Final
Environmental Assessment
Disposition of Chiefs’ Circle Residential Structures

78th Civil Engineer Group, Asset Optimization Branch
Robins Air Force Base, Georgia

April 27, 2012
Pursuant to the Council on Environmental Quality regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500-1508), Department of Defense Directive 6050.1, and Air Force Regulation 32 CFR Part 989, the 78th Civil Engineer Group, Asset Optimization Branch (78 CEG/CEAO), has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) to identify and evaluate potential effects of disposition of five residential structures and associated outbuildings located at the Chiefs’ Circle historic district at Robins AFB. This EA is incorporated by reference into this finding.

PURPOSE AND NEED
Disposition of the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures is proposed in order to bring the land use at the Chiefs’ Circle residential site into conformance with Robins AFB’s Area Development Plan (which includes the physical relocation of various functions to improve overall effectiveness and efficiency of base functions and operations) without significant expenditures of money, time and/or resources; and to reduce expenditures associated with the continued repair and maintenance of vacant and underutilized facilities. The five residential structures located at the Chiefs’ Circle site are currently underutilized and do not match the planned land use for the area. Three of the five residential structures are vacant, and the remaining structures are being used temporarily as a location for the Combined Federal Campaign (CFC; Building 505) and meeting/office space for the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts and Cub Scouts.

The structures at the Chiefs’ Circle site are not currently suitable for use as residences and cannot reasonably be converted into office or other administrative space. Renovation for future use as residences or conversion for use as administrative space would require significant time and expense for the initial construction/renovation activities and continued expenditures for future repair and maintenance of the structures. As a result of these conditions, no permanent user groups have been identified to date for the long-term use of these facilities. Pursuant to the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between Robins AFB and the Georgia Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), Building 500 will be preserved until either a permanent user has been identified or two years have passed wherein Building 500 would be demolished (EA Section 1.1).

Funds are not currently available for the repair and long-term maintenance of the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures. The current uses of the site by the Scouts and the Airman’s Attic provide no budget or resources for the continued repair and maintenance of the existing structures. As these residential structures are not part of the recently completed Military Family Housing (MFH) Privatization Initiative, no military funding is available for their repair and maintenance. Without proper maintenance, conditions at these structures would continue to deteriorate, and eventually become a safety hazard, and the houses would become an eyesore.

The proposed disposition of the Chiefs’ Circle structures will allow for future use of the land for functions in conformance with the Area Development Plan and will resolve the current underutilization of the structures and concerns related to a lack of funding for repair and maintenance of the structures (EA Section 1.2).
DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The Proposed Action, disposition of the existing Chiefs' Circle residential structures, consists of preservation of one two-story duplex (Building 500) until either a permanent user has been identified or two years have passed wherein the structure would be removed in accordance with the MOA between Robins AFB, the Georgia SHPO, and the ACHP. The other four two-story duplexes and associated open carports (Buildings 501, 502, 504, and 505) would be removed in accordance with the provisions of the MOA. The Proposed Action will also include removal and proper disposal of construction debris, toxic and non-toxic materials located within the structures, and contaminated soil (if any) encountered during the removal of building foundations, pavement and other subsurface features; minimal removal of trees, shrubs and landscaping (as needed) to adequately and safely perform the demolition activities; and closure, relocation and/or removal of existing underground utilities within the project area (as needed) to adequately and safely perform the demolition activities (EA Section 2.2).

DESCRIPTION OF THE NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Under the No-Action Alternative, no demolition activities would be performed at the Proposed Action Site; the structures would continue to deteriorate over time and continue to be underutilized by Robins AFB with only two of the five structures occupied (by the Airman’s Attic, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts and Cub Scouts). Lack of funds for the repair and maintenance of the structures would result in eventual deterioration of the structures to the point of being unsafe for use. This alternative would not provide for repair and maintenance of the buildings and site, and would not align with the Area Development Plan for optimizing allocation of resources for supporting the war fighter (EA Section 2.3).

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT CARRIED FORWARD

Alternatives to the Proposed Action were considered by comparing them against the project requirements. These alternatives included renovating the structures and continuing their use as military residences, use as public housing, use as a potential Temporary Living Facility (TLF) for military personnel, use as administrative space, reuse of the structures for non-military uses such as the current use by the Scouts and the Airman’s Attic, the physical relocation of one or all of the structures to an on-base or off-base location, and removal of all five residential structures and associated open carports. However, these alternatives did not meet the requirements of providing an effective solution for future land use/planning issues and would not provide a resolution to concerns related to a lack of funding for maintaining the residential structures, nor align with the Area Development Plan for optimizing resource allocation to support the war fighter. Further, removal of the historic structures was not feasible, except as set forth in the MOA. No other reasonable alternatives that would meet project requirements were identified for detailed evaluation in the EA (EA Section 2.4).

ANTICIPATED ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Implementation of the Proposed Action will result in no significant adverse effects on environmental resources and a short-term beneficial effect on socioeconomic environment. Removal of four of the residential structures in the Chiefs’ Circle Historic District would be carried out under the Memorandum of Agreement Between Robins Air Force Base, The Georgia Historic Preservation Office, And The Advisory Council On Historic Preservation Regarding Chiefs’ Circle Historic District, and will thereby avoid significant impacts. Demolition activities under the Proposed Action will have no, or minimal, effect on topography, surface waters, floodplains,
wetlands, geology, groundwater, water supply, wastewater and safety. There will be insignificant adverse impact on the other environmental components (EA Section 2.5).

Before and during demolition activities, contractors will use Best Management Practices (BMPs), obtain all appropriate permits (coverage under National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit GAR100001; Houston County Sediment and Erosion Control Permit; and Dig Permit from the Environmental Management Branch (78 CEG/CEAN), and remove and dispose of any waste appropriately under governing regulations, thus causing only temporary and insignificant impacts to storm water, air quality, solid waste, hazardous materials, toxic materials, noise environment, biological environment, and transportation (EA Sections 4.1.4.2, 4.2.2, 4.3.2.2, 4.3.3.2, 4.3.4.2, 4.4.2, 4.5.2 and 4.8.2).

Storm Water: The activities associated with demolition of the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures will be temporary and will not cause significant adverse impacts to storm water. This is because the base uses BMPs during the course of day-to-day operations, and plans to use BMPs such as silt fencing, hay bales and erosion-control blankets during demolition of the structures to control storm water runoff and erosion so as not to cause significant adverse impacts. The excavation/removal of the building foundations will increase the chance for contact with soils potentially contaminated with Chlordane (a pesticide used in the past in MFH areas for the control of subterranean termites). If Chlordane-contaminated soil is identified, corrective action would be regulated under the corrective action portion of Robins AFB’s Hazardous Waste Facility Permit, and any excavated soil destined for removal and disposal will be managed and disposed of appropriately. In addition, the demolition and removal operations will increase the potential for soil erosion and degradation of surface water runoff. The demolition will be designed and the existing area would be modified to include features, if needed, to sufficiently delay runoff of surface water from high-intensity storms and to control erosion and subsequent sedimentation. Care will be taken during the demolition to avoid disturbance of the underground utilities that traverse the project site, or the utilities will be removed (as needed) (EA Section 4.1.4.2).

Air Quality: Demolition activities associated with the Proposed Action will not affect air resources to a significant degree. Emissions associated with demolition activities will be of limited quantity and duration, and thus, will be insignificant (EA Section 4.2.2).

Solid Waste: The Proposed Action will temporarily increase the generation of solid waste because of the demolition activities. Complete demolition of the Chiefs’ Circle structures will produce waste concrete, asphalt, brick, metal, wood and other construction materials. Waste materials will be recycled to the extent possible. Waste that is not recyclable will be disposed by the building contractor in approved local landfill facilities with adequate landfill capacity (EA Section 4.3.2.2).

Hazardous Materials and Waste: Hazardous materials, such as fuels for construction equipment and vehicles, will be used during the site demolition activities. These materials will be used and handled in accordance with Robins AFB’s Hazardous Waste Management Plan (HWMP) and all applicable regulations, and significant adverse impacts will not occur due to their usage.

Excavated soil and associated building materials removed from the Proposed Action Site will be sampled for waste characterization as needed. If Chlordane-contaminated soil material is identified, corrective action would be regulated under the corrective action portion of Robins AFB’s Hazardous Waste Facility Permit. Any excavated soil or building debris determined to be hazardous waste and destined for removal and disposal will be managed and disposed of appropriately under the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) (EA Section 4.3.3.2).
Toxic Materials: Comprehensive surveys for asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paint (LBP) have not been performed for the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures. Given the construction date of the structures (1942), the potential exists for ACM and LBP to be present in the buildings. ACM and LBP surveys will be performed on the structures prior to any demolition activity. Any identified ACM or LBP would be removed and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations, therefore, impacts will not be significant.

No PCB-containing electrical transformer units are located within the boundaries of this site. No known PCB-containing equipment will be disturbed by the Proposed Action. Given the construction date of the structures, the potential exists for PCB-containing fluorescent light ballasts to be present in the buildings. Potential PCB-containing fluorescent light ballasts located within the buildings will be assessed prior to demolition and disposed of per applicable regulations. There will be no significant impact from PCB-containing materials (EA Section 4.3.4.2).

Noise Environment: Demolition of the Chiefs’ Circle structures will result in short-term, localized, and potentially loud noise impacts during demolition only. The impact of demolition activities on the noise environment at Robins AFB would be insignificant (EA Section 4.4.2).

Biological Environment: The Proposed Action will not result in a significant impact to wildlife or vegetation due to modification or removal of the minimal amount of existing vegetation in the areas of the site where demolition activities are proposed. Only trees, shrubs and vegetation immediately surrounding the structures will be removed in order to facilitate demolition activities. No federal-listed endangered, threatened or sensitive animal species are present on Robins AFB except for the American Alligator, which is listed because of similarity of appearance to the American Crocodile. State plant species of concern are found in habitats distant from the project site (EA Section 4.5.2).

Cultural Resources: The five Chiefs’ Circle residential structures have been evaluated and found to be eligible for listing on the NRHP as part of the Chiefs’ Circle Historic District. The residential structures are eligible based on their architectural design and their arrangement in a circular fashion. Accordingly, proposed Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Level II documentation of the proposed historic district was completed, and the Proposed Action will be handled in accordance with the MOA between Robins AFB, the ACHR and the Georgia SHPO (EA Section 4.6.2).

Socioeconomics: The Proposed Action will produce a short-term positive effect on the socioeconomic environment from demolition expenditures. The Proposed Action will not result in adverse health impacts to children or significant impacts to low-income and/or minority populations (EA Section 4.7.2).

Transportation and Safety: There will be a temporary, insignificant increase in traffic from demolition vehicles, including trucks hauling demolition debris from the Proposed Action Site. Contractors and heavy equipment operators would adhere to all applicable safety regulations and guidelines (EA Section 4.8.2).

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The cumulative effects of the Proposed Action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions were evaluated and found to be insignificant. Two recently completed, one current, and two future actions were identified as potentially producing cumulative environmental effects in the area of the Proposed Action Site. These actions consist of the recently completed operations and management (O&M) demolition of residential structures in the Pine Oak and Lakeside subdivisions; the construction and operation of the new General Purpose Warehouse;
construction of a temporary headquarters (HQ) facility for Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC); and the proposed Security Forces facility and permanent campus for HQ AFRC.

Insignificant cumulative effects will result from temporary increases in emissions of carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides from construction employee traffic and operation of heavy equipment at the proposed sites; temporary increases in the generation of solid waste and toxic materials will occur from construction activities at the sites; temporary increases in noise will occur from construction activities at the sites; and the cumulative effect of the actions would result in beneficial economic impacts to the local economy. There will be no cumulative effect from the above-listed projects on cultural resources since none of the other projects will adversely affect historic structures; a HABS has been completed for Chiefs’ Circle in accordance with Section 106 requirements, and the Proposed Action will be performed in accordance with stipulations of the MOA for Chiefs’ Circle (EA Section 4.9).

PUBLIC NOTICE

A public notice was published on March 28, 2012 in the local newspaper, the Houston Home Journal, to announce the availability of the Draft Final EA. Copies of the Draft Final EA were sent to the Georgia State Clearinghouse for distribution to relevant state regulatory agencies. No comments were received from the public or the Georgia State Clearinghouse during the 30-day review period. Comments received during consultation with the SHPO and the ACHP were incorporated into the Final EA. All agency consultation is complete.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The Proposed Action consists of removal of Buildings 501, 502, 504 and 505 and preservation of Building 500 until either a permanent user has been identified or two years have passed wherein the structure will be removed in accordance with the MOA between Robins AFB, the Georgia SHPO, and the ACHP. A detailed evaluation was conducted to determine potential adverse effects to the human, physical and natural environment. Based upon my review of the facts and analyses contained in the EA, which is hereby incorporated by reference, I conclude that the Proposed Action will not have a significant impact on the natural or human environment, and that the Proposed Action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to the environment including the preparation of the HABS and implementing the Proposed Action in accordance with the stipulations contained in the MOA between Robins AFB, the Georgia SHPO, and the ACHP in order to offset the adverse impacts to cultural resources at Robins AFB. An Environmental Impact Statement is not required for this action. This document, and the supporting EA, fulfills the requirements of National Environmental Policy Act, the Council on Environmental Quality regulations, and Title 32, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 989, Environmental Impact Analysis Process.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Robins Air Force Base (AFB) proposes disposition of the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures in order to bring use of the Chiefs’ Circle site into conformance with base realignment goals. The proposed disposition would reduce expenditures associated with the continued repair and maintenance of vacant and underutilized facilities. The five residential structures and associated carport outbuildings located at the Chiefs’ Circle site are currently underutilized and do not match planned land use for the area. Three of the five residential structures are vacant, and the remaining structures are being used temporarily by the Combined Federal Campaign (CFC) and as meeting/office space for the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts and Cub Scouts.

The Chiefs’ Circle residential subdivision, or “Proposed Action Site,” is located in the central portion of Robins AFB at the southwestern corner of the intersection of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and Robins Parkway. The Proposed Action Site consists of an approximately seven-acre lot developed with five residential structures and four associated carports. These buildings consist of five identical plan duplexes constructed as officer housing in 1942.

