direct Effects portion of the APE was disturbed when the airport was

developed in the mid- to late 1980s. The Indirect Effects portion of the APE encompass an area around the runway likely to be exposed to increased noise (DNL 65 dB or higher), air emissions, light emissions, etc. The APE is depicted on Figure 2.

Historic and Archaeological Resources in the APE

NRHP Search – A review of information contained in the Florida Master Site File showed no known resources within the APE or near the airport that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The nearest National Register-eligible resource is the Seaboard Airline Railroad Station (PB12917), which is located approximately 9 miles east of the airport.

<u>Cultural Resource Assessment Desktop Analysis</u> – Archaeological Consultants, Inc. (ACI) prepared a desktop analysis for the proposed development project. The study included the identification and description of known archaeological sites and historic resources located within or proximate to the APE¹, as well as an evaluation of potential archaeologically sensitive areas. A copy of ACI's report is enclosed with this letter.

Background research did not identify any recorded archaeological sites within or near the APE. The report states there is a low probability for aboriginal and historic archaeological site occurrence in the APE. This is due to lack of preferred soil types; the area's low, wet setting; and no evidence of remaining hammocks in the APE. The potential for unrecorded historic period archaeological sites was also assessed and found to be low. A review of property appraiser data and aerial photographs and maps showed no indication historic buildings or structures. Because there is a low potential for archaeological and historic sites, ACI recommended that a Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS) does not appear to be warranted for this project. However, it was recommended that because the proposed project includes ground disturbance activities, special conditions be in place regarding unexpected discoveries during construction.

Consultation

Based on site conditions, a review of the proposed development project, and the research conducted, the FAA's preliminary determination is the undertaking would not affect historic properties or cultural resources. However, we are interested in knowing if the Seminole Tribe of Florida has any concerns or interests related to the proposed project and would like to enter into Section 106 consultation. We welcome your knowledge and opinion on the APE, whether additional study is needed for this undertaking, and the effects of the proposed project. FAA appreciates your review of the enclosed project information and response within 30 days of receipt of this letter. Please direct correspondence and questions to me at (407) 487-7296 or peter.m.green@faa.gov.

Sincerely

Peter M. Green, AICP

Environmental Protection Specialist

Enclosures

¹ Subsequent to the completion of ACI's Desktop Survey, the APE was enlarged slightly for FAA's consideration of potential indirect effects (e.g., aircraft noise). The Direct Effects portion of the APE (areas subject to disturbance) remain unchanged.



Federal Aviation Administration

July 27, 2021

[Sent via e-mail: leader.bs@sno-nsn.gov]

Orlando, FL 32819 Phone: (407) 487-7220

Fax: (407) 487-7135

Orlando Airports District Office

8427 South Park Circle, Suite 524

Brigita Leader, MS Interim Director/TCNS Coordinator Historic Preservation Office Seminole Nation of Oklahoma Post Office Box 1498 Wewoka, Oklahoma 74884

RE: Project Notice and Invitation for Consultation Proposed Runway Extension and Related Improvements North Palm Beach County General Aviation Airport (F45) Palm Beach County, Florida

Dear Ms. Leader.

Palm Beach County has requested approval from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to extend Runway 14-32 at the North Palm Beach County General Aviation Airport (F45). The federal actions associated with the proposed development project is an undertaking subject to the *National Historic Preservation Act* (Section 106) and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800. This letter is to inform the Seminole Nation of Oklahoma of the proposed project and invite your Tribe to consult on the project.

Proposed Undertaking

The proposed development project would extend Runway 14-32 from its present length of 4,300 feet to 6,000 feet. The project's purpose is to better accommodate the needs of existing and other users that cannot use the airport or are required to use smaller aircraft when using the airport. Other related improvements include widening the runway from 60 feet to 100 feet, grading and drainage improvements, and relocating a section of the airport's entrance road. The proposed development project is depicted on the enclosed Figure 1. A more descriptive summary of the project and its individual elements is included with this letter.

Area of Potential Effect (APE)

The construction and operation of the proposed development project was reviewed to identify an APE for the evaluation of potential impacts on historic, archaeological, and cultural resources. Based on a review of the proposed project, the Direct Effects portion of the APE includes all areas where ground disturbance is expected to occur. This portion of the APE would those areas associated with runway and taxiway construction, the relocation of airport access and maintenance roads, and select removal of vegetation (e.g., trees) within the Runway Object Free Area and Runway Protection Zones. A majority of the Direct Effects portion of the APE was disturbed when the airport was

developed in the mid- to late 1980s. The Indirect Effects portion of the APE encompass an area around the runway likely to be exposed to increased noise (DNL 65 dB or higher), air emissions, light emissions, etc. The APE is depicted on Figure 2.

Historic and Archaeological Resources in the APE

NRHP Search – A review of information contained in the Florida Master Site File showed no known resources within the APE or near the airport that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The nearest National Register-eligible resource is the Seaboard Airline Railroad Station (PB12917), which is located approximately 9 miles east of the airport.

<u>Cultural Resource Assessment Desktop Analysis</u> – Archaeological Consultants, Inc. (ACI) prepared a desktop analysis for the proposed development project. The study included the identification and description of known archaeological sites and historic resources located within or proximate to the APE¹, as well as an evaluation of potential archaeologically sensitive areas. A copy of ACI's report is enclosed with this letter.

