cause adverse water quantity or flooding impacts to receiving waters and adjacent lands.

- 40. The evidence was not sufficient to establish that the road repair work caused or contributed to a violation of state water quality standards.

 Ultimate Findings of Fact
- 41. The greater weight of the competent substantial evidence establishes that 101st Avenue was in existence long before January 1, 2002, has been publicly used since that time, and has been regularly maintained and repaired by the County for more than seven years prior to the Exemption. Evidence to the contrary was not persuasive.
- 42. The greater weight of the competent substantial evidence establishes that during its relevant period of existence, the width of 101st Avenue that actually has been maintained or repaired is substantially -- if not identically -- the same as the width of 101st Avenue after the road repairs under the Exemption were completed. The work performed under the Exemption did not realign or expand the number of traffic lanes of 101st Avenue. The repairs to 101st Avenue included work reasonably necessary to repair and stabilize the road using generally accepted roadway design standards. Evidence to the contrary was not persuasive.
- 43. The greater weight of the competent substantial evidence establishes that no excavated material related to the work under the Exemption was placed at or near Dr. Still's property or, for that matter, anywhere along 101st Avenue. Evidence to the contrary was not persuasive.
- 44. The greater weight of the competent substantial evidence establishes that the repairs to 101st Avenue did not adversely impound or obstruct existing water flow, cause adverse impacts to existing surface water storage and conveyance capabilities, or otherwise cause adverse water quantity or flooding impacts to receiving waters and adjacent lands. Evidence to the contrary was not persuasive.