The five Chiefs’ Circle residential structures are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as part of the Chiefs’ Circle Historic District because of their architectural design and their arrangement in a circular fashion. These designs were built with Colonial Revival influences and have not been extensively altered since their construction. Each building is approximately 3,400 square feet in size and consists of a two-story, six-bay, U-shaped duplex. The buildings are characterized by a concrete and brick foundation, gable roof covered with asphalt-shingles, two interior brick chimneys, and an exterior veneer of American or stretcher bond brick. At the rear façade of the structures are attached gable roof carports of frame construction with brick piers that were added in 1986. The buildings are reached by concrete sidewalks at the main façade and asphalt driveways. Four associated one-story frame open carports, built in 1986, are also located at the Proposed Action Site.
The structures at the Proposed Action Site are not currently suitable for use as residences and cannot easily be converted into office or other administrative space. Renovation for future use as residences or conversion for use as administrative space would require significant time and expense for initial construction/renovation activities and continued expenditures for future repair and maintenance of the structures. Better residential and administrative spaces are currently available or planned as a part of development at Robins AFB. As a result of these conditions, no permanent user groups at Robins AFB have been identified to date for the facilities.

Three of the five residential structures are vacant, and the remaining structures are being used temporarily as a location for the CFC (Building 505) and meeting/office space for the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts and Cub Scouts (Building 504). Pursuant to the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between Robins AFB and the Georgia State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), Building 500 would be preserved until either a permanent user has been identified or two years have passed from the effective date of the MOA wherein Building 500 would be demolished.

Robins AFB, as a part of its base realignment plan (Area Development Plan), has proposed physical relocation of various functions to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of base functions and operations. The primary goal is to relocate those functions and operations that directly support the war fighter (or “hard” functions) to the northern portion of base, principally in those areas associated with the airfield. Also as part of the redistribution, those functions and operations that do not directly support the war fighter (or “soft” functions) would be relocated to areas away from the airfield, toward and on the southern portion of base. The physical alignment of facilities with related functions and support requirements would allow for optimal utilization of land area on base and generally improve efficiency and cost effectiveness of base operations. The current use of the Proposed Action Site does not conform with planned base realignment goals.
Funds are not currently available for the repair and maintenance of the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures because these residential structures are not part of the recently completed Military Family Housing (MFH) Privatization Initiative. Without proper maintenance, these structures would continue to deteriorate and eventually become a safety hazard, and the houses eventually would become an eyesore.

The Proposed Action, disposition of the existing Chiefs’ Circle residential structures, would include maintaining one two-story duplex (Building 500) and demolishing the remaining four two-story duplexes and associated open carports (Buildings 501, 502, 504 and 505). The Proposed Action would also include removal and proper disposal of construction debris, toxic and non-toxic materials located within the structures, and contaminated soil (if any) encountered during the removal of building foundations, pavement and other subsurface features. In order to adequately and safely perform the demolition activities, minimal removal of trees, shrubs and landscaping would occur; and closure, relocation and/or removal of existing underground utilities within the project area would be conducted. The existing roadway would not be removed as a part of the Proposed Action, and trees, shrubs and landscaping not affected by the demolition activities would remain in place.

78th Civil Engineer Group, Asset Optimization Branch (78 CEG/CEAO), has conducted this EA to identify and assess potential effects of the Proposed Action: disposition of Chiefs’ Circle residential structures involving preservation of one structure and demolition of four structures. No other action alternative was identified that met all the requirements of the project, and thus none is evaluated in the EA. The No-Action Alternative evaluated herein involves no project implementation - no demolition activities would be performed at the Proposed Action Site; the structures would continue to be underutilized by Robins AFB with only two of the five structures occupied (by the CFC, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts and Cub Scouts). Further, because funds are not available for the repair and maintenance of the structures, the structures would continue to deteriorate and would eventually create an unsafe condition.
Two alternatives were considered in the EA: the Proposed Action and the No-Action Alternative. Other alternatives initially considered failed to meet criteria for the project and were not evaluated in the EA. These failed alternatives included renovating the structures and continuing their use as residences, renovating the structures for use as a potential Temporary Living Facility (TLF) for military personnel, renovating the structures for future use as administrative space by mission-related groups in accordance with the Area Development Plan, general reuse of the structures for “soft” uses such as the current uses by the Scouts and the CFC, the physical relocation of one or all of the structures to an on-base or off-base location, and the demolition of all five structures and four associated carports. However, because these alternatives would not meet the Proposed Action requirements in alignment with Robins AFB’s Area Development Plan, would not provide an effective solution addressing future land use/planning issues, and would not provide a resolution to concerns related to a lack of funding for maintaining the structures, they were eliminated from further detailed evaluation.

Neither the Proposed Action nor the No-Action Alternative was determined to cause significant adverse short-term or long-term impacts to the environment (Table 2-1). The Proposed Action would result in an adverse impact to cultural resources. In order to offset this adverse impact, a Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Level II documentation of the historic district was completed (an acceptable mitigation strategy for historic structures). Further, Robins AFB would demolish four of the five individual structures and maintain the fifth structure until an as yet unidentified user could be identified in accordance with the Memorandum of Agreement [MOA] Between Robins Air Force Base, The Georgia Historic Preservation Office [SHPO], And The Advisory Council On Historic Preservation [ACHP] Regarding Chiefs’ Circle Historic District.

Cumulative impacts were also assessed and were determined to be insignificant; environmental resources and elements would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Action, and the impacts from the Proposed Action, when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, would not be significant (Table 2-1).
In summary, maintaining one and removing four of the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures at the Proposed Action Site would allow for conformance with the existing Area Development Plan for future actions; result in additional land space at Robins AFB for directly supporting the war fighter; and offset adverse impact on cultural resources in accordance with the MOA among Robins AFB, the Georgia SHPO and the ACHP. An indirect benefit would be to eliminate the continued burdens on funding, time and resources associated with the renovation and/or repair of these substandard buildings.
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HVAC  Heating, Ventilation, & Air Conditioning
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LCC  Life Cycle Cost
MFH  Military Family Housing
MOA  Memorandum of Agreement
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# ABBREVIATIONS & ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS</td>
<td>National Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPA</td>
<td>National Historic Preservation Act, as Amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHP</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M</td>
<td>Operations and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QRP</td>
<td>Qualified Recycling Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSHA</td>
<td>Occupational Safety and Health Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCB</td>
<td>polychlorinated biphenyl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRA</td>
<td>Resource Conservation Recovery Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLF</td>
<td>Temporary Living Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>United States Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED ACTION

78th Civil Engineer Group, Asset Optimization Branch (78 CEG/CEAO) has conducted this Environmental Assessment (EA) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to identify and assess potential effects of the Proposed Action and No-Action Alternatives as described in Section 2 and evaluated in Sections 3 and 4. The Proposed Action includes preserving one two-story duplex (Building 500) until either a permanent user has been identified or two years have passed from the effective date of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between Robins Air Force Base AFB and the Georgia State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP; see Appendix F). The other four two-story duplex residential structures (Buildings 501, 502, 504 and 505) and associated outbuildings located at the Chiefs’ Circle residential site would be removed in accordance with the MOA.

NEPA requirements help to ensure that environmental information is made available to the public during the decision-making process and prior to actions being taken. 78 CEG/CEAO provided an opportunity for public and agency review of, and comment on, the Draft Final EA prior to completion of the Final EA. A public notice was published on March 28, 2012 in the local newspaper, the Houston Home Journal, to announce the availability of the Draft Final EA. Copies of the Draft Final EA were sent to the Georgia State Clearinghouse for distribution to relevant state regulatory agencies. Comments were received from the Georgia State Clearinghouse on April 16, 2012. No comments received from the public during the 30-day review period. Comments received during consultation with the SHPO and the ACHP were incorporated into the Final EA to complete the consultation process (see Appendix F).

1.1 PURPOSE OF PROPOSED ACTION

Robins AFB, as a part of its base realignment plan (Area Development Plan), has proposed the physical relocation of various functions to improve overall effectiveness and efficiency of base functions and operations. The primary goal is to relocate those “hard” functions and operations that directly support the war fighter to the northern
portion of base, principally in those areas associated with the airfield. An example of a hard function with facilities to be relocated is the 402nd Maintenance Wing (402 MXW). The 402 MXW has shops in Building 603 and associated surrounding buildings, and performs maintenance on a variety of aircraft. These operations directly support the industrial flightline. Also as part of the redistribution, “soft” functions would be relocated to areas away from the airfield, toward and on the southern portion of base. Some examples of soft functions include: the Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC), which provides supplemental services to the U.S. Air Force and civilian populations, and the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), which has a primary role of providing supplies and services to America's military forces worldwide. The physical alignment of facilities with related functions and support requirements would allow for optimal utilization of land area on base and generally improve the efficiency and cost effectiveness of base operations.

The purpose of the Proposed Action would be to bring the land use at the Chiefs’ Circle residential site into conformance with the overall Area Development Plan without significant expenditures of money, time and/or resources associated with the continued repair and maintenance of vacant and underutilized facilities. The five residential structures located at the Chiefs’ Circle site are currently underutilized and do not match the planned land use for the area. Three of the five residential structures are vacant, and the remaining structures are being used temporarily as a location for the Combined Federal Campaign (CFC; Building 505) and meeting/office space for the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts and Cub Scouts (Building 504). Pursuant to the MOA between Robins AFB and the Georgia Historic Preservation Office and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Building 500 would be preserved until either a permanent user has been identified or two years have passed wherein Building 500 would be demolished.

The structures at the Chiefs’ Circle site are not currently suitable for use as residences and cannot easily be converted into office or other administrative space. Renovation for future use as residences or conversion for use as administrative space would require significant time and expense for the initial construction/renovation activities and
continued expenditures for future repair and maintenance of the structures. As a result of these conditions, no permanent user groups for these facilities at Robins AFB have been identified to date. In addition, current “soft” uses of the site by the Scouts and the CFC provide no budget or resources for the continued repair and maintenance of the existing structures.

Demolition of four of the Chiefs’ Circle structures would allow for future use of the land for functions in conformance with the Area Development Plan and would resolve issues associated with the current underutilization of the structures and lack of funds for repair and maintenance.

1.2 NEED FOR PROPOSED ACTION

The Chiefs’ Circle residential structures are not part of the recently completed Military Family Housing (MFH) Privatization Initiative, and as a result, fund currently are not available for their repair and maintenance. Without proper maintenance, conditions at these structures would continue to deteriorate and the houses would eventually present a safety hazard and would become an eyesore. In addition, Headquarters Air Force Material Command (AFMC) has issued a directive for the reduction of occupied square footage in facilities across the command. Savings from reduced custodial, utility or other direct support costs from recently closed facilities would be retained at the local installation level to offset costs which historically had been funded by Air Staff or AFMC.

The five Chiefs’ Circle residential structures were constructed in 1942 and are not currently suitable for use as residences or administrative offices. Interior spaces within the structures are smaller than those of current residential or administrative facilities. Additional construction/renovation work would be required on the building structures and systems (electrical; heating, ventilation and air conditioning; plumbing; roofing; parking, etc.) prior to reuse as either residences or administrative space. Pre-demolition asbestos sampling (and likely asbestos removal) would also be required prior to the initiation of any renovation or demolition activities.
Robins AFB is currently experiencing a shortage of space for future construction and development projects. With the implementation of base realignment plans, in three to five years Robins AFB would have adequate space for future projects. There is no planned use for the Chiefs’ Circle area. Removal of the Chiefs’ Circle structures would create additional space that could be appropriately designated for future use in accordance with planned development goals.

In conclusion, the removal of four of the Chiefs’ Circle structures would contribute to AFMC goals for reduction of occupied space and resolve the current underutilization of the structures and lack of funds for repair and maintenance. Issues associated with the maintenance, renovation and/or repair of these substandard buildings would be eliminated. Further benefits associated with the removal of Chiefs’ Circle structures would include additional land space made available to Robins AFB for directly supporting the war fighter.
2.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

This chapter presents the considerations used for selecting alternatives, describes the Proposed Action and No-Action Alternative and summarizes the environmental consequences of implementing the Proposed Action and No-Action Alternative. Other potential alternatives that were preliminarily evaluated and subsequently eliminated from further consideration are also discussed briefly in the following sections.

2.1 REQUIREMENTS

Several requirements were identified for the evaluation of alternatives that were based on fulfilling the purpose of the action of bringing the use of the Chiefs’ Circle site into conformance with the Area Development Plan and reducing expenditures associated with the continued repair and maintenance of vacant and underutilized facilities. Alternatives that merited detailed evaluation must meet the following criteria that support the purpose and need for action.

- Conform with base realignment goals in accordance with the Area Development Plan for redistribution of facilities to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of base functions and operations:
  - “Hard” functions that directly support the war fighter are being relocated to the northern portion of base in areas associated with the airfield.
  - “Soft” functions are being re-located to areas away from the airfield on the southern portion of base.
- Ability to provide an action that would allow for future development of the site in alignment with Robins AFB’s Area Development Plan.
- Provide solutions to land use/planning issues relating to new facility construction and development.
- Provide an action that resolves the future use of underutilized or vacant structures, and allows space for supporting the war fighter.
- Provide resolution to the concern regarding the lack of funding for maintaining the Chiefs’ Circle structures.
- Constitute a potentially acceptable action with respect to National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 implementing regulations.
2.2 PROPOSED ACTION DESCRIPTION

This EA addresses the proposed disposition of the five Chiefs’ Circle residential structures and associated outbuildings at Robins AFB. Robins AFB is located in Houston County in central Georgia, approximately 100 miles southeast of Atlanta, 18 miles south of Macon, and immediately east of the city of Warner Robins (Figures 1 and 2).

The Chiefs’ Circle residential subdivision, or “Proposed Action Site,” is located in the central portion of Robins AFB at the southwestern corner of the intersection of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and Robins Parkway. The Proposed Action Site consists of an approximately seven-acre lot developed with five residential structures (consisting of 10 units) and four associated carports (Figures 3 and 4).

Components of the Proposed Action include:

- Preservation of Building 500 until either a permanent user has been identified or two years have passed wherein the structure would be removed.
  - Seek a permanent user for the building.
  - Remove the building if a permanent user cannot be identified within two years after the Memorandum of Agreement Between Robins Air Force Base, The Georgia Historic Preservation Office, And The Advisory Council On Historic Preservation Regarding Chiefs’ Circle Historic District is signed by all parties to the agreement.

- Removal of Buildings 501, 502, 504 and 505, including associated open carports.
  - Removal and proper disposal of construction debris and toxic and non-toxic materials located within the structures.
  - Removal and proper disposal of contaminated soil (if any) encountered during the removal of building foundations, pavement and other subsurface features.
  - Minimal removal of trees, shrubs and landscaping (as needed) to adequately and safely perform the demolition activities.
  - Closure, relocation and/or removal of existing underground utilities within the project area (as needed) to adequately and safely perform the demolition activities.
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The existing roadway would not be removed as a part of the Proposed Action and trees, shrubs and landscaping not affected by the demolition activities would remain in place. The Proposed Action activities would take three to six months to complete.

2.3 NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Under the No-Action Alternative, in the disposition of Chiefs’ Circle at the Proposed Action Site; the structures would continue to be underutilized by Robins AFB with only two of the five structures occupied (by the CFC, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts and Cub Scouts). Funds are not available for the repair and maintenance of the structures resulting in continued deterioration of the structures.