Background research did not identify any recorded archaeological sites within or near the APE. The report states there is a low probability for aboriginal and historic archaeological site occurrence in the APE. This is due to lack of preferred soil types; the area's low, wet setting; and no evidence of remaining hammocks in the APE. The potential for unrecorded historic period archaeological sites was also assessed and found to be low. A review of property appraiser data and aerial photographs and maps showed no indication historic buildings or structures. Because there is a low potential for archaeological and historic sites, ACI recommended that a Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS) does not appear to be warranted for this project. However, it was recommended that because the proposed project includes ground disturbance activities, special conditions be in place regarding unexpected discoveries during construction.

Consultation

Based on site conditions, a review of the proposed development project, and the research conducted, the FAA's preliminary determination is the undertaking would not affect historic properties or cultural resources. However, we are interested in knowing if the Seminole Nation of Oklahoma has any concerns or interests related to the proposed project and would like to enter into Section 106 consultation. We welcome your knowledge and opinion on the APE, whether additional study is needed for this undertaking, and the effects of the proposed project. FAA appreciates your review of the enclosed project information and response within 30 days of receipt of this letter. Please direct correspondence and questions to me at (407) 487-7296 or peter.m.green@faa.gov.

Sincerely.

Peter M. Green, AICP

Environmental Protection Specialist

Enclosures

¹ Subsequent to the completion of ACI's Desktop Survey, the APE was enlarged slightly for FAA's consideration of potential indirect effects (e.g., aircraft noise). The Direct Effects portion of the APE (areas subject to disturbance) remain unchanged.



Federal Aviation **Administration**

July 27, 2021

Orlando Airports District Office 8427 South Park Circle, Suite 524 Orlando, FL 32819 Phone: (407) 487-7220 Fax: (407) 487-7135

[Sent via e-mail: lhaikey@pci-nsn.gov]

Mr. Larry D. Haikey PBCI Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Poarch Band of Creek Indians 5811 Jack Springs Road Atmore, Alabama 36502

RE: Project Notice and Invitation for Consultation

> Proposed Runway Extension and Related Improvements North Palm Beach County General Aviation Airport (F45) Palm Beach County, Florida

Dear Mr. Haikey,

Palm Beach County has requested approval from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to extend Runway 14-32 at the North Palm Beach County General Aviation Airport (F45). The federal actions associated with the proposed development project is an undertaking subject to the National Historic Preservation Act (Section 106) and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800. This letter is to inform the Poarch Band of Creek Indians of the proposed project and invite your Tribe to consult on the project.

Proposed Undertaking

The proposed development project would extend Runway 14-32 from its present length of 4,300 feet to 6,000 feet. The project's purpose is to better accommodate the needs of existing and other users that cannot use the airport or are required to use smaller aircraft when using the airport. Other related improvements include widening the runway from 60 feet to 100 feet, grading and drainage improvements, and relocating a section of the airport's entrance road. The proposed development project is depicted on the enclosed Figure 1. A more descriptive summary of the project and its individual elements is included with this letter.

Area of Potential Effect (APE)

The construction and operation of the proposed development project was reviewed to identify an APE for the evaluation of potential impacts on historic, archaeological, and cultural resources. Based on a review of the proposed project, the Direct Effects portion of the APE includes all areas where ground disturbance is expected to occur. This portion of the APE would those areas associated with runway and taxiway construction, the relocation of airport access and maintenance roads, and select removal of vegetation (e.g., trees) within the Runway Object Free Area and Runway Protection Zones. A majority of the Direct Effects portion of the APE was disturbed when the airport was

developed in the mid- to late 1980s. The Indirect Effects portion of the APE encompass an area around the runway likely to be exposed to increased noise (DNL 65 dB or higher), air emissions, light emissions, etc. The APE is depicted on Figure 2.

Historic and Archaeological Resources in the APE

NRHP Search – A review of information contained in the Florida Master Site File showed no known resources within the APE or near the airport that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The nearest National Register-eligible resource is the Seaboard Airline Railroad Station (PB12917), which is located approximately 9 miles east of the airport.

<u>Cultural Resource Assessment Desktop Analysis</u> – Archaeological Consultants, Inc. (ACI) prepared a desktop analysis for the proposed development project. The study included the identification and description of known archaeological sites and historic resources located within or proximate to the APE¹, as well as an evaluation of potential archaeologically sensitive areas. A copy of ACI's report is enclosed with this letter.

Background research did not identify any recorded archaeological sites within or near the APE. The report states there is a low probability for aboriginal and historic archaeological site occurrence in the APE. This is due to lack of preferred soil types; the area's low, wet setting; and no evidence of remaining hammocks in the APE. The potential for unrecorded historic period archaeological sites was also assessed and found to be low. A review of property appraiser data and aerial photographs and maps showed no indication historic buildings or structures. Because there is a low potential for archaeological and historic sites, ACI recommended that a Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS) does not appear to be warranted for this project. However, it was recommended that because the proposed project includes ground disturbance activities, special conditions be in place regarding unexpected discoveries during construction.

Consultation

Based on site conditions, a review of the proposed development project, and the research conducted, the FAA's preliminary determination is the undertaking would not affect historic properties or cultural resources. However, we are interested in knowing if the Poarch Band of Creek Indians has any concerns or interests related to the proposed project and would like to enter into Section 106 consultation. We welcome your knowledge and opinion on the APE, whether additional study is needed for this undertaking, and the effects of the proposed project. FAA appreciates your review of the enclosed project information and response within 30 days of receipt of this letter. Please direct correspondence and questions to me at (407) 487-7296 or peter.m.green@faa.gov.

Sincerely,

Peter M. Green, AICP

Environmental Protection Specialist

Enclosures

¹ Subsequent to the completion of ACI's Desktop Survey, the APE was enlarged slightly for FAA's consideration of potential indirect effects (e.g., aircraft noise). The Direct Effects portion of the APE (areas subject to disturbance) remain unchanged.



Federal Aviation Administration

July 27, 2021

Orlando Airports District Office 8427 South Park Circle, Suite 524 Orlando, FL 32819 Phone: (407) 487-7220 Fax: (407) 487-7135

[Sent via e-mail: kevind@miccosukeetribe.com]
Mr. Kevin Donaldson
Environmental Specialist

Environmental Specialist Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida Tamiami Station Post Office Box 440021 Miami, Florida 33144

RE: Project Notice and Invitation for Consultation Proposed Runway Extension and Related Improvements North Palm Beach County General Aviation Airport (F45) Palm Beach County, Florida

Dear Mr. Donaldson.

Palm Beach County has requested approval from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to extend Runway 14-32 at the North Palm Beach County General Aviation Airport (F45). The federal actions associated with the proposed development project is an undertaking subject to the *National Historic Preservation Act* (Section 106) and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800. This letter is to inform the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida of the proposed project and invite your Tribe to consult on the project.

Proposed Undertaking

The proposed development project would extend Runway 14-32 from its present length of 4,300 feet to 6,000 feet. The project's purpose is to better accommodate the needs of existing and other users that cannot use the airport or are required to use smaller aircraft when using the airport. Other related improvements include widening the runway from 60 feet to 100 feet, grading and drainage improvements, and relocating a section of the airport's entrance road. The proposed development project is depicted on the enclosed Figure 1. A more descriptive summary of the project and its individual elements is included with this letter.

Area of Potential Effect (APE)

The construction and operation of the proposed development project was reviewed to identify an APE for the evaluation of potential impacts on historic, archaeological, and cultural resources. Based on a review of the proposed project, the Direct Effects portion of the APE includes all areas where ground disturbance is expected to occur. This portion of the APE would those areas associated with runway and taxiway construction, the relocation of airport access and maintenance roads, and select removal of vegetation (e.g., trees) within the Runway Object Free Area and Runway Protection Zones. A majority of the Direct Effects portion of the APE was disturbed when the airport was

developed in the mid- to late 1980s. The Indirect Effects portion of the APE encompass an area around the runway likely to be exposed to increased noise (DNL 65 dB or higher), air emissions, light emissions, etc. The APE is depicted on Figure 2.

Historic and Archaeological Resources in the APE

NRHP Search – A review of information contained in the Florida Master Site File showed no known resources within the APE or near the airport that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The nearest National Register-eligible resource is the Seaboard Airline Railroad Station (PB12917), which is located approximately 9 miles east of the airport.

<u>Cultural Resource Assessment Desktop Analysis</u> – Archaeological Consultants, Inc. (ACI) prepared a desktop analysis for the proposed development project. The study included the identification and description of known archaeological sites and historic resources located within or proximate to the APE¹, as well as an evaluation of potential archaeologically sensitive areas. A copy of ACI's report is enclosed with this letter.

Background research did not identify any recorded archaeological sites within or near the APE. The report states there is a low probability for aboriginal and historic archaeological site occurrence in the APE. This is due to lack of preferred soil types; the area's low, wet setting; and no evidence of remaining hammocks in the APE. The potential for unrecorded historic period archaeological sites was also assessed and found to be low. A review of property appraiser data and aerial photographs and maps showed no indication historic buildings or structures. Because there is a low potential for archaeological and historic sites, ACI recommended that a Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS) does not appear to be warranted for this project. However, it was recommended that because the proposed project includes ground disturbance activities, special conditions be in place regarding unexpected discoveries during construction.

Consultation

Based on site conditions, a review of the proposed development project, and the research conducted, the FAA's preliminary determination is the undertaking would not affect historic properties or cultural resources. However, we are interested in knowing if the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida has any concerns or interests related to the proposed project and would like to enter into Section 106 consultation. We welcome your knowledge and opinion on the APE, whether additional study is needed for this undertaking, and the effects of the proposed project. FAA appreciates your review of the enclosed project information and response within 30 days of receipt of this letter. Please direct correspondence and questions to me at (407) 487-7296 or peter.m.green@faa.gov.

Sincerely,


Peter M. Green, AICP


Environmental Protection Specialist


Enclosures


¹ Subsequent to the completion of ACI's Desktop Survey, the APE was enlarged slightly for FAA's consideration of potential indirect effects (e.g., aircraft noise). The Direct Effects portion of the APE (areas subject to disturbance) remain unchanged.