Eventually, the houses would pose a safety hazard and a security risk and become an eyesore. At a minimum, increased surveillance and patrols of the area would be required to ensure public safety. If no repair or maintenance activities are performed and the residences become structurally unsound, access to the site would need to be restricted, including possibly surrounding the site with fencing. In addition, the alternative does not allow for use of the site in conformance with the Area Development Plan. Failure to address the disposition of the Chiefs’ Circle structures would result in underutilized and unsafe structures and, ultimately, less than optimal allocation of resources for supporting the war fighter.

2.4 ALTERNATIVES ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

The alternatives evaluation included preliminary assessments of various options for the disposition of the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures. Seven options were identified and considered as part of the alternatives evaluation (see Appendix A for Supporting Documentation).

Alternative 1 – Renovating the structures and continuing their use as residences for military and non-military personnel. More efficiently designed and updated residential housing units are available through the recently completed MFH privatization initiative.
In addition, the Air Force mission does not provide nor sustain housing for low income families or other non-military personnel. Reuse of the Chiefs’ Circle structures would necessitate repair/replacement of the roofs, general repairs and upgrades, asbestos material removal (prior to any renovation activities that could affect these materials), utility costs and standard maintenance/upkeep costs. It is estimated (based on the results of a comparative Life Cycle Cost [LCC] Analysis – see Appendix B) that the costs for renovation of the structures and continued repair/maintenance for this alternative would total approximately $615,000. This alternative does not allow for effective use of the site and is not in conformance with base realignment goals. In addition, funds are not available for the repairs and upgrades needed to renovate the structures. Alternative 1 was eliminated from further evaluation because it did not meet Proposed Action requirements for alignment with Robins AFB’s Area Development Plan, did not provide an effective solution for addressing future land use/planning issues, and did not provide a resolution to concerns related to a lack of funding for maintaining residential structures.

Alternative 2 – Renovating the structures for use as a potential Temporary Living Facility (TLF) for military personnel. A TLF was built across from the base commissary several years ago, and it was determined that Robins AFB has fulfilled its TLF space requirements. Even if the base needed additional TLF space, the use of Chiefs’ Circle for such a function would be problematic, as TLFs are typically co-located with stores and eating establishments. Chiefs’ Circle is not located within easy walking distance of these types of establishments on Robins AFB. In addition, reuse of the Chiefs’ Circle structures for this purpose also would necessitate repairs, upgrades, asbestos material removal (prior to any renovation activities that could affect these materials), utility costs and standard maintenance/upkeep costs (as described above in Alternative 1). Alternative 2 was eliminated from further consideration because it did not meet Proposed Action requirements for alignment with Robins AFB’s Area Development Plan, did not provide an effective solution for addressing future land use/planning issues, and did not provide a resolution for concerns related to a lack of funding for maintaining residential structures.
Alternative 3 – Renovating the structures for future use as administrative space by mission-related groups in accordance with the Area Development Plan. This alternative would allow for administrative function reuse of the structures; however, no such groups at Robins AFB were identified, and more efficiently designed and logistically-preferable administrative spaces are presently available (see Appendix A). Reuse of these structures as administrative space would include repair/replacement of the building systems (HVAC, electrical, plumbing, communication lines) and roofs, structural repairs, upgrade of the stairwells, general repairs and upgrades, asbestos material removal (prior to any renovation activities that could affect these materials), utility costs and standard maintenance/upkeep costs (see Appendix B). The plumbing fixtures and stairways to the second floors were not designed for the handicapped and would need to be brought into compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) regulations. The distribution load for the second floor is less than the 50 pounds per square foot required for administrative areas and would require structural reinforcement if the space was to be used. In addition, a parking area would likely need to be constructed to account for administrative personnel. The LCC (see Appendix B) estimated that the costs for renovation of the structures and continued repair/maintenance for this alternative would total approximately $1,666,000. This alternative does not allow for effective reuse of the site. Alternative 3 was eliminated from further consideration because it did not meet the Proposed Action requirements of providing an effective solution for addressing future land use/planning.

Alternative 4 – Reuse of the structures for “soft” uses such as the current use by the Scouts and the CFC. This alternative would allow reuse of the structures; however, no additional such groups at Robins AFB (or the City of Warner Robins) were identified that have expressed interest in the use of the space (see Appendix A). In addition, the existing groups that currently use the space do not possess an operating budget that allows for the maintenance and repair of the structures. Alternative 4 was eliminated from further consideration because it did not meet Proposed Action requirements of providing an effective solution for addressing future land use/planning issues and
would not provide a resolution to concerns related to a lack of funding for maintaining the structures.

Alternative 5 – Physical relocation of one or all of the structures that make up Chiefs’ Circle Historic District to an on base or off-base location. Relocation of one or more of the structures to an on-base location was initially considered. However, the design of the structures limits their use and does not provide good opportunities for future use. No viable options for future use of relocated structures on base is known at this time. The following organizations were contacted for relocation to an off-base location: 1) Keep Warner Robins Beautiful (a City of Warner Robins department); 2) Carpenter Construction (a firm that is involved in a number of construction and demolition projects on Robins AFB); 3) NewTown Macon (an organization that works with the City of Macon to revitalize its downtown area); and 4) Lords of Macon (a firm specializing in recycling Middle Georgia building materials). Representatives of these organizations stated that it was too expensive to move the buildings, though it was technically possible (see Appendix A). Estimates for relocation of all five structures ranged from $200,000 (with bricks removed) to $500,000 (with bricks intact). However, the bricks would have to be left in place to maintain the historical integrity of the structures, and damage to at least some of the exterior brick features is very likely during relocation. In addition, any new owner of the buildings would have to comply with development restrictions in order to maintain the historic significance of the structures.

No successful leads for the physical relocation of the structures were generated through contact with the above-referenced agencies. Alternative 5 was eliminated from further consideration because it did not meet the Proposed Action requirements of providing an effective solution for addressing future land use/planning issues and did not provide for space that could be directed to supporting the war fighter.

Alternative 7 – Removal of all five of the two-story duplexes and four associated open carports. Federal and State regulatory agencies who administer NHPA Section 106 regulations related to historic properties prefer preservation of historic structures.
Alternative 7 was eliminated because the removal of all of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-eligible structures would not in accordance with the MOA between Robins AFB, the SHPO, and the ACHP (see Appendix A).

An additional alternative (mothballing the structures until a future use could be found) was also initially considered. However, the potential effects of this option are similar in nature to the No-Action Alternative. Specifically, no demolition activities would be performed at the Proposed Action Site, the structures would continue to be underutilized by Robins AFB, and funds are not available for the repair and maintenance of the structures resulting in continued deterioration of the structures.

2.5 \textbf{COMPARISON OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS}

Implementation of either the Proposed Action or the No-Action Alternative, as detailed in Section 4 of this document, would result in no significant adverse effect (Table 2.1).
Table 2-1. Comparison of Alternatives Receiving Detailed Evaluation

|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Environmental Component | + = Beneficial Effect  
O = No Effect  
--- = Insignificant Adverse Effect  
X = Adverse Effect |         |
| Physical Environment | Topography                                                                                     | O                     | O                     |
|                     | Surface Waters                                                                                | O                     | O                     |
|                     | Floodplains and Wetlands                                                                       | O                     | O                     |
|                     | Storm Water                                                                                   | ---                   | O                     |
|                     | Geology and Soils                                                                             | O                     | O                     |
|                     | Groundwater                                                                                  | O                     | O                     |
|                     | Water Supply and Drinking Water                                                              | O                     | O                     |
| Air Quality         |                                                                                              | ---                   | O                     |
| Waste Management and Toxic Materials | Wastewater                                                                                | O                     | O                     |
|                     | Solid Waste                                                                                  | ---                   | O                     |
|                     | Hazardous Materials and Waste                                                                | ---                   | O                     |
|                     | Toxic Materials                                                                               | ---                   | ---                   |
| Noise Environment   |                                                                                              | ---                   | O                     |
| Biological Environment |                                                                                      | ---                   | O                     |
| Cultural Resources  |                                                                                              | X                     | X                     |
| Socioeconomic Environment |                                                                                      | +                     | O                     |
| Safety             |                                                                                              | O                     | ---                   |
| Transportation     |                                                                                              | ---                   | O                     |
| Cumulative Impacts  |                                                                                              | ---                   | ---                   |
3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

This section describes the existing environment within the area potentially affected by the Proposed Action and No-Action Alternative. A brief description of the Proposed Action Site is followed by descriptions of the physical environment, air quality, waste management and toxic materials, noise environment, biological environment, cultural resources, socioeconomic environment, and transportation and safety. Discussion of the described elements and resources provides the basis for analysis of potential effects to the environment from the Proposed Action and No-Action Alternative.

General information regarding the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures and site vicinity is provided in the previous EA, Final Environmental Assessment, Military Family Housing Privatization Initiative, Robins Air Force Base, Georgia and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) dated September 2006. A copy of the Final EA and FONSI may be obtained from 78 CEG/CEAO (Rebecca Crader, phone number 478-327-8288). While this previous EA does not specifically address the effect of the MFH privatization on the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures (as the residences were not part of the MFH privatization initiative), it does provide relevant background and historical information for the Proposed Action Site, and relevant sections of this EA are presented in Appendix C. Additional relevant background on Robins AFB is presented in Appendix C. Site-specific information presented in this section is derived from on-site evaluation and information obtained from 78 CEG/CEAN and other Robins AFB personnel.

Proposed Action Site - The Proposed Action Site is an approximately seven-acre lot located in the central portion of Robins AFB in the area currently occupied by the Chiefs’ Circle residential subdivision (see Figure 4). Five residential structures (consisting of 10 units), four associated carports and one residential street are currently located within the borders of the Proposed Action Site (Table 3.1).
Table 3-1. Proposed Action Site: Description of On-Site Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address / ID</th>
<th>Property Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500 A &amp; B Chiefs’ Circle</td>
<td>Two-story, brick exterior, duplex with a gable roof of asphalt shingles, brick and concrete foundation and an associated carport (Bldg. No. 506). Currently vacant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504 A &amp; B Chiefs’ Circle</td>
<td>Two-story, brick exterior, duplex with a gable roof of asphalt shingles, brick and concrete foundation and an associated carport (Bldg. No. 509). This building is currently used by the Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts and Cub Scouts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505 A &amp; B Chiefs’ Circle</td>
<td>Two-story, brick exterior, duplex with a gable roof of asphalt shingles, brick and concrete foundation. Currently used by the Combined Federal Campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings 506, 507, 508 &amp; 509</td>
<td>Open carports constructed of paved base, wood frame supports and corrugated metal roof.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These buildings consist of five identical plan duplexes constructed as officer housing in 1942. These designs were built with Colonial Revival influences and have not been extensively altered since their construction. Each building is approximately 3,400 square feet in size and consists of a two-story, six-bay, U-shaped duplex. The buildings are characterized by a concrete and brick foundation, gable roof covered with asphalt-shingles, two interior brick chimneys, and an exterior veneer of American or stretcher bond brick.

Two primary entrances are located on the main façade of each structure. Each entrance has a one-story entry porch with square Doric motif columns and a flat roof covered in tar and pebbles. The entrances have original six-panel glass and wood doors with two small rectangular glass lights above four wood panels. Added to the doors openings are screen and glass storm doors. Window openings are rectangular with soldier course lintels and header course sills. The windows are circa 1980 metal or vinyl clad one-over-one rectangular sash design. Adjacent to the windows are original louvered wood shutters.
Above the foundation is a brick belt course of soldier course brick, and dividing the first and second stories is a belt course of header bond brick. In the gable fields of the main façade, the original wood siding has been covered with circa 1980 aluminum siding. On the side façades of the buildings are one-story frame sun rooms with rectangular one-over-one sash windows and a flat roof with asphalt shingles. The original weatherboard siding on the sun rooms has been covered with circa 1980 aluminum siding.

At the rear façade of the structures are attached gable roof carports of frame construction with brick piers that were added in 1986. The buildings are reached by concrete sidewalks at the main façade and asphalt driveways. Four associated one-story frame open carports that were built in 1986 are also located at the Proposed Action Site.

The structures are currently vacant with the exception of Building 505 B and Building 504 A&B. Robins AFB has allowed the temporary use of Building 505 B for the CFC, 504 A for the Girl Scouts and 504 B for the Boy Scouts / Cub Scouts.

The existing residential setting of the Proposed Action Site is characterized by mature hardwood trees and typical residential landscaping (lawns and shrubs). All utilities (electrical, water, sanitary sewer, storm sewer, telephone, and cable television) within this area are below ground. Electrical transmission lines are located along the eastern and western sides of the Proposed Action Site, to the rear of the residences. Transmission lines run to pad-mounted electrical transformer units located between the residences and distribution lines run from the transformers to the residences. A main water line is located roughly in the center of the site in a north-south orientation. Smaller lines diverge from the main water line to each of the residential structures. Sanitary sewer lines are located along the northern, eastern and southern portions of the site at the rear of the residences. Storm sewer lines are located along the northern border of the site, parallel to Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.

Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard (a four-lane major thoroughfare) borders the Proposed Action Site to the north, beyond which are: Building 365 (DLA) and paved lots used for parking. Undeveloped wooded land is located to the east of the Proposed Action Site,
beyond which is an unnamed tributary leading to the east. Robins Parkway occupies the area further east. Undeveloped wooded land is located to the south of the Proposed Action Site, beyond which is another unnamed tributary leading to the reservoir west of Duck Lake. Further south lies former Pine Oak residential subdivision land on which a temporary AFRC headquarters facility has been constructed. An access road and Building 385 border the Proposed Action Site to the west, beyond which is additional administrative development.

3.1 PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

The following description of the physical environment of the study area is based on its principal components: topography, surface waters, floodplains, wetlands, storm water, geology and soils, groundwater and water supply and drinking water.

3.1.1 Topography

Topography at the Proposed Action Site is relatively flat, with an average elevation of approximately 295 feet above mean sea level (msl).

3.1.2 Surface Waters

The Proposed Action Site has no surface water features located on it, and as the site is currently developed with residential structures, no operations that directly impact surface waters currently occur on site. An unnamed drainageway and intermittent stream are located immediately east and south of the Proposed Action Site, respectively. These surface water features merge to the southeast of the site. The merged waterway flows to the east, where it is piped under Robins Parkway, and into a retention pond. The retention pond ultimately discharges into Duck Lake located approximately 1,000 feet southeast of the Proposed Action Site.
3.1.3 Floodplains and Wetlands

Based on review of flood insurance rate maps of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA, 2007), the most recent Robins AFB floodplain map (Robins AFB, 2006), and site observations, the Proposed Action Site is not located within the 100-year floodplain, nor does the site contain jurisdictional wetlands. No activities or operations at the site directly impact floodplains and wetlands.