CULTURAL RESOURCE ASSESSMENT DESKTOP ANALYSIS NORTH PALM BEACH COUNTY GENERAL AVIATION AIRPORT RUNWAY EXTENSION AND CONNECTED ACTIONS PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA

e ed

n n en cence ss c es

e

c c C n n s nc C te

ec n e n e ec c s e

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive	Summary 1
Location a	nd Environmental Setting
	d Research and Literature Review5
Archaeolo	gical and Historical Considerations5
	ns
	s Cited
Figure 1. Figure 2.	LIST OF FIGURES Location of the North Palm Beach County General Aviation Airport
Figure 3. Figure 4. Figure 5.	Soil type distribution
Figure 6. Figure 7.	1845 and 1846 plats of the project APE
	LIST OF TABLES
Table 1. Table 2. Table 3.	CRAS projects conducted proximate to the property

ec i e r

A d sk op a a ysis h No h a m B ach Cou y a A ia io Airpo Ru way sio a d Co ct d Act o s p o c o at d i a m ach Cou t was co uct d by A chaoo ica Co su a s I c ACI) o b alf of E vi o m a Sci c Associat s. The study. co duct d acco da c with S c o 106 o th a nal i ric Pr r at n Ac i c ud h ide i ca io a d desc ptio of al k ow a chaeolo ica si es a h s o ic esou ces ocated wi hi o po ima to h A a of o ial E c s A E as w las a discussio o po al a cha olo icaly se siti a eas ack ou d esea ch i d cated ha o a chaco o ical si es ha e bee eco ded w h o ea he he e is a ow p obab i y o es base o he e o me a se i A eview of th p op ty app ais da a su sts o po ial o histo ic s ructu s a d th his o ic a ia photos a d maps e ea ed o his o ic bui di so st uc u es O 19 6 S ate of Fo a 1 5d, 1 6 S A 953a 1953b S S 19 5 1950. h was a so a ow pot tia 'o archa o o ica a dhi o ic si s a da Cultural R sou c Ass ssm t Su v y C AS o s ot app ar o b wa ra d r his p oj ct. How if o is ui d as par of h p rm t i proc ss, h dwo k should m t th e ui eme s of Chapte s 267 373 a d 72. 5, r da Sa t s F o a s Coastal a a eme o am a d imp eme i sae e u a io s possible e ects o his o ic p ope ies iste o is i , i th RH , o o h wis f h storica , archi c ura o archa o o ica a u , as wel as the s a da ds co ai ed lo da is o of is o ca esou ces / rc anag nt Standard and p rat na an al HR 2 03). h por should a so m t th sp ci ca io s s thi Chap A-6 F r da Ad n s ra i d.

cinndnirnen en

he has a ele a io of s mete s 0 e above mea sea eve. les who the Easte Va y physio aphic io Whi 197). It sud ai by the shelp s mets of the logistic has a su cially id c d by she sa and c ay oridate parmet of E i o mea of ction F E 2001a 20 1b).

cco di to t e .S. epa m of A cu e S , e is w hi Ri ie a associatio ha is made up of b oad, ow atwoo s a d assy s ou hs i te spe sed wi h u e ous assed po ds a d swampy a eas. he a u a e atio s s ash pi c, cabba e pa m, saw pa me to south bayb y, i kb ry pi la d th aw a d o h ati rass s. Cypr ss, p ck w d S. oh swo, co kw d, sa d co d ass a d o h w a d rass s ow i h w a as McCollum t a 197 h a o y th soi typ s wi hi h prop rt R a sa d 0 2 s op s Ri ra sa d, u t y po d d 0-1 slop s a d abasso fi sa d - s op s. h i is but o s depicted o gure (US A 2 1). he Rivic a so s a e ca y eve poo y d ai e, a occu b oad, ow a as a d i d p ss o s. Wabasso sa is poo y ai a occu s th woo s.




Figure 1. Location of the North Palm Beach County General Aviation Airport.




Figure 2. Environmental setting of the APE.



g e oi t d st u on.

h soils s ppot di v t iv m s, which i provid h bit s th loc l im l pop l io, d h s p ovid ss ti l od so c s. How v r, th soils h v ri bl s i b l ty op d woodl d, d w l d h b ts. h h b t or op l d wildli co sis s of c opl d, p st m dows d r s th t o ow w h ss s h r bs shr bs d v i s. Th s s p od c i d s d c ops r ss s l gum s, d wild h r b c o s pl s Th wildl c ed o hese e s i cl de bobwhite u i dove sp row h w me dowl eld sp row co o il d c l r . Woodl d wildli h bit i cl d s r of d c d o s pl ts o co i ro s pl s o bo h d ssoci d r ss s le mes d wild h e b ceo s p s. Wildlife t c ed o hese e s i cl de ey owhee woodpec e s, owls s i r els y o, coo, dee . The h bit w l ndwldl cl d s so op n m s yo sw py s lloww t r s Wildl n h s e s i cl de d c s e e s he o s i she s, lli o s, d o crs i d h l et l T b le 6). i vic s d s d ll h bit ts i d p ssio l i s r t ood r w l d h b t s W b sso s d fair r woodl d h bits. h y r t d oo or v ry poo r th h b ats o m io d.


rndsrndrr

vi w of p ti t rch olo ic l dhis oric l lit cords dohrdocm ts d d p i i o h l r w s co d c h c s of his d s op lysis w s o sc in h yp s of c lt l so c s ow h pro c cini s w ll s th po i l o th occ r c of yc eco ded eso ces ese chi c l ded re iew o sites lis ed i the P d e lo id M s Si Fil FMSF) p il 2 2 l G S pd) mi io th P lm B ch o ty Prop ty pp se s d soil s vey i o m ion pl p, cld otes d t c boo eco ds historic eri l pho os o le w h he Public tio o chiv l ib y d se m te i ls P M) e io l p his o i s his o s d si loc io pr dicti mod ls nd r l nt R S r por s nd m n scrip s.

<u>r i ndis ri Cnsdrins</u>

h ch olo ic l b c o d r s rc dic t d th t o ch olo c l sit s loc d wi h h PE d h o ly wo sit s w thi . ilom rs m l s) PB l
V v s) is c mpsi s blish d r r so c p oc r m t M ows d Lo o 05). h s b de crmi ed po e i lly eli ible o lisi i e P by he S te istoric P ese io O ce SHPO). PB Lo Slo h) is lso list d s proc r m sit h lso h s bo l c m cs. w s eco ded d i eco n iss ce s vey o h c ee Slou h thou h o copy o the epo s l ble he MS p o vides list f he Spoecs co duc ed p o im e to he P.

Flo id l ic iv rsi y compil d th rch olo ic l d t wih P lm B ch o y d loo d h dis ib io o ch olo ic l sit s w hi di t colo ic l sys ms Th s syst ms we e he divided i o hi h med m, d low ob bili y re s i ter s o bo i i l si e loc tio . s o hi h po i l co sis d o low d t op c l h mmoc s d h co st l d d str d r s. Mode e o es o ch colo ic l pote ti l co sisted o pi e o es s p i es, d d y m shes. The low p ob bili y e s co sisted of wet p i ies s mps m rshes, po ds, d Florid sc ub en edy c l l l 5) O e o he m i cto s i si e selec io w s the bi ity o the l d o p oduced od so ces no i e ms o icult l prod ce b n t lly occ r i pl s d im ls. he si es po d so h of L O chob, i h B ll Gl d r w r loc t d i ood pro s, b w lly p o im o st m, d co sis d of midd s, mo ds d mo ds w h l r id s K dy l. 7). Th s si loc io s w chos by b acc ss o t c od r so c s. sho ld b o d h h s l m t p o d b low c ot b ppl d to sit s of th P l o d ly ch ic pe iods, which precede he o et o mode e vio e t co ditio s.



Locatio of he evo sy ec rded cul u al esources ro mate o the AP.

Table 1. CRAS projects conducted proximate to the property.

REFERENCE	PROJECT	# of Newly Recorded Resources	# of Previously Recorded Resources
2807 / (Fuhrmeister and Hardin 1991)	A Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of the Proposed Crane-Bridge-Plumosus 230 KV Transmission Line Project Corridor, Palm Beach and Martin Counties, Florida	0	0
6173 (Ambrosino and Estabrook 2000)	A Cultural Resource Assessment Survey of Eight Alternative Routes for State Road 7 from Okeechobee Boulevard (SR 704) to the Beeline Highway (SR 710) Palm Beach County, Florida	0	0
12752 (Mankowski and Longo 2005)	A Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Vavrus North Parcel, Palm Beach County, Florida	1	0
9061 (Labadia et al. 2003)	Phase I Cultural Resource Survey and Archaeological Inventory of the Onshore Florida Portion of the Proposed Seafarer U.S. Pipeline System Project in Palm Beach and Martin Counties, Florida	2	2
10954 / (Labadia et al. 2004)	Phase I Cultural Resources Survey and Archaeological Inventory of the Onshore Florida Portion of the Proposed Seafarer US Pipeline System Project in Palm Beach County, Florida	2	2
12730 (Carr and Longo 2005)	A Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Vavrus South Parcel, Palm Beach County, Florida	0	0
19570 (Janus Research 2012)	Cultural Resources Assessment Survey SR 710 (Beeline Highway) Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study from Approximately One Mile East of SR 76 (Kanner Highway) to SR 708 (Blue Heron Blvd), in Martin and Palm Beach Counties	3	4
27198 / (Davenport and Green 2013)	Letter Report of Findings: Sandhill Crane West Restoration Project, Palm Beach County, Florida	0	0

ACI examined the site data in terms of distance to water and soil types using the April 2020 FMSF data, specifically looking at the distribution of sites withing the Easter Valley physiographic region. There are 144 sites recorded in this area with confirmed site locations and aboriginal in nature; historic sites were not included in this analysis. **Table 2** shows the distribution of the sites by water type and distance. As can been seen over 90% of the sites are within 100 m (328 ft) of a water sources, of which 55% are associated with swamps or wetlands. Creeks and sloughs account for another 27% of the sites. Over 7% are located along a river with another 7% being along the shore of Lake Worth.

Table 2. Site distribution by water type and distance.