3.1.4 Storm Water

The Proposed Action Site does not currently receive storm water runoff from off-site sources. No outside operations that adversely affect storm water occur in this area. Precipitation falling onto the site infiltrates the vegetated areas and sheet flows into ditches and storm drains located along the streets in the vicinity of the site, and towards unnamed intermittent tributaries located immediately east and south of the site. Storm sewer lines and associated drains are located along the northern border of the site, parallel to Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. The drains and ditches are part of the on-site storm water collection system that initially discharges to Duck Lake, subsequently discharges to Horse Creek and the associated wetlands, and eventually flows to the Ocmulgee River.

3.1.5 Soils

Many of the soils in the vicinity of the existing Proposed Action Site have been disturbed due to the construction of the streets and residential structures located on the site. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) mapped and classified the soils on the central and western portions of the site as “Lucy sand, 0 to 5 percent slopes” (USDA, 1967). The soils on the extreme eastern and southern borders of the site are classified as “Lucy sand, 5 to 8 percent slopes.” The soils of the Lucy series are described as deep, well-drained and somewhat excessively drained soil on gently sloping uplands (USDA, 1967). The areas of the site that are not covered by buildings or pavement are predominately covered with grass (lawn), landscaping and trees, and the soils are not exposed.
Current site uses are not known to adversely impact on-site or off-site soils. However, Chlordane (a pesticide) was used in the past in military family housing areas for the control of subterranean termites. The pesticide was applied underground around the foundation of the housing units, so soils beneath and Chiefs’ Circle residential structures have the potential to be contaminated with Chlordane. Potential actions associated with Chlordane-contaminated soil disturbance and removal are discussed in Section 4.1.5.2.

3.1.6 Groundwater

Current and past operations and land uses at the Proposed Action Site are not known to have adversely impacted groundwater. No groundwater contamination is known to exist, and no groundwater treatment systems are in operation on or in the immediate vicinity of the site. Based on topographical features, it is estimated that groundwater depth varies from approximately 15 to 20 feet below ground surface (bgs) in the area of the site. No groundwater drinking wells are located within the boundaries of the Proposed Action Site.

3.1.7 Water Supply and Drinking Water

Robins AFB is permitted to operate its water supply system under state of Georgia Permit No. CG1530042. By operating in compliance with permit requirements, the base ensures that it meets Federal and Georgia Safe Drinking Water Act requirements.

Potable water distribution pipes are located throughout the property, as they supply potable water to each of the five residential structures. Potable water distribution pipes are also located at the northern periphery of the Proposed Action Site, running parallel to Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. A main water line, running from Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, is located roughly in the center of the site in a north-south orientation. Smaller lines diverge from the main water line to each of the residences. Potable water is currently only used in Building 505 B and Building 504 (A&B) in the restrooms and kitchen when being used by the CFC and Scouts, respectively.
3.2 AIR QUALITY

3.2.1 Regional Air Quality

Robins AFB is located in an attainment area, indicating that the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) are being met in Houston County.

3.2.2 Air Emission Sources

Robins AFB is compliant with its Title V permit (Air Quality Permit No. 9711-153-0033-V-02-0 and Amendment No. 9711-153-0033-V-02-0).

Insignificant mobile source air emissions are currently generated by Robins AFB maintenance vehicles traveling to the site, and by personal vehicles travelling to and from the structures currently used by the CFC (504 B) and the Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts and Cub Scouts (Building 504 A&B). No other air emissions are currently produced at or in association with the Proposed Action Site.

3.3 WASTE MANAGEMENT AND TOXIC MATERIALS

3.3.1 Wastewater

Base-generated sanitary sewage is treated at Robins AFB’s sanitary sewage treatment plant, and effluent is monitored for biological oxygen demand, chemical oxygen demand, fecal coliform bacteria, pH, oil and grease, ammonia nitrogen, selected metals, total suspended solids, total phenols, and total residual chlorine. Discharges currently are within National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit limits.

Sanitary sewer lines are located throughout the Proposed Action Site, as they serve each of the five residential structures. Sanitary sewer lines are located along the northern, eastern and southern portions of the site at the rear of the residences. Sanitary sewage is currently only generated by activities in Building 504 B by the CFC and Building 504
(A&B) by the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts and Cub Scouts. No industrial wastewater is generated within the boundaries of the site.

### 3.3.2 Solid Waste

Solid wastes are generated from all areas of Robins AFB, including base housing, municipal operations, office complexes, industrial facilities, and construction/demolition areas. An *Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan* (ISWMP) has been developed to establish an integrated approach to dealing with solid waste management issues at Robins AFB (Robins AFB, 2010). The approach includes source reduction, recycling, and disposal. Solid waste must be disposed of in accordance with Section 01560 Environmental Requirements, and Section 01572 Construction and Demolition Waste Management of the Robins AFB Civil Engineering Specifications. All scrap pipe, wire, and metal are recycled through the Base Qualified Recycling Program (QRP) Recycling Center. Solid wastes that cannot be recycled are collected and transported to the Houston County landfill for disposal. Houston County has committed to providing solid waste disposal services to Robins AFB and has a Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) landfill with current permitted capacity of nine years and a Construction & Demolition (C&D) landfill with current permitted capacity of 33 years with 40 years of useful life. Approximately 50 years of additional capacity could be acquired through expansion of the landfill if needed permits were obtained.

Solid waste (not hazardous waste) associated with the Proposed Action Site includes waste such as kitchen waste, paper, plastics, metal and glass containers, and standard housekeeping materials. Solid waste from the Proposed Action Site is handled in accordance with the ISWMP; the amounts are projected to be consistent with that generated by a typical household or small office operation. Robins AFB has implemented a recycling program with the objective of reducing the amount of solid waste landfilled. Recyclable materials from office and residential sources include various types of paper, glass, cardboard, metals and plastics. Minimal amounts of waste material are currently being generated or recycled from the site.
3.3.3 Hazardous Materials and Waste


No hazardous materials are stored and no hazardous waste is currently generated at the Proposed Action Site. Household quantities of chemicals used at the utilized structures include: typical cleaning/maintenance chemicals, batteries, fluorescent light bulbs and other household materials/maintenance chemicals. Household hazardous wastes at this location are no longer exempt from the RCRA due to the structure being unoccupied.

3.3.4 Toxic Materials

Background information relative to toxic materials as it relates to Robins AFB is presented in Section 12.3 of Appendix C.

Comprehensive surveys for friable asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paint (LBP) have not been performed for the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures. Given the construction date of the structures (1942), ACM and LBP are assumed to be present in the buildings. Wastes contaminated with ACM, LBP, or other hazardous materials at levels below their respective regulatory thresholds require the submission of a Special Waste Acceptance Application with analytical data to Environmental Management in order to obtain preapproval for disposal at Houston County Landfill prior to start of work. No polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) containing electrical transformer units are located within the boundaries of this site. Given the construction date of the structures, PCB-containing fluorescent light ballasts are assumed to be present in the buildings.
3.4 NOISE ENVIRONMENT

No significant noise is currently being generated from the Proposed Action Site. Noise outside of the site is generated by the airfield and adjacent roadways. Based on available noise contour data, the site is located within an area subject to less than 65 decibel day/night levels (Middle Georgia Regional Development Center, 2004). These decibel levels are equivalent to those produced by a normal conversation or washing machine, and are below the Air Force Occupational Safety and Health (AFOSH)-established exposure limit of 85 decibels (by eight-hour time weighted average) that requires use of Personal Protective Equipment to protect hearing.

3.5 BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT

3.5.1 Flora

The areas around the residences at the Proposed Action Site have been disturbed by previous construction activities and contain mostly developed, landscaped or impervious surfaces. However, the flora located at this site does include over 50 mature hardwoods and pines interspersed between the residences, and areas of landscaped grasses and landscaped shrubs and trees.

3.5.2 Fauna

The areas around the residences at the Proposed Action Site have been disturbed by previous construction activities and contain mostly residences, roads, landscaped or impervious surfaces. The site offers minimal habitat for fauna, mainly limited to trees and shrubs, which small mammals and birds could use. The Eastern Gray Squirrel (Sciurus carolinensis), Mockingbird (Mimus polyglottos) and American Robin (Turdus migratorius) were observed at the site at the time of an August 2007 site visit.
3.5.3 **Endangered, Threatened and Sensitive Species**

No threatened, endangered or sensitive plant or animal species or their habitats are located on or adjacent to the Proposed Action Site.

3.6 **CULTURAL RESOURCES**

The five Chiefs’ Circle residential structures have been evaluated and found to be eligible for listing on the NRHP as part of the Chiefs’ Circle Historic District. These buildings consist of five identical plan duplexes constructed as officer housing in 1942 by Griffin, Mion, and Shepard (builder). Designs for the structures were prepared by the United States Corp of Engineers, Savannah District. These buildings were designed and were built with Colonial Revival influences and have not been extensively altered since their construction. Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Level II documentation provides background information for the remainder of the proposed historic district (see Appendix D). The duplexes are eligible for listing based on their architectural design or their arrangement in a circular fashion.

No archaeological sites have been recorded in the vicinity of the Proposed Action Site.

3.7 **SOCIOECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT**

Socioeconomic resources include the basic attributes and resources associated with the human environment. In particular, this includes population and economic activity. Economic activity typically encompasses employment, personal income and industrial growth.

The Proposed Action Site is developed with five residential structures (totaling 10 units). The majority of these structures are vacant with the exception of Building 505 and Building 504 (A&B) as Robins AFB has allowed the temporary use of these buildings for the CFC (504 B), the Girl Scouts (504 A) and Boy Scouts / Cub Scouts (504 B). Maintenance costs for the five buildings are estimated to range from approximately
$6,000/year (as residential housing) to $10,000/year (as administrative offices). Utility costs for the five buildings are estimated to range from approximately $30,000/year (as residential housing) to $60,000/year (as administrative offices).

### 3.8 TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY

At Robins AFB, safety issues are those that directly affect the protection of human life and property, and principally involve aviation, munitions and fire prevention. In addition, Air Force personnel are protected by observing Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA), AFOSH standards, Robins AFB safety requirements and RCRA (see Section 3.3.3).

No regular operations occur at the Proposed Action Site. Located on the central portion of Robins AFB, the only street within the boundary of the site is Chiefs’ Circle, which consists of a circular road where traffic travels around a central island and the road fronts each of the residential structures. The roadways in the immediate vicinity of Chiefs’ Circle include: Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard to the north and Robins Parkway to the east. The Proposed Action Site is located in an area of little traffic congestion, and has direct access to Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. Currently no transportation or safety issues are associated with the Proposed Action Site or the immediately surrounding roads.
4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

This chapter describes the potential environmental effects of implementing the Proposed Action and the No-Action Alternative. Potential effects of actions are based on the description of the actions as presented in Section 2 and existing environmental conditions of the site as presented in Section 3. Environmental effects from the No-Action Alternative address effects as they currently occur or could occur in the future if no action is taken.

4.1 PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

4.1.1 Topography

4.1.1.1 No-Action Alternative

The topography at Robins AFB is not currently being impacted by activities at the Proposed Action Site, and under the No-Action Alternative, the topography of Robins AFB would remain unchanged because no demolition activities would occur. Therefore, implementation of the No-Action Alternative would result in neither significant positive nor significant negative effects to the topography at or near Robins AFB.

4.1.1.2 Proposed Action

Demolition activities associated with disposition of the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures would not significantly change the topography of the Proposed Action Site because the removal of the existing structures would not require permanent alteration of the ground surface at the site.
4.1.2 Surface Waters

4.1.2.1 No-Action Alternative

Implementation of the No-Action Alternative would result in neither significant positive nor significant negative effects to surface waters at or near Robins AFB because no demolition activities would occur, surface waters would remain unchanged, and surface waters are not currently being significantly impacted by the subject site or activities at the site.

4.1.2.2 Proposed Action

Demolition activities associated with the disposition of the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures would not cause significant adverse impacts to surface waters. This is because the base uses Best Management Practices (BMPs) during the course of day-to-day operations, and plans to use BMPs such as silt fencing, hay bales and erosion-control blankets during the demolition of the structures to control storm water runoff and erosion so as not to cause significant adverse impacts to surface waters. See Section 4.1.4.2 for potential impacts to surface waters from soil erosion and storm water runoff from demolition activities, and additional BMP information.

4.1.3 Floodplains and Wetlands

4.1.3.1 No-Action Alternative

Under the No-Action Alternative, floodplain and wetland characteristics at Robins AFB would remain unchanged; floodplains and wetlands would not be impacted because no floodplains or wetlands are located on site, and these resources are not currently being significantly impacted by the subject site or activities at the site. Implementation of the No-Action Alternative would cause neither significant positive nor significant negative effects to floodplain characteristics and wetlands at or near Robins AFB.
### 4.1.3.2 Proposed Action

Demolition activities associated with disposition of the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures would result in neither significant positive nor significant negative effects to floodplains or wetlands. No changes to the 100-year floodplain or to existing wetland areas near or receiving storm water runoff from the site would occur as a result of demolition activities. This is because the base uses BMPs during the course of day-to-day operations, and plans to use BMPs such as silt fencing, hay bales and erosion-control blankets during the demolition activities that would occur as part of the Proposed Action. In addition, these resources are not currently significantly impacted by the subject site or activities on the site.

### 4.1.4 Storm Water

#### 4.1.4.1 No-Action Alternative

Implementation of the No-Action Alternative would cause neither significant positive nor significant negative effects to storm water at or near Robins AFB because no changes to storm water or the storm water conveyance system would occur, and storm water is not currently being significantly impacted by the subject site or activities on the site.

#### 4.1.4.2 Proposed Action

The demolition activities associated with disposition of the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures would not cause significant adverse impacts to storm water. This is because the base uses BMPs during the course of day-to-day operations, and plans to use BMPs such as silt fencing, hay bales and erosion-control blankets during demolition of the structures to control storm water runoff and erosion so as not to cause significant adverse impacts.
The proposed removal of four of the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures and associated outbuildings would impact areas totaling approximately one acre at the Proposed Action Site; no impervious surfaces would be added. Excavation/removal of the building foundations would increase the chance for contact with soils potentially contaminated with Chlordane. See Section 4.1.5.2 for potential actions associated with disturbance and removal of Chlordane-impacted soils at the Proposed Action Site. In addition, the demolition and removal operations would increase the potential for soil erosion and degradation of surface water runoff. The demolition would be designed and the existing area would be modified to include features, if needed, to sufficiently delay runoff of surface water from high-intensity storms and control erosion and subsequent sedimentation. Care would be taken during the demolition to avoid disturbance of the underground utilities that traverse the project site, or the utilities would be removed (as needed).