	≤100 m (328 ft)		≤200 m	(656 ft)	>200 m	(656 ft)	Total	
Water type	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Creek/slough	37	25.69%	1	0.69%	1	0.69%	39	27.08%
Lake	1	0.69%		0.00%		0.00%	1	0.69%
Lake Worth	10	6.94%		0.00%		0.00%	10	6.94%
Ocean	3	2.08%		0.00%		0.00%	3	2.08%
River	10	6.94%	1	0.69%		0.00%	11	7.64%
Swamp/wetland	74	51.39%	2	1.39%	4	2.78%	80	55.56%
Total	135	93.75%	4	2.78%	5	3.47%	144	100.00%

Soil types and their drainage characteristics can also be used to assess the likelihood for aboriginal site occurrence (Almy 1978). However, it should be noted that this may not provide an accurate representation of their distribution. While we know the percentage of sites for each soil type, we do not know the percentage of each soil type that has been examined for archaeological resources. There are 43 soil types within the Eastern Valley of Palm Beach County; 33 of which have recorded archaeological sites (Table 3). It should be noted that many of these soil types are not suitable as site predictors, these are included in the "Other" category, which accounts for 8.3% of the area. These include varieties of made land, urban areas where soil types cannot be ascertained, and water bodies. Although water is a site predictor, one does not expect to find many sites in water, although they are known to occur. Many of the sites occurred on more than one soil type. This analysis only included the four types covering the greatest acreage for each site, which totaled 851 soil type occurrences. Column "1" indicates that this soil type had the greatest area of the site, and so on down the line, so that column "4" had the smallest site acreage. Within this study area, the poorly drained soils account for 58.7% of the area, with another 30.2% of the soils being very poorly drained. The remaining lands include 1.72% excessively drained, 0.75% moderately well drained, 0.25% somewhat poorly drained, and 0.06% well drained.

Table 3. Site distribution by drainage class and soil type.

	% of	Soils				DESCRIPTION OF THE PERSON OF T	% of	1100
DRAINAGE/Soil type, % slopes	arca	1	2	3	4	Total	sites	difference
	EXCES:	SIVEL	Y DRA	INED				
Palm Beach-Urban land complex, 0-8%	0.06%	2				2	0.98%	0.92%
St. Lucie-Paola-Urban land complex, 0-8%	1,66%	2	2			4	1,96%	0.30%
Total	1.72%	4	2	0	0	6	2.94%	1.22%
	IODERAT	ELY W	ELLI	RAIN	ED			
Pomello fine sand, 0-5%	0.75%	6			100	6	2.94%	2.19%
Total	0.75%	6	0	0	0	6	2.94%	2.19%
	POO	RLY D	RAIN	ED		10-0	- and	
Basinger fine sand, 0%-2%	4.87%		2		1	3	1.47%	-3,40%
Basinger-Urban land complex	0.78%				- 6	0	0.00%	-0.78%
Beaches	0.00%					0	0.00%	0.00%
Boca fine sand, 0%-2%	4.54%	5	2		- 8	7	3.43%	-1.11%
Hallandale fine sand, 0%-2%	1.18%	3		1		4	1.96%	0.78%
Holopaw fine sand, 0%-2%	2.25%	4				4	1,96%	-0.29%
Immokalee fine sand, 0%-2%	5.18%	10	1			11	5.39%	0.21%
Jupiter fine sand, 0%-2%	0.02%	1	1			2	0.98%	0.96%
Myakka fine sand, 0%-2%	7.11%		1	- 1		2	0.98%	-6.13%
Myakka-Urban land complex	0.61%			- 1	- 0	0	0.00%	-0.61%
Oldsmar sand, 0%-2%	2.29%		1			1	0.49%	-1.80%
Pineda fine sand, 0%-2%	4.04%	1	1		- 8	2	0.98%	+3,06%
Pinellas fine sand	2.23%	17	1	- 1		19	9.31%	7.09%
Pompano fine sand, 0%-2%	0.39%			3		0	0.00%	-0.39%
Riviera fine sand, 0%-2%	18.11%	25	10			35	17.16%	-0.96%
Riviera-Urban land complex	0.11%				- 1	0	0.00%	-0.11%
Wabasso fine sand	3.24%		- 1			1	0.49%	-2.75%
Winder fine sand, 0%-2%	1.75%	24	2	2		28	13.73%	11.97%
Total	58.70%	90	23	5	1	119	58.33%	-0.37%
	OMEWHA	T POC	RLYE	RAIN	ED			· Inner
Canaveral-Urban land complex	0.25%	5	1			6	2.94%	2.69%
Total	0.25%	5	1	0	0	6	2.94%	2.69%