In addition to meeting applicable codes for demolition activities, the demolition contractor would be required to satisfy all relevant environmental requirements, submittals and permits related to the proposed project. The permit process includes submission of Notice of Intent for permit coverage under the base’s NPDES General Permit to discharge storm water associated with construction/demolition activity; development and approval of an Erosion, Sediment and Pollution Control Plan that meets the requirements of the Permit, while written in accordance with Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission’s Manual for Sediment and Erosion Control in Georgia, 5th Edition; following of the applicable county water protection ordinance; obtaining a Houston County Sediment and Erosion Control Permit; submittal of land disturbance fees to Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) and Houston County; obtaining of a dig permit from 78th CEG to identify underground utilities; review of the base’s day-to-day BMP operations and plans; and submission of a Notice of Termination to Georgia EPD following completion of work when site conditions meet the definition of “final stabilization.” Permit requirements also include performing periodic site inspections, sampling storm water discharges from the site, and analyzing turbidity of storm water runoff, performed in accordance with 40 CFR 136.
All permit applications would be submitted to 78 CEG/CEAN for review prior to final submittal to governing authorities.

4.1.5 Soils

4.1.5.1 No-Action Alternative

No changes to soils at the subject site would occur under the No-Action Alternative because no demolition activities would occur. In addition, soils are not currently being significantly impacted by the subject site or activities at the site other than from accepted pesticide application practices. Implementation of the No-Action Alternative would produce neither significant positive nor significant negative effects.

4.1.5.2 Proposed Action

Prior to demolition associated with disposition of the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures, 78 CEG/CEAN would conduct sampling at the site for any excavation activities (including removal of building foundations and associated subsurface utilities) in areas of potential Chlordane-contaminated soil. In addition, intrusive work would be carefully planned and coordinated to assure appropriate health and safety (H&S) protocols are followed so that direct contact with contaminated soil does not occur. Waste characterization sampling would be performed as needed, and the excavated soil and waste materials would be managed accordingly. If contaminated soil at concentrations exceeding regulatory thresholds were found, its removal and proper disposal would be a beneficial effect of the project, depending on type and levels of contamination. Any excavated soils determined to be hazardous waste and destined for removal and disposal would be managed and disposed of appropriately; if found to be non-hazardous, the soil would be stockpiled on base for potential future reuse, and any waste material would be properly disposed of as solid waste. Any hazardous or universal waste generated would be disposed of through the Defense Logistics Agency Disposition Services (DLADS).
As discussed previously in Section 4.1.4.2, as a result of demolition activities associated with the Proposed Action, the potential for soil erosion and the potential for eroded soil to adversely affect the quality of storm water runoff would increase. If Chlordane-contaminated soil is identified above applicable regulatory thresholds and would be transported from the area of contamination, the excavated area would be leveled and would either be re-seeded or covered with sod to prevent exposure to precipitation, and reduce the potential for excavation/soil removal activities to adversely affect the quality of storm water runoff.

4.1.6 Groundwater

4.1.6.1 No-Action Alternative

Implementation of the No-Action Alternative would result in neither significant positive nor significant negative effects to groundwater because no changes to groundwater resources would occur and groundwater is not currently being significantly impacted by the subject site or activities at the site.

4.1.6.2 Proposed Action

The demolition activities associated with disposition of the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures would not impact groundwater at the site as the demolition activities would not be deep enough to impact or intersect groundwater. Conducting the Proposed Action would produce neither significant positive nor significant negative effects to groundwater.

4.1.7 Water Supply and Drinking Water

4.1.7.1 No-Action Alternative

No changes to existing water supply impacts and drinking water resources and usage would occur under the No-Action Alternative because no demolition activities would
occur. In addition, these resources are not currently being significantly impacted by the subject site or activities at the site. Implementation of the No-Action Alternative would result in neither significant positive nor significant negative effects to water supply and drinking water.

4.1.7.2 Proposed Action

Implementation of the Proposed Action would not affect the existing water supply at Robins AFB to a significant degree. Demolition activities associated with the disposition of the existing Chiefs’ Circle residential structures would not use significant amounts of water or affect the existing water supply at Robins AFB. Overall drinking water consumption at Robins AFB would slightly decrease as a result of the Proposed Action because Building 504 (A&B) would no longer be available for use by the Scouts.

4.2 AIR QUALITY

Potential air emissions resulting from the Proposed Action and No-Action Alternative have been evaluated based on the Clean Air Act as amended. The effects of an action are considered significant if they increase ambient air pollution concentrations above NAAQS, contribute to an existing violation of NAAQS, or interfere with or delay the attainment of NAAQS.

4.2.1 No-Action Alternative

No changes to air emissions would occur under the No-Action Alternative because no demolition activities would occur. In addition, air quality is not currently being significantly impacted by the subject site or activities at the site. Implementation of the No-Action Alternative would result in neither significant positive nor significant negative effects to air emissions.
4.2.2 Proposed Action

In order to address air emissions associated with demolition activities, surveys would be performed to identify ACM and LBP building materials in the Chiefs’ Circle structures prior to any demolition/removal activity (see Section 4.3.4.2). If ACM is found, the contractor would be required to satisfy applicable environmental safety requirements, submittals, and permits related to the removal of ACM at the proposed project site: demolition plans would be prepared and implemented to provide for safe removal and disposal of ACM and LBP materials in the affected building in accordance with applicable regulations; the contractor would be required to follow the permit process in accordance with the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (GDNR), EPD, Asbestos Program requirements; and all permit applications would be submitted to 78 CEG/CEAN for review prior to final submittal to governing authorities.

The demolition plan for the Chiefs’ Circle structures would incorporate methods for and be coordinated with ACM and LBP abatement activities to control airborne asbestos and lead emissions and maintain air quality. Furthermore, demolition of the structures would not cause significant adverse impacts to air quality due to fugitive dust. The base uses BMPs during the course of day-to-day operations, as outlined in individual Erosion, Sediment and Pollution Control Plans that would be created for each project. The BMPs for dust would include procedures for wetting disturbed portions of the project areas during periods of excessive dryness; therefore any increase in fugitive dust would not cause significant adverse impacts.

It is estimated that demolition and removal of the Chiefs’ Circle structures would take three to six months. Demolition activities would increase emissions of carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, and nitrogen oxides from demolition/construction worker traffic and operation of heavy equipment. However, because the increase in commutation trips and emissions from construction worker vehicles would be temporary and emissions from heavy vehicles would also be relatively limited in quantity and duration, these emissions would not cause significant adverse impacts to air quality.
Based on the above-described assessment, implementation of the Proposed Action would not cause any violations of the NAAQS and would not significantly increase air emissions at Robins AFB. Air emissions associated with the Proposed Action would be compliant with Robins AFB’s Title V permit.

4.3 WASTE MANAGEMENT AND TOXIC MATERIALS

4.3.1 Wastewater

4.3.1.1 No-Action Alternative

Under the No-Action Alternative, sanitary and industrial wastewater would not be affected because no demolition activities would occur. In addition, these resources are not currently being significantly impacted by the subject site or activities at the site. Sanitary wastewater would continue to be generated at the Proposed Action Site at current levels, and no industrial wastewater would be generated at the Proposed Action Site. Thus, implementation of the No-Action Alternative would not result in significant adverse or significant positive impacts to the environment as it relates to wastewater.

4.3.1.2 Proposed Action

Sanitary wastewater would be significantly reduced or no longer be generated at this site following proposed disposition of the Chiefs’ Circle structures; no industrial wastewater would be generated. Demolition activities at the Proposed Action Site would not generate sanitary or industrial wastewater. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Action would produce neither significant positive nor significant negative effects to sanitary and industrial wastewater generation at Robins AFB.
4.3.2 Solid Waste

4.3.2.1 No-Action Alternative

No significant adverse or significant positive impacts would occur to solid waste and the physical environment as it relates to solid waste because no change in the volume or handling of solid waste would occur at Robins AFB, and existing solid waste handling and disposal does not significantly impact the physical environment.

4.3.2.2 Proposed Action

Implementation of the Proposed Action would result in no significant positive or significant negative impacts to solid waste or to the physical environment as it relates to solid waste. As stated in Section 3.3.2, Houston County has committed to providing solid waste disposal services to Robins AFB and has adequate disposal capacity for the solid waste that would be generated from this project. Waste materials containing ACM or LBP would be handled in accordance with applicable regulations (see Section 4.3.4.2).

Conducting the Proposed Action would temporarily increase the generation of solid waste because of the demolition activities associated with the Proposed Action. Removal of the Chiefs’ Circle structures would produce waste concrete, asphalt, brick, metal, wood and other construction materials.

Waste materials would be recycled to the extent possible. Robins AFB has an official contract specification called “Construction and Demolition Waste Management,” which would be followed for demolition activities. This specification exceeds State of Georgia requirements on construction and demolition (solid waste) recycling, and allows the base to specify exactly how much material must be recycled from a demolition site. Section 1.2 of the contract specification document states that contractors must “use all reasonable means to divert construction and demolition waste from landfills and incinerators and to facilitate their recycling or reuse. A minimum of 50 to 75 percent by
weight of total project solid waste shall be diverted from the landfill.” This would mean that any contractor bidding on the demolition job would be contractually bound to recycle whatever percentage Robins AFB deems appropriate. A reasonable figure for recycling solid waste for Chiefs’ Circle would be 75 to 80 percent by weight (see Appendix A).

Waste that is not recyclable would be disposed by the building contractor in approved local landfill facilities.

Solid wastes generated in association with the Proposed Action would be handled in accordance with Robins AFB’s ISWMP.

4.3.3 Hazardous Materials and Waste

4.3.3.1 No-Action Alternative

Under the No-Action Alternative, use of hazardous materials and generation of hazardous waste would not be affected because no demolition activities would occur. In addition, these resources are not currently being significantly impacted by the subject site or activities at the site. The No-Action Alternative would cause neither significant positive nor significant negative environmental effects related to hazardous materials and hazardous waste.

4.3.3.2 Proposed Action

Implementation of the Proposed Action would cause neither significant positive nor significant negative environmental effects related to hazardous materials and hazardous waste.

Excavated soil and associated building materials removed from the Proposed Action Site would be sampled for waste characterization as necessary. If contaminated soil material is identified, corrective action would be regulated under the corrective action portion of
Robins AFB’s Hazardous Waste Facility Permit. Any excavated soil and building debris that is determined to be hazardous waste would be segregated from other materials to the extent possible, and managed and disposed of as hazardous waste. Any hazardous waste generated would be disposed of through the DLADS.

Hazardous materials, such as fuels for construction equipment and vehicles, would be used during the site demolition activities. These materials would be used and handled in accordance with Robins AFB’s Hazardous Waste Management Plan (HWMP) and all applicable regulations, and significant adverse impacts would not occur due to their usage.

4.3.4 Toxic Materials

4.3.4.1 No-Action Alternative

The No-Action Alternative would cause neither significant positive nor significant negative environmental effects related to toxics and toxic waste because toxic materials would not be affected, and these materials are not currently significantly impacting the environment. As the structures continue to deteriorate, an inspection and evaluation of potential ACM, LBP and PCB-containing equipment might be required to identify potential health and environmental concerns requiring at a minimum that access be restricted until repair, removal or demolition activities are conducted.

4.3.4.2 Proposed Action

Demolition activities associated with disposition of the Chiefs’ Circle structures would not significantly adversely or significantly positively impact toxic materials or toxic waste or the environment as it relates to these materials because the toxic materials and waste would be managed and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations, and disposal is a permitted activity.
ACM and LBP surveys would be performed on the structures prior to any demolition activity. Identified ACM and LBP would be removed and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations. No known PCBs or known PCB-containing equipment would be disturbed by the Proposed Action. However, potential PCB-containing fluorescent light ballasts located within the buildings would be assessed prior to demolition and disposed of per applicable regulations.

4.4  NOISE ENVIRONMENT

4.4.1  No-Action Alternative

Implementation of the No-Action Alternative would not result in significant positive or significant negative effects to the noise environment because the noise environment would not change, and the existing noise environment is not significantly impacted by the existing operations.

4.4.2  Proposed Action

Demolition activities associated with disposition of the Chiefs’ Circle structures would result in short-term, localized, and potentially loud noise impacts during demolition. The demolition activities would not impact the noise environment at Robins AFB to a significant degree. Workers would wear ear protection, as necessary, for activities requiring this level of protection.

4.5  BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT

4.5.1  No-Action Alternative

The No-Action Alternative would have neither significant positive nor significant negative impacts on the biological environment because no demolition activities would occur. In addition, this resource is not currently being significantly impacted by the subject site or activities at the site. Natural resources would not be disturbed.
4.5.2 Proposed Action

The demolition activities associated with disposition of the Chiefs’ Circle structures would have neither significant positive nor significant negative impacts on the biological environment. The Proposed Action would not result in a significant impact to wildlife or vegetation due to modification or removal of the minimal amount of existing vegetation in the areas of the site where demolition activities are proposed. Only trees, shrubs and vegetation immediately surrounding the structures would be removed in order to facilitate demolition activities. No endangered, threatened, or sensitive animal species would be affected by the Proposed Action at the Sites, as neither these species nor their habitats are located in this area.

4.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES

4.6.1 No-Action Alternative

The No-Action Alternative would have an adverse effect on cultural resources. If the houses are not maintained and continue to stand vacant, the condition and integrity of the NRHP-eligible resources are likely to decrease. It is therefore possible that the integrity could diminish to the extent that the resources would no longer be eligible for the NRHP. The extent to which the No-Action Alternative would cause a decrease in integrity is not measurable at this time.

4.6.2 Proposed Action

Implementation of the Proposed Action would result in the immediate removal of Buildings 501, 502, 504, and 505 and preservation of Building 500 until either a permanent user has been identified or two years have passed wherein the structure would be removed in accordance with the MOA among Robins AFB, the Georgia SHPO, and the ACHP (see Appendix F). Because the Proposed Action would result in a potentially adverse effect on the Chiefs’ Circle Historic District, a HABS Level II documentation of the proposed historic district (see Appendix D) was completed and
implementation of the Proposed Action would be in accordance with the above-mentioned MOA.

Agency consultation in compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA began in January 2007 when Robins AFB first notified the Georgia SHPO of the initial intent to convert the Chiefs’ Circle structures for administrative use. In March 2007 SHPO concurred with Robins AFB on a finding of no adverse effect by the Chiefs' Circle conversion. However, in August 2007 Robins AFB notified SHPO and the ACHP of the proposed demolition of the Chiefs’ Circle structures. The conversion of the structures as initially planned was later rejected as being unfeasible by Robins AFB. Subsequent coordination from September 2007 to present between Robins AFB, SHPO and ACHP centered on adequate justification for the demolition of the Chiefs’ Circle structures and culminated in the above-mentioned MOA (see Appendix E).

Based on previous survey findings, no archaeological resources would be affected by the Proposed Action. If artifacts are identified during demolition, excavation activities will cease and plans will be developed to address the resource, per Robins AFB’s Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP). When archaeological resources are inadvertently discovered, project personnel are directed to avoid the site of discovery, stop work in the area of discovery, and immediately contact the Robins AFB Cultural Resources Manager (CRM). The CRM would send a qualified representative to visit the discovery site. The resource would then be recorded, evaluated, and the effects mitigated as necessary.

4.7 SOCIOECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

4.7.1 No-Action Alternative

The socioeconomic environment would not change significantly under the No-Action Alternative, when compared to the economy associated with Robins AFB and the Warner Robins area. Robins AFB would continue to exert a significant positive impact on the economy of the Middle Georgia region of influence. Minority populations and
low-income populations would not be significantly adversely or significantly positively impacted. No significant environmental health risks and safety risks to children would occur. Hence, implementation of the No-Action Alternative would result in neither significant positive nor significant negative effects to the socioeconomic environment.

4.7.2 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would provide additional economic stimulus to the regional economy primarily through expenditures associated with the removal of the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures. The recycling of building materials could generate revenue. However, due to the current economic situation (decline in residential/commercial construction markets), no exact figures could be estimated for the resale of these recycled materials, although it is not expected to be more that 10 percent of the demolition costs. The demolition activities would positively impact the economy, with expenditures mostly in the local area with local contractors, as the demolition would take approximately three to six months to complete.

No significant adverse environmental impacts would occur as a result of the Proposed Action and no populations (minority, low-income, or otherwise) would be disproportionately impacted; therefore, no significant impacts with regard to environmental justice would occur.

4.8 TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY

4.8.1 No-Action Alternative

Under the No-Action Alternative, there would be no significant positive or significant adverse effects to transportation or safety. However, the structural, mechanical, and electrical components of the vacant residential structures would continue to decline to the point that the facilities would become structurally unsound (or otherwise unsafe), requiring at a minimum that access be restricted until repairs or demolition activities are conducted.
4.8.2 Proposed Action

Implementation of the Proposed Action would not significantly positively or significantly adversely impact traffic and safety at Robins AFB or the surrounding area. Contractors will be required to follow appropriate Robins AFB and OSHA safety rules during transit to the Proposed Action Site. Construction vehicles would enter the base through Gate 4 and drive approximately one-half mile to the Proposed Action Site, while workers in non-commercial vehicles could enter Robins AFB through any of the other entrance gates.

Demolition activities would involve the operation of heavy machinery and other equipment. The base would require the construction contractor to implement actions consistent with governing regulations to ensure worker health and safety during construction.

4.9 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations stipulate that potential environmental impacts resulting from cumulative impacts should be considered within an EA. A cumulative impact is the impact on the environment that results from the incremental impact of an action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. In accordance with NEPA, a discussion of cumulative impacts resulting from projects that are proposed, currently under construction, recently completed, or anticipated to be implemented in the near future is presented below. Two recently completed, one current, and two future actions were identified as potentially producing cumulative environmental effects in the area of the Proposed Action Site. The actions are described as follows.

Operations and Management Demolition Effort: The operations and management (O&M) demolition effort at the Pine Oak and Lakeside residential subdivisions included the demolition of all residential structures within the subdivisions. This O&M demolition effort occurred as a part of the larger,
recently completed MFH privatization initiative. This project temporarily increased the area of permeable land surface and temporarily increased air emissions, noise, traffic volume and volume of solid waste and toxic materials generated by demolition activities.

**New General Purpose Warehouse**: The DLA constructed a General Purpose Warehouse (GPW) at the northwestern corner of Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard and Robins Parkway. The new GPW consists of a 167,575 square-foot, one-story building (used primarily as warehouse space) and a small annex for administrative space. Operations involve receiving and breaking down pallets of commodities and building up and shipping out new pallets of commodities, or receiving and shipping out built-up pallets as a whole. Approximately one hundred new employees will work at the GPW, which operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week. All truck staging and parking occurs on this site, and existing parking areas on or adjacent to the site are available for personal vehicle parking. This project increased the generation of solid waste and sanitary wastewater, the consumption of potable water, and the number of vehicles on local roadways and entering Robins AFB.

**Temporary Headquarters Facility for Air Force Reserve Command**: AFRC is constructing a temporary headquarters building in the former Pine Oak residential area where residences were removed as part of the O&M demolition effort mentioned above. This project will slightly increase the area of impermeable land surface within the former residential area. The construction activities associated with this project will temporarily increase air emissions, noise, traffic volume and volume of solid waste generated by construction activities. Most AFRC personnel would relocate to this building from other locations on base, so there would be no net increase in air emissions, noise, traffic volume, solid waste volume, or sanitary wastewater generation from consolidating AFRC personnel at this location.

**Headquarters, Air Force Reserve Command Campus**: A new AFRC Headquarters Campus is proposed for construction in the area of the current Lakeside residential subdivision at the southeastern corner of Robins Parkway and Lakeside Drive. The site is an approximately 25-acre parcel of currently occupied by residential houses. The new AFRC Campus facility would consist of four facility buildings totaling approximately 350,000 gross square feet in size.
with an associated 100,000 square feet of parking area and roadways. The facility would be capable of accommodating 1,200+ personnel. Existing AFRC operations and personnel currently located in buildings on base and off base would relocate to this facility. The new facility would include space for administrative functions and the AFRC band. Additional site features would include on-site separate parking areas, sculptures and landscaping. The construction activities associated with this project would increase the area of impermeable land surface by approximately 15 acres, and temporarily increase air emissions, noise, traffic volume and volume of solid waste and toxic materials generated by construction/demolition activities.

**New Security Forces Facility**: A new Security Forces Facility is proposed for construction on Eastman Street at the northeastern corner of the Robins Parkway and Watson Boulevard. The site is an approximately three-acre parcel of undeveloped land, a portion of which is currently used for parking. The Security Forces facility would consist of an approximately 40,500-square foot, two-story facility and an associated parking/storage area capable of accommodating 400 personnel. Existing Security Forces operations currently located in Buildings 261, 263 and 327 would relocate to this facility. The new facility would include: investigations offices, pass and registration areas, supply/equipment storage, training areas, armory, law enforcement and security control centers, and corrections and administrative areas. Additional site features would include on-site separate parking areas for Security Forces vehicles and other privately owned vehicles. The construction activities associated with this project would increase the area of impermeable land surface by approximately two acres, and temporarily increase air emissions, noise, traffic volume and volume of solid waste and toxic materials generated by construction/demolition activities.

Potential cumulative effects of the above-listed projects will be addressed through existing permit requirements or by obtaining permit modifications as necessary.

Cumulative increases in storm water runoff due to increased impermeable area at the above-described Proposed Action sites would occur. Site-specific design features would be employed at each of the sites to limit the volume and rate of storm water runoff so that the effect of the cumulative volume of runoff would be insignificant. The construction contractor would be required to implement practices under an approved
Erosion, Sediment and Pollution Control Plan, designed for the resulting effects on storm water and surface water quality to be insignificant. Also, the cumulative effect of numerous construction projects on storm water would be addressed, as appropriate, under individual approved Erosion, Sediment and Pollution Control Plans, designed for the resulting effects on cumulative storm water and surface water quality to be insignificant.

The construction phases of these actions would increase carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides from construction employee traffic and operation of heavy equipment. Demolition activities associated with disposition of the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures would emit minimal air emissions. The cumulative increase in emissions from construction worker vehicles would be temporary and insignificant to the environment when considered in the context of Robins AFB and the nearby areas, and considering the fact that it would be unlikely that any of these projects would occur at the same time. These projects would result in temporary and insignificant adverse cumulative effects to air quality.

Cumulative increases in the generation of solid waste would occur from construction activities. Solid waste materials would be recycled as feasible, and any toxic materials would be disposed in accordance with applicable regulations. The wastes would not be significant when compared to the total solid waste and toxic material generation for Robins AFB.

The effects of noise generation by the projects would be temporary and insignificant. Noise would not have a cumulative adverse effect on the environment.

There would be no cumulative effect from the above-listed projects on cultural resources. None of the other projects would adversely affect historic structures; a HABS has been completed for Chiefs’ Circle in accordance with Section 106 requirements, and the Proposed Action would be performed in accordance with stipulations of the MOA for Chiefs’ Circle. There would be no cumulative effect on archaeological resources at the Proposed Action Site because no archaeological resources are affected.
Conducting these actions would produce positive effects within the region of economic influence during the construction of the facilities. The cumulative effect of the Proposed Action would result in insignificant beneficial economic impacts to the local economy.

As described in the preceding paragraphs of this section of the EA, the remaining environmental resources and elements would not experience significant adverse or positive cumulative effects. Significant cumulative effect would not occur from the implementation of the Proposed Action.
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5.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

Charles Allen, P.E. – Independent Technical Reviewer, URS - Mr. Allen has a B.S. in Civil Engineering, and is a Professional Engineer with over 35 years of experience on a variety of NEPA environmental impact assessments, civil, geotechnical, and seismic engineering projects, Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessments, waste stream and pollution prevention projects, environmental permitting, and hazards analysis. He has served as the Independent Technical Reviewer for several NEPA EAs prepared on behalf of 78 CEG/CEAO and for several other Federal agencies including U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, U.S. Department of Justice, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Postal Service, among others.

Kenneth Branton – Program Manager, URS - Mr. Branton has a B.S. in Mining and Petroleum Engineering. He is a retired Lieutenant Colonel (LtCol) from the U.S. Air Force with 22 years of service as a Bioenvironmental Engineer. LtCol Branton served as the Deputy Director of Environmental Management at Robins AFB and the Chief of the Environmental Restoration Division from 1991-96. He also served as the Deputy Director of the Air Force Environmental Research Laboratory at Tyndall AFB from 1996-98. He completed the Shipley course on “How to Manage the EIAP/NEPA Process: Air Force Specific (ELAP)” in 1992 and has conducted environmental impact assessments and served as the Independent Technical Reviewer on numerous Air Force and FEMA projects. Mr. Branton has 12 years of experience as a consultant environmental engineer of which 10 years has been at Robins AFB as a Senior Program Manager managing all types of environmental projects for the conservation, compliance, remediation, and pollution prevention programs.

Patricia Slade – Project Manager, URS - Ms. Slade has a B.S. in geology and more than 25 years of experience in NEPA documentation, environmental planning, environmental due diligence, and geological studies. She has served as the NEPA Project Manager for previous projects completed for the Air Force, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Federal Emergency Management Agency, U.S. Department of Justice, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, U.S. Postal Service, among others. She works on a
variety of inter-disciplinary projects, including storm water/NPDES permitting, Phase I ESAs and Phase II investigations, geotechnical investigations, asbestos and lead-based paint surveys, cultural resources surveys, indoor air quality surveys, county-wide flood damage reduction projects, and regulatory compliance projects. She has performed or managed completion of numerous NEPA documents for a variety of federal and state agencies.

**Larry Neal – Project Manager, URS** - Mr. Neal has a B.A. in biology and a M.S. in biological oceanography. He has more than 35 years of experience in NEPA documentation, environmental planning, and natural resource management involving projects for many DoD Departments, including the AF and AFRC. He has more than 13 years of experience in performing natural resources management, comprehensive planning, and NEPA compliance activities and studies at Robins AFB and in preparing associated technical deliverables. He has provided onsite staff support in NEPA, cultural and natural resources management to Headquarters AFRC. Since 1999, he has served as a Task Leader for many of the natural resources studies and management plans for Robins AFB. He has provided related environmental services, including third-party independent technical review of NEPA documents, for other Air Force Commands and Bases, the Army, the Marine Corps, the Corps of Engineers, Department of Agriculture, Veterans Administration, state government, and private industry.

**Chris Taylor – Environmental Scientist, URS** - Mr. Taylor has a B.S. in geology and more than 18 years of relevant experience in environmental due diligence, NEPA documentation, and geological studies. He has prepared several NEPA EAs on behalf of 78 CEG/CEAN and worked with other federal authorities for proposed development projects including the Air Force, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, Federal Aviation Administration, U.S. Postal Service, among others. He works on a variety of inter-disciplinary projects, including Phase I ESAs and Phase II investigations; geotechnical investigations; asbestos, lead-based paint, lead in drinking water and radon surveys; indoor air quality surveys; and regulatory compliance projects.
Philip E. Elson – Program Manager, Aerostar Environmental Services, Inc.  Mr. Elson has a B.S. in Biology and over 25 years of experience providing environmental consulting services throughout the U.S. He specializes in developing and implementing environmental management programs associated with large-scale land acquisition and development projects. His duties have included resolving environmental concerns relating to hazardous waste and petroleum contamination; conducting transactional and operational environmental audits; overseeing data collection and documentation activities associated with Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Assessment preparation; and serving as project liaison with federal, state, and local environmental regulatory agencies. He has managed natural resource and NEPA related projects for a variety of federal clients including the U.S. Air Force, U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, Army National Guard, U.S. Navy, and Federal Aviation Administration.

Louise Duffy – Technical Reviewer, AEROSTAR - Ms. Duffy has 8 years of experience in drafting and reviewing environmental documents. She is also a Certified Professional in Erosion and Sediment Control and has significant experience in drafting and editing planning documents and environmental site assessment reports; performing wetland delineations and threatened and endangered species habitat assessment; performing environmental inspections for private development and pipeline construction projects.
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Joy J. Bernard – 78 CEG/CEAR
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Jim Gillis - 78 CEG/CEAP
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Preface

This appendix provides supplemental information for various options related to the disposition of the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures. Potential issues associated with various options are summarized at the end of the discussion (see Table A-1)

Synopsis of Efforts to Convert Chiefs’ Circle to Temporary Living Facilities, to Administrative Space, for “Soft Uses” or for Residential Housing (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4)

During the first six months of 2007, various options for converting Chiefs’ Circle from housing to administrative space were considered, proposed, and ultimately rejected. In January of that year 78 CEG/CEAN (Environmental Management) notified the GA SHPO that Robins AFB wished to convert these buildings for that purpose. Shortly thereafter the base submitted a proposal to Air Staff concerning this conversion, but the proposal was rejected. The major factors that determined the infeasibility of this option pertained to the cost of installing communication lines, shoring up the floors of the buildings to support more people and equipment than they were originally designed for, upgrading the HVAC systems and the bathroom facilities to meet the needs of more people, and the cost of converting the few rooms in each house into office spaces for many people. Upstairs accessibility, especially to meet codes with respect to handicapped workers, was also a substantial potential expense. Another significant factor involved in the rejection of this conversion pertained to the fact that the location of Chiefs’ Circle does not abide with the constraints of the base Area Development Plan. Under that plan, administrative and housing facilities are to be located in areas other than where Chiefs’ Circle is currently located, as the central portion of the base is dedicated for industrial uses.