DD AIN ACE IS THE OF A	% of	Soils				Total	% of	Aller
DRAINAGE/Soil type, % slopes	arca	1	2	3	4	Total	sites	difference
	VERY P	POORL	Y DRA	INED				
Anclote fine sand	0.46%		2	1		3	1.47%	1.01%
Basinger and Myakka sands, depressional	3.07%	3	1	1	ĵ	5	2.45%	-0.62%
Chobee fine sandy loam	0.33%		1	- 1		2	0.98%	0.65%
Floridana fine sand, frequently ponded (fp), 0%-1%	0,55%	3	1			4	1.96%	1.42%
Kesson mucky sand, tidal	0.10%	-1	- 1			2	0.98%	0.88%
Okeelanta muck, drained, fp, 0%- 1%	1.12%	2	2	1		- 5	2.45%	1.33%
Pahokee muck, drained, fp, 0%-1%	0.02%					. 0	0.00%	-0.02%
Riviera fine sand, fp, 0%-1%	22.87%	13	- 8	- 1		22	10.78%	+12.08%
Sanibel muck	0.23%		1	1		2	0.98%	0.75%
Tequesta muck, fp, 0%-1%	1.36%	1	1	3		2	0.98%	-0.38%
Terra Ceia muck, drained, fp, 0%- 1%	0.07%					0	0.00%	-0.07%
Torry muck	0.01%					0	0.00%	-0.01%
Wulfert and Durbin muck, tidal	0.03%					0	0.00%	-0.03%
Total	30.22%	2.3	18	6	0	47	23.04%	-7.18%
	WI	ELL DE	RAINE	D	-			
Canaveral-Urban land complex	0.25%	5	1			6	2.94%	2.69%
Total	0.25%	5	1	0	0	6	2.94%	2.69%
		ОТН	ER					
Arents-Urban land complex, 0%- 5%	2.60%	4				4	1.96%	-0.64%
Arents-Urban land complex, organic substratum	0.57%	2				2	0.98%	0.41%
Pits, (1%-5%	0.53%	- 1	- 1		- 8	2	0.98%	0.45%
Quartzipsamments, shaped, 0%- 5%	0.77%	5	1			6	2.94%	2.17%
Udorthents, 2%-35%	0.35%					0	0.00%	-0.35%
Urban land	0.85%		1			- 1	0.49%	-0.36%
Water	2.62%	- 1				- 1	0.49%	-2.13%
Total	8.31%	13	3	0	0	16	7.84%	-0.46%
Grand Total	100.00%	538	233	60	20	851	100.00%	0.00%

As can been seen in the table, there is a relatively normal distribution of sites across the landscape. The more interesting differences are highlighted in red (preferred soils) or blue (less preferable). This is calculated by the percentage of sites minus the percent of area; anything with a difference of 2% or more is highlighted. The moderately well and somewhat poorly drained soils have a positive correlation with sites, but not nearly as high as some of the poorly drained soils. Winder sand has a 12% difference and Pinellas sand has a 7.1% difference. The very poorly drained soils overall have a negative correlation with sites, which is not unexpected. Specifically, the frequently ponded Riviera sand has a -12.1% difference. The other four avoided soils are Myakka (-6.1%), Basinger (-3.4%) and Pineda (-3.1%).

In addition to the soil and water factors, it has been determined that oak/palm hammocks, with a slightly higher terrain than the surrounding lands have a high potential for archaeological sites. A review of the 1953 aerial, which shows much of the APE as undeveloped, was conducted to ascertain whether such features were present. Figure 5 shows those areas that may have been small hammocks;

hese ve ll been des royed d ring irpor ons r ion. o h mmo ks ppe wi hin e re proposed r new ons r ion.




Figure 5. Lo on o he poten al hammo s w th he 1 aer al

Based on the environmental setting, the project APE was considered to have a low probability for aboriginal archaeological site occurrence. The preferred soil types are absent, and no evidence of hammocks is present. The potential for yet unrecorded historic period archaeological sites was also assessed and found to be low. The project area was initially surveyed in the 1845 by A.H. Jones and George MacKay (State of Florida 1845a, 1845b, 1845c). The plats depict no development within or near the APE (State of Florida 1845d, 1846) (Figure 6). It was described as 2nd rate pine covered with sawpalmetto and interspersed with ponds and savannahs (State of Florida 1845a:547, 1845b:309-310). All of Sections 2, 3, and 11, and the east half of Section 34 were deeded to the Florida Coast Line Canal and Transportation Company in 1906; the west half of Section 34 was deeded to the Jacksonville, Tampa, and Key West Railway Company in 1881 (State of Florida n.d.:191-192). It is unlikely that either of these companies did anything with these tracts.




Figure 6. 1845 and 1846 plats of the project APE.

A review of the historic aerial photos available from the PALMM indicated that in 1953, the northwest portion of the APE appears to have been cleared for row crops or possible pines. No development of the remainder of the APE occurred until the construction of the airport. Although several dirt trails crossed the APE as of 1986 (FDOT 1986; USDA 1953a, 1953b).

Background research indicated that no recorded historic (50 years of age or more) resources (buildings, structures, cemeteries, bridges) are located within or adjacent to the APE. The Seaboard Air Line Railroad corridor (8PB12917) is located northwest of the APE. Although it has been determined eligible for listing in the NRHP, the proposed undertaking will have no direct or indirect affects to qualities that have been used to determine its significance. A review of the historic aerial photos available from the PALMM, historic quad maps, and the Palm Beach County property appraiser's data suggests no potential for historic resources within the APE (FDOT 1986; Jacks 2021; USDA 1953a, 1953b; USGS 1945, 1950) (see Figure 5, Figure 7).




Figure 7. 1945 quad map of the APE.

Conclusions

The background research revealed no recorded archaeological sites or historic resources within the APE. Although there is a low potential for aboriginal and historic archaeological sites and a low potential for historic resources. As a result, a CRAS may not be necessary, but if required during the permitting process the fieldwork should meet the requirements of Chapters 267, 373, and 872.05, FS, Florida's Coastal Management Program, and implementing state regulations, for possible effects on historic properties listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), or otherwise of historical, architectural or archaeological value, as well as the standards contained in FDHR's Cultural Resource Management Standards and Operational Manual (FDHR 2003); the report should also meet the specifications set forth in Chapter 1A-46, FAC.

References Cited

my Ma o M.

he chaeolo cal Po en al of So Su vey Repo s *The Florida Anthropologist* 1 75 91.

mb os o James . a d R cha d W Es ab o

2 Cul u a Resou ce ssessme S vey of h l e a ve Rou es S a e Road om O eechobee Bouleva d SR 7) o he Beel e H way SR 71) Palm Beac Cou y, F o da. Pa ame ca Co ul a nc., a pa. MS 17

Ca Robe S. ad V co o o

Phase chaeo o ca Su vey of the Va vus Sou h Pa cel Palm Beach Cou y Fo da. chaeo o cal a d o c l Co se va cy a c. S# 73.

Dave po Ch s a a d Je ee

e e Repo of F d s Sand I C a e Wes Resto a on P o ec Palm Beac Cou y F o da. Pa m eac Plan n epa men Wes Palm Beach S#2719.

F P Flo da epa me of vome a P ec o

- 2 la Geology (Environmental). Flo da o aph c a a b a a esv le.
- 2 1b Surficial Geology. Fo da eo aph c ata bay a esv lle.

FD R Flo da vso of Hso cal Resouces

2 Cultural Resource Management Standards and Operational Manual. Flo da so o H so cal Resou ces, allahassee.

F O Flo da epa me of a spo a o)

19 e al Pho o aphs - 4-2 - P 2 - - 4-1. O le P M a e v l e.

Fuh me s e ha es a d Ke eth W. a d

Cul u al Resou ce ssessme Su vey o he P oposed a e-B d e-Plumosus 2 KV a sm ss o e P o cc Co o Palm Beach a d a Count es, Flo da. Ja us Resea ch ., ampa. MS# 7.

acks, Do o hy

2 21 Records Search. Palm Beach Cou P ope y pp a se Wes Palm Beac. h ps maps.co.palm-beach us cw s papa.h ml ccessed

Ja us Resea ch

Cul u a Resou ce ssessme Survey SR 7 Beel e H ay) Pro ec Deve opme a d v o me P & S udy o pp o ma e y O e M le s o SR 7 Kan e H hway o SR 7 (Blue Hero Boulevard) Miam a d Palm Beach Cou es Flo da. Ja us Resea , ., am a MS 19 7.

Ke edy ll am J. Cha les Robe s, Sh h-lu S a a d Rya Whee e

Peh so c Resou ces Palm Beach Cou ty Pre m a y Ped c ve S udy.

Depa me of opolo y Flo d A l c vers ty Boca Ra o . S l.

- Labadia, Catherine, Katy Coyle, Eric Vogelheim, Jeremy Pincoske, David George, and William P. Athens
 - 2004 Phase I Cultural Resources Survey and Archaeological Inventory of the Onshore Florida Portion of the Proposed Seafarer U.S. Pipeline System Project in Palm Beach County, Florida. R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., New Orleans. MS# 10954.
- Labadia, Catherine, Katy Coyle, Eric Vogelheim, Jeremy Pincoske, David R. George, and William P. Athens
 - 2003 Phase I Cultural Resource Survey and Archaeological Inventory of the Onshore Florida Portion of the Proposed Seafarer U.S. Pipeline System Project in Palm Beach and Martin Counties, Florida. R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., New Orleans. MS# 9061.
- Liudahl, Kenneth, David J. Belz, Lawrence Carey, Robert W. Drew, Steve Fisher, and Robert Pate Soil Survey of Collier County Area, Florida. USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service.
- Mankowski, Joseph F. and Victor Longo
 - A Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Vavrus North Parcel, Palm Beach County, Florida, AHC Technical Report 623. Archaeological and Historical Conservancy, Davie. MS# 12752.
- McCollum, Samuel H., Orlando E. Cruz, Leon T. Stern, William H. Wittstruck, Richard D. Ford, and Frank C. Watts
 - Soil Survey of Palm Beach County Area, Florida, USDA, Soil Conservation Service, 1978 Washington, D.C.
- State of Florida, Department of Environmental Protection
 - 1845a Field Notes, A. H. Jones, Volume 75.
 - 1845b Field Notes, A.H. Jones, Volume 111.
 - 1845c Field Notes. George MacKay. Volume 84.
 - 1845d Plat. Township 41 South, Range 41 East. A. H. Jones and George MacKay.
 - Plat. Township 42 South, Range 41 East. A. H. Jones and George MacKay. 1846
 - n.d. Tract Book. Volume 30.
- USDA (U.S. Department of Agriculture)
 - 1953a Aerial Photograph 11-27-53, BUM-2L-96. On file, PALMM, Gainesville.
 - 1953b Aerial Photographs 11-27-53, BUM-2L-161, 163. On file, PALMM, Gainesville.
 - Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) Database for Florida September 2018. USDA, NRCS, Fort Worth, TX.
- USGS (U.S. Geological Survey)
 - 1945 Delta, Fla.
 - 1950 Delta, Fla., PR 1967, PR 1973, PR 1984,.
 - 2013 Delta, Fla. USA_Topo_Maps.
- White, William A.
 - 1970 Geomorphology of the Florida Peninsula. Geological Bulletin 51. Florida Department of Natural Resources, Bureau of Geology, Tallahassee.