With regard to the installation and upgrading of communication lines (as listed above), a wireless network could be utilized at the buildings as a cost reduction measure. However, as compared to the number of vulnerabilities that are available against a wired network, a wireless network has many more and therefore requires more security procedures to defend against them. The simple fact that the medium of transmission is no longer contained in physically controllable wire opens up more possibilities for attacks to come from new directions. The first and foremost threat to a wireless network is a hacker that can sit outside of a building and intercept network transmissions that leak from the building. More advanced wireless security networks exist, but this requires purchasing specific systems, hardware, software, peripherals, etc., all of which would require design and approval from the military before installation.

The following administrative functions were considered as possibilities for occupying Chiefs’ Circle:

1) Judge Advocate Claims (currently in building 708)
2) Sexual Assault Response Coordinator’s Office (Building 708)
3) Area Defense Council (Building 368)
4) TMO (Building 914)
5) GSA Rep (Building 255)
6) DLA Reps (3 each) (Building 300)
7) CARE (Building 300)
8) Housing Office (Building 706)
9) ANG Rep (Basement Building 300)

Reasons why the Chiefs’ Circle facilities were rejected for permanently housing the above administrative functions, in addition to the issues called out above, included: a) the administrative function needed to be co-located with similar organizational functions, b) a more secure building was needed, c) some functions were designated to move to proposed new facilities, and d) even a single structure was too large to accommodate some existing functions.

In addition to potentially using Chiefs’ Circle for administrative functions, the buildings were also evaluated (during late 2006 and early 2007) for use as a potential Temporary Living Facility (TLF). However, a TLF was built across from the base commissary just a few years ago, and it was determined that Robins fulfills its TLF space requirements. Even if the base was in need of additional TLF space, the use of Chiefs’ Circle for such a function would be problematic, as these facilities are typically co-located with stores and eating establishments. Chiefs’ Circle is not located within easy walking distance of these types of establishments on Robins AFB.

In addition to administrative functions, during the last half of 2007, considered was given to using the buildings for “soft functions,” i.e., on-base organizations that do not have the typical office communication line requirements such as “drops” for computer hook-ups. For example, one of the buildings is currently being used as a meeting location for a local Boy Scout troop. There were two problems with this option: 1) No other organization expressed an interest in using the buildings, even the City of Warner Robins when contacted about this option; and 2) Even if an organization expressed interest, that organization would have to provide for the maintenance requirements for the building – a significant financial issue. In short, soft uses were determined to be an impractical long-term option for these buildings.

With regard to the reuse of the structures for military and non-military family housing, the Chiefs’ Circle housing structures are considered inadequate surplus housing to the Air Force. To improve the quality of family housing and sustain that quality, the Air Force, along with the Office of Secretary of the Defense (OSD), initiated family housing privatization for installations within the United States. Since the Air Force housing budget is based on no Government-owned housing due to privatization, no housing funds are available to mothball (put into long term storage) and sustain inadequate surplus housing that has been excluded from privatization. In meeting the global security challenge for the United States, the Air Force does not have the funds to mothball and sustain inadequate surplus facilities; limited funds are needed to meet the challenge. Cost studies have already shown that demolition is more cost effective than improving the house or making the house an administrative facility, which are probably the least costly alternative uses. Thus, any cost to mothball and sustain a facility for some future use should enhance the cost benefit for demolition. Demolition also provides non-monetary benefits, such as security, safety, fire prevention and social.
The Chiefs’ Circle housing units are no longer needed to meet Air Force housing requirements for military members in the housing market area for Robins AFB. These housing units are also inadequate in regards to functional space use and infrastructure for housing military members. As such, these units are to be divested from the Air Force housing program. The Air Force and OSD goal is to privatize all military housing in the United States by Fiscal Year 2010 (FY 10). When this goal is fully met, the Air Force will have no government-owned housing and no funds to sustain housing structures. In meeting the global security challenge for the United States, the Air Force mission does not provide nor sustain housing for low income families.

The January 2005 Housing Community Profile (HCP) for Robins AFB provided a condition assessment and cost analyses of the Chiefs’ Circle community/infrastructure and housing units. As early as 2005, the condition assessment for the community was deemed as deteriorated, the area infrastructure was deemed as fair, and the housing units were deemed as fair. The improvement costs for the community/infrastructure was $193K in FY04 dollars. The average cost to improve the units was $134.7K and to replace the units was $150.1K in FY04 dollars. With the HCP and 2006 Housing Requirements and Market Analysis as references, the scope of the Robins’ Phase II housing privatization deal eliminated the cost to improve/replace/sustain a small family housing area isolated from other neighborhoods by major roads with high volumes of traffic and situated adjacent to an industrial/commercial area.

Security would also be a concern for utilizing the structures for public housing. Security requirements for base housing and housing personnel are defined in the privatized housing contract, which is the only housing instrument for non-military personnel. The occupancy maximum for existing privatized housing must be exceeded before any consideration would be given to providing additional housing. However, Chiefs’ Circle is not part of privatized housing, and making those buildings available to the general public would not be compatible with force protection requirements at Robins AFB.

Synopsis of Communications Regarding Moving Chiefs’ Circle (Alternative 5)

In July 2008, several contacts were made regarding the possibility of moving the five structures that make up Chiefs’ Circle Historic District to an off-base location. The following organizations were contacted: 1) Keep Warner Robins Beautiful (a City of Warner Robins department); 2) Carpenter Construction (a firm that is involved in a number of construction and demolition projects on Robins AFB); 3) NewTown Macon (an organization that works with the City of Macon to revitalize its downtown area); and 4) Lords of Macon (a firm specializing in recycling Middle Georgia building materials).

Debra Jones of Keep Warner Robins Beautiful forwarded photos of the buildings to others in her network and stated that she would re-contact 78 CEG/CEAN if anyone expressed interest in removing the buildings from Robins AFB. There was no positive response from Ms. Jones.

Jerry Carpenter, of Carpenter Construction, informed the 78 CEG/CEAN that it was too expensive to move those buildings, though it was technically possible. He felt that the expense was not worth the potential gains. Estimates for relocation of all five structures ranged from
$200,000 (with bricks removed) to $500,000 (with bricks intact). Mike Ford, CEO of NewTown Macon, echoed Mr. Carpenter’s comments, but directed one of his contacts, Philip Lord of Lords of Macon, to contact CEG/CEAN to arrange a site visit. While this site visit fell through at the last moment, Mr. Lord did inform CEG/CEAN that after review of the photos that had been provided, it would be prohibitively expensive to move the buildings.

Synopsis of Communications Regarding Recycling Chiefs’ Circle Material

In June 2008, several contacts were made regarding recycling building materials in the event of the demolition of Chiefs Circle. The following organizations were contacted: 1) Habitat for Humanity; 2) the Georgia Recycling Coalition; 3) the Georgia Department of Natural Resources; and 4) Lords of Macon.

John Sillers of Habitat for Humanity visited the site in June and said that the organization might be interested in recycling some of the material, but not the bricks. Materials that can be recovered from the houses include cabinets, appliances, crown molding, storm doors, shelves in heater rooms, gas water heaters, louvered doors, metal conduit, mantels, floor molding, fireplaces, ceiling fans, book cases, railings on stairwells, full length mirrors on doors, thermostat controls, smoke alarms, doors, door hardware, Venetian blinds, electrical switches/receptacles, switch covers and anything else that can be recovered (that can be reused). Both Gloria Hardegree, of the Georgia Recycling Coalition, and Stephanie Busch, of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, supplied lists of recycling brokers in Georgia, but no successful leads could be generated. Mr. Lord of Lords of Macon stated that the bricks (his specialty) were not historic enough to warrant recycling as historic bricks.

Robins AFB has an official contract specification called “Construction and Demolition Waste Management,” which would be followed in the event of the demolition of Chiefs’ Circle. This specification exceeds State of Georgia requirements on construction and demolition (solid waste) recycling, and allows the base to specify exactly how much material must be recycled from a demolition site. Section 1.2 of this document states that contractors must “divert construction and demolition waste from landfills and incinerators and to facilitate their recycling or reuse. A minimum of \textbf{50/75 percent} by weight of total project solid waste shall be diverted from the landfill.” This would mean that any contractor bidding on the demolition job would be contractually bound to recycle whatever percentage Robins AFB deems appropriate. For instance, during the ongoing demolition of Military Family Housing on base, it has been found that by recycling brick, asphalt, concrete, windows, doors, and appliances, at least 75% of the solid waste was recyclable. It appears that a reasonable figure for recycling solid waste for Chiefs’ Circle would be 75-80% by weight. Due to the current economic situation (decline in residential/commercial construction markets), no exact figures could be generated for the resale of these recycled materials.
Synopsis of Communications Regarding Removal of Chiefs’ Circle Structures (Alternatives 6 and 7)

In January 2007, Robins AFB notified the Georgia State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) of its intention to convert Chiefs’ Circle residential structures into administrative space, and the SHPO concurred with a finding of no adverse effect. Based on analysis of this option, the base determined that reuse as administrative space was impracticable and that demolition of all structures was the most acceptable option (Alternative 7) and notified the SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) of this decision. Demolition of all of the residential structures was considered to be unacceptable by the SHPO who requested that further alternatives to the proposed demolition be considered. The draft Environmental Assessment (EA) addressing additional alternatives to demolition was provided for review in June 2008. The SHPO and ACHP felt that the analyses of alternatives to demolition was inadequate.

Coordination continued, further analyses were performed, and information was provided through 2010 and early 2011. The base informed the SHPO and ACHP that the outcome of all analyses was that the most feasible alternative was to retain one structure temporarily, continuing to seek a permanent user, and demolish the four remaining structures (Alternative 6). On 28 March 2011, the SHPO and ACHP agreed that this alternative would be acceptable and requested that the base draft a Memorandum of Agreement between Robins AFB, the SHPO, and the ACHP addressing this alternative.
**Table A-1. Chiefs' Circle Residential Structures - Alternatives Considered**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Issues:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternative 1 involved renovating the Chiefs' Circle residential structures and continuing their use as residences for military and/or non-military personnel.</td>
<td>• Reuse would necessitate repair/replacement of the roofs, general repairs and upgrades, asbestos material removal, utility costs and standard maintenance/upkeep costs.</td>
<td>• A TLF was built across from the base commandant several years ago, and it was determined that Robins AFB has fulfilled its TLF space requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alternative 2 involved renovating the structures for use as a potential Temporary Living Facility (TLF) for military personnel.</td>
<td>• More efficiently designed and updated residential housing units would be available for military personnel through the MFH privatization initiative.</td>
<td>• The use for such a function would be problematic, as these facilities are typically co-located with stores and eating establishments (Chiefs' Circle is not located within a walking distance of these types of establishments on Robins AFB).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alternative 3 involved renovating the structures for future use as administrative space by mission-related groups in accordance with the Area Development Plan.</td>
<td>• Reuse as residential housing is not in conformance with base realignment goals.</td>
<td>• Reuse of the Chiefs' Circle structures for this purpose also would necessitate repairs, upgrades, asbestos material removal, utility costs and standard maintenance/upkeep costs (as described in Alternative 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alternative 4 involved the reuse of the structures for “soft” uses (outside the Area Development Plan) such as the current use by the Scouts and the Airman’s Attic.</td>
<td>• No funds are budgeted for the repairs and upgrades needed to renovate the structures.</td>
<td>• No administrative groups at Robins AFB were identified that were interested in the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alternative 5 involved the physical relocation of one or all of the structures that make up Chiefs' Circle Historic District to an on base or off-base location.</td>
<td>• Security requirements for base housing and housing personnel are defined in the privatized housing contract, which is the only housing instrument for non-military personnel.</td>
<td>• The existing groups that currently use the space do not possess an operating budget that allows for the maintenance and repair of the structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alternative 6 consisted of the demolition of five two-story duplexes and four associated open carports and the removal of associated debris.</td>
<td>• No viable options for future use of relocated structures on base could be identified.</td>
<td>• Reuse for “soft functions” is not in conformance with base realignment goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Alternative 7 consisted of the demolition of all but one of the Chiefs' Circle structures, with an unspecified administrative (or soft) reuse of the remaining structure on site.</td>
<td>• Various off-base organizations were contacted for relocation options; however, limited response was received at this time. In addition, any new owner of the buildings would have to comply with development restrictions in order to maintain the historic significance of the structures.</td>
<td>• The design of the structures limits their use and does not provide good opportunities for future use on base.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** This combined alternative consisted of all but one of the Chiefs' Circle structures, with an unspecified administrative (or soft) reuse of the remaining structure on site.
APPENDIX B

CHIEFS’ CIRCLE MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
LIFE CYCLE COST (LCC) ANALYSIS AND COMMUNICATIONS SURVEY
COST ESTIMATE
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PREFACE

This appendix provides a life cycle analysis for the disposition of the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures. Estimated costs associated with various options are summarized below and supporting information is provided in the following sections.

**Alternative 1 – Estimated Costs: $615,000**
Costs for renovation of the structures and continued repair/maintenance for this alternative would total approximately $615,000 for a 15 year life cycle.

**Alternative 2 – Estimated Costs: $615,000**
Costs for renovation of the structures and continued repair/maintenance for this alternative is estimated to be similar to that of Alternative #1.

**Alternative 3 – Estimated Costs: $1,666,000**
Costs for renovation/upgrade of the structures and continued repair/maintenance for this alternative would total approximately $1,666,000 for a 15 year life cycle.

**Alternative 4 – Estimated Costs: $400,000**
No specific costs estimates are available although renovation/upgrade of the structures and continued repair/maintenance for this alternative would be required. It is estimated that minimum costs for renovation and maintenance (including utilities) would be approximately $400,000 for a 15 year life cycle. This is likely a minimum cost estimate.

**Alternative 5 – Estimated Costs: $500,000**
Estimates for relocation of all five structures ranged from $200,000 (with bricks removed) to $500,000 (with bricks intact). However, the bricks would have to be left in place to maintain the historical integrity of the structures.

**Alternative 6 – Estimated Costs: $500,000 (or $220,000 for “Soft Use”)**
Estimated costs for demolition of four structures is approximately $140,000.

Future Admin Use - Estimated cost for renovation/continued maintenance of one structure is approx. $360,000 (15 yr life cycle)

Future “Soft Use” – Estimated cost for renovation/continued maintenance of one structure is approx. $80,000 (15 yr life cycle)

**Alternative 7 – Estimated Costs: $171,600**
Demolition of the Chiefs’ Circle residential structures is expected to cost approximately $171,600 in the form of construction labor salaries, equipment, materials, and disposal costs

CHIEF S’ CIRCLE MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING LIFE CYCLE COST (LCC) (Present worth) ANALYSIS – 27-Aug-07

1. Purpose: The purpose of this life cycle analysis is to select the best option for the Chiefs’ Circle Housing. The housing includes 5 buildings. Total area for 5 buildings is 17,810
square feet (sq ft). Total area for each building is 3,562 sq ft which includes 2 units, and each unit is a 2 story unit. The building age is approx. 60 years old.

2. Life cycle cost (LCC) - Present worth:

   a. Present worth of Uniform Series Compound amount:

   \[
P = A \left( \frac{(1+i)^n}{i(1+i)^n} \right)
   \]

   (UPW: 15 years, 3%): 11.9379

   Where:
   
   \( P = \) Present worth  
   \( A = \) Amount  
   \( i = \) Interest Rate: 3%  
   \( n = \) Number of Interest Periods: 15  
   \( \text{UPW} = \) Uniform Series Compound Amount Factor

3. Number of options:

   a. Option 1: Demolish the entire Chiefs’ Circle Housing.
   b. Option 2: Renovate Chiefs’ Circle Housing to the administration area.
   c. Option 3: Maintain Chiefs’ Circle Housing for use as residences.

4. Option 1: Demolish the entire Chiefs’ Circle Housing:

   Total cost for this option is $171,600 (Refer to the architectural cost estimate)

5. Option 2: Renovate Chiefs’ Circle Housing to the administration area:

   a. General: The plumbing fixtures and stairway to the 2nd floors were not designed for handicapped. The distribution load for the 2nd floor was originally designed for 40 lbs/sq ft and is less than the required load of 50 lbs/sq ft for the administration area.

   b. Total estimated cost for the renovation of the housing to the administration area:

   *HVAC: Total estimated renovation cost is $18,000 per unit. Total cost for 5 buildings: $180,000.
   *Communication: Total cost for 5 buildings: $250,000 (per Communication Shop).
   *Plumbing: Total cost for 5 buildings: $50,000.
   *Stairwell: Total cost for 5 buildings: $25,000.
   *Structural: Total cost for 5 buildings: $150,000.
   *Electrical: Total cost for 5 buildings: $40,000.
   *Parking: Total cost for 5 buildings: $50,000.
   *Roof: Total cost for 5 buildings: $55,000.
   *Asbestos work: Total cost for 5 bdgs: $30,000

   Total $830,000

   c. Other costs:

   *Utility Cost: Total estimated utility cost for 5 buildings: $60,000 /year
     \( \text{UPW} = $60,000 \times 11.9379 = $716,274 \)
   *Maintenance: Total estimated maintenance cost for 5 buildings: $10,000 /year
     \( \text{UPW} = $10,000 \times 11.9379 = $119,379 \)
6. Option 3: Maintain Chiefs’ Circle Housing for use as residences:

- **Roof**: Total roof repair cost for 5 buildings: $55,000.
- **General**: Total repair cost for 5 buildings: $100,000.
- **Asbestos removal**: Total cost for 5 buildings: $30,000
- **Utility Cost**: Total estimated utility cost for 5 buildings: $30,000/year
  
  \[ \text{UPW} = \$30,000 \times 11.9379 = \$358,137 \]
- **Maintenance**: Total estimated maintenance cost for 5 buildings: $6,000/year
  
  \[ \text{UPW} = \$6,000 \times 11.9379 = \$71,627 \]

7. Cost Comparisons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIFE CYCLE COST (LCC) OF ALL OPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFE OF BUILDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENOVATION COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC ENERGY COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC MAINTENACE COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCOUNT RATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LIFE CYCLE COST (Present worth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEST SELECTION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Recommendations: Based on the above life cycle cost - Present worth analysis, recommend option 1 be selected.
This page intentionally left blank
APPENDIX C

ROBINS AFB BACKGROUND INFORMATION
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This appendix presents relevant background information on Robins Air Force Base. Only sections relevant to the subject EA are included.

1.0 INTRODUCTION
This appendix describes the existing environment in the area potentially affected by the alternatives being evaluated. The chapter begins with a description of the location, history, and current missions of Robins AFB. The remainder of the chapter is organized based on descriptions of the components of the environment that may be affected, in the following order: physical environment, air quality, biological environment, cultural resources, land use, noise environment, safety, socioeconomic resources, infrastructure, and waste management. The effects of the alternatives on the baseline conditions of each environmental component are evaluated in Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences.

2.0 BASE DESCRIPTION, HISTORY, AND CURRENT MISSIONS
2.1 Base Description
Robins AFB is a 6,733-acre facility located in Warner Robins, Georgia. It is the home of the Warner Robins Air Logistics Center (WR-ALC) which supports the goals and objectives of AFMC and other related AF and DoD activities by providing affordable combat capabilities, readiness, and sustainability to its customer, the warfighter. WR-ALC provides combat capabilities for DoD by maintaining and sustaining more than 200 weapon systems and deploying combat-ready forces. WR-ALC hosts more than 60 tenant units. Robins AFB is one of the South’s largest AF bases and Georgia’s largest industrial complex, employing approximately 21,000 military, civilian, and contractor personnel.

Approximately one-half of the area within base boundaries has been developed in support of base missions. Undeveloped areas support natural wetlands (>2,237 acres) and timberland (approximately 2,728 acres), most of which occur within the Ocmulgee River, Horse Creek, and Sandy Run Creek floodplains.

2.2 Base History
Not relevant to this EA.

2.3 Current Base Missions
Not relevant to this EA.

2.4 References
Not relevant to this EA.
3.0 PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

The physical environment of the study area is described below based on its principal components: physiography, including topography, surface waters, floodplains, and wetlands; geology; groundwater; and climate.

3.1 Physiography

3.1.1 Topography

Robins AFB is located in central Georgia on the upper margin of the Inner Coastal Plain. The uplands of the base lie in a subprovince of the Fall Line Hills called the Fort Valley Plateau (Clark and Zisa, 1976). Clark and Zisa (1976) describe this area as “distinct from the Fall Line Hills in that the broad, flat-topped interfluvies are the dominant feature, there are fewer streams, and there is less local relief.” The eastern portion of the base is dominated by the Ocmulgee River and its broad floodplain. The erosion action of the Ocmulgee here has created bluffs, high floodplain, deep swamp, meander scars, loops, and oxbow lakes. Sandy Run Creek, along the southern boundary of Robins AFB, has a floodplain up to 2,000 feet wide with a line of low bluffs, five- to fifteen-feet high, to its north.

Elevations on Robins AFB range from a high of approximately 350 feet to a low of approximately 235 feet in the southern section of the base in the floodplain of the Ocmulgee River. Relief is generally minimal on most of the base, rarely over 30 feet locally. The exceptions are the 40-foot high northeast- and east-facing bluffs near the central portion of the base overlooking the floodplain of the Ocmulgee River. Several ridges less than ten feet above the average elevation of the Ocmulgee floodplain extend into the floodplain.

3.1.2 Surface Waters and Floodplains

The upland portion of Robins AFB is drained by four intermittent streams that flow west to east into the Ocmulgee floodplain. Surface water drainage on the northern portion of the base generally flows from west to east from SR 247 to Horse Creek, then to the wetlands east of the base, and eventually to the Ocmulgee River. Echeconnee Creek crosses the northern tip of the base. Horse Creek is the primary perennial stream on the base. It starts along the eastern perimeter of the runway area and flows southeast through the Ocmulgee floodplain wetlands before leaving base property and entering the Ocmulgee River. A smaller, unnamed, intermittent stream runs from the discharge point of Duck Lake through Patton Pond and eventually into the floodplain wetlands. A larger stream, Sandy Run Creek, forms the southern boundary of the base and has a floodplain that is approximately 2,000 feet wide. Upstream from the base, Sandy Run
Creek receives the discharge from a sanitary wastewater treatment plant operated by the city of Warner Robins.

Storm water runoff can enter Robins AFB from areas to the west, principally through four storm water inlets located near Buildings 43, 85, 380, and 640. Storm water flows east from the northern inflow points and eventually flows into the wetlands and Horse Creek east of the installation. The southern inflow points discharge to the main intermittent stream that flows into Duck Lake.

Storm water from the northern inflow point flows east under the runway area via storm water pipes and eventually flows into the wetlands and Horse Creek; the southern inflow point discharges to the main intermittent stream that flows into Duck Lake. Storm water runoff from the northern portion of the base flows north/northeast to the wetlands of the Ocmulgee River floodplain. Storm water from the north central portion of the base flows along natural, intermittent streams and man-made drainage features into Horse Creek. Storm water from the south central portion of the base flows into the intermittent streams that feed Duck Lake, then it continues to flow east along the unnamed stream through Patton's Pond and into the wetlands. Storm water on the southern portion of base flows along natural and man-made features to floodplain wetlands. Some storm water runoff collects in Scout Lake and Luna Lake. The natural drainage of storm water from the industrial areas on the southern portion of base flows to the floodplain wetlands of Sandy Run Creek.

3.1.3 Wetlands

The jurisdictional wetlands on the base previously have been delineated. Approximately 32 percent of Robins AFB is wetlands. Significantly more than half of all the wetlands on the base are associated with the Ocmulgee floodplain. Wetlands in the floodplain of the Ocmulgee River are seasonally and semi-permanently flooded, while wetlands in the floodplain of Sandy Run Creek are temporarily flooded. Most of the wetlands are broad-leaved deciduous, forested, palustrine (PFO1) wetlands.

3.2 Geology and Soils

A wide variety of soil series and soil types are present on Robins AFB due to the existence of gently-sloping uplands, steep bluffs, upland wetlands, organic floodplain wetlands, and non-organic floodplain wetlands. The former Soil Conservation Service, now the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, conducted a Soil Survey of Robins AFB in 1989 (USDA, 1989). Sixteen soil series and nine complexes were mapped on the base. A soil series is the lowest category of the U.S. system of soil taxonomy and is made up of soils that are almost alike.
A soil complex consists of two or more soil series intermixed at a scale too small to be individually delineated on a soil survey map. On the base there are seven upland soil series, seven lowland or floodplain series, two non-series-specific soil groups (hydraquents and udorthents), and four urban land complexes. The acreage covered by each soil type and its percentage of the total area of the base are presented in Table 3-2.

3.3 Groundwater
Not relevant to this EA.

3.3.1 Water Supply and Drinking Water
Robins AFB operates its own public water supply system under State of Georgia Permit No. CG1530042. All water supplied to the base is obtained from groundwater wells. The system receives water from seven (six currently active) water supply wells installed at Robins AFB between May 1956 and 2004, all of which produce water from the Blufftown aquifer. The capacity of the public supply wells is 10.4 million gallons per day (MGD); however, constant use at this rate is not possible due to permit withdrawal limitations. Daily average water use during the 2010 was 1.44 million gallons. The water supply system provides water for irrigation, industrial processes, and drinking water to a population of approximately 2,965 on-base residents and to the base workforce of approximately 21,000 civilian and military personnel.

An additional potable water well is used strictly for recreational purposes and fills one of the lakes located at Robins AFB.

3.4 Climate
Not relevant to this EA.

3.5 References


4.0 AIR QUALITY

4.1 Regional Air Quality

The State of Georgia is classified as in attainment for all of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) criteria pollutants except for 1997 8-hour ozone (O₃) and 1997 particulate matter (PM) 2.5. Air quality in Houston County, which includes Robins AFB, is currently classified as an attainment area (i.e., pollutant levels are below the NAAQS standards). The nearby Macon Nonattainment Area, which includes Bibb County and a portion of Monroe County, was redesignated as a maintenance area for 8-hour O₃ in June 2007 (Federal Register, 2007), and, in March 2011, the USEPA proposed that the Macon Area has attained the 1997 annual PM 2.5 standard.

4.2 Air Emission Sources

Not relevant to this EA.

4.3 Air Quality Requirements at Robins AFB

Not relevant to this EA.

4.4 References


5.0 BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT

Not relevant to this EA.

6.0 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Cultural resources include prehistoric and historic sites, structures, artifacts, districts or any other physical evidence of human activities considered important to a culture or community for
scientific, traditional, religious, or other reasons. Cultural resources include prehistoric and historic archaeological resources, as well as architectural resources. Prehistoric resources are evidences of human activity that predate the advent of written records in the region. Historic archaeological resources include campsites, roads, battlegrounds, and a variety of other structures from the period of recorded history in the region. Architectural resources include structures or districts of historic or aesthetic significance, such as buildings, bridges, and dams. To be considered for protection, such architectural structures normally must be more than 50 years old. However, more recent structures, such as those constructed during the Cold War era, may warrant protection if they manifest the potential to gain significance in the future. According to the terminology of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, all of the above cultural resources may be considered historic properties.

6.1 Regulatory Requirements

The need for Robins AFB to properly treat cultural resources is derived from various acts, agreements, and Air Force instructions, regulations, and directives, including:

- Antiquities Act of 1906
- Historic Sites Act of 1935
- National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as Amended
- Architectural Barriers Act of 1968, as Amended
- National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as Amended
- Executive Order 11593, Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment
- Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974
- Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act of 1976
- American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978
- Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, as Amended
- Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990
- Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993
- Native American Free Exercise of Religion Act
- Archaeological and Historic Resources Management (Department of Defense Directive 4710.1)
- Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement among the United States Department of Defense, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, as Amended
- Memorandum of Agreement for Cooperative Actions in Cultural Resource Management on Military Lands between the Department of Defense and the National Trust for Historic Preservation
- Cultural Resources Management (Air Force Instruction 32-7065)
- Natural Resource: Historic Preservation (Air Force Instruction 126-7)
- Environmental Quality (Air Force Policy Directive 32-70)
6.2 Known Cultural Resources

Under Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC 470h-2), Robins AFB has been given the responsibility of conducting a cultural resources inventory and evaluation of all of its holdings. The earliest archaeological survey and cultural resources inventory on the base was conducted in 1977. The first major archaeological survey of Robins AFB was conducted in 1986. The main base property has since been completely surveyed for archaeological sites and historic structures/districts, and the survey work has been reviewed and accepted by the Georgia SHPO.

All upland Phase II archaeological testing has been completed and Robins AFB has a total of 15 archaeological sites eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The historical/architectural survey of the base examined all structures on base and Robins AFB has a total of 26 buildings eligible for the NRHP. Two districts (12 structures) and 14 additional individual buildings have been recommended as eligible for inclusion on the NRHP (Table 6-1).

In addition to the general requirements for any Air Force facility to preserve cultural resources, Robins AFB currently is finalizing a Programmatic Agreement (PA) with the Georgia SHPO regarding maintenance activities on historic structures or in historic districts. Once the PA is finalized and signed, RAFB will be obligated to follow their requirements. If the stipulations of the PA are followed, base activities will have no adverse effects on any eligible historic structure or district. In addition, the Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP) for Robins AFB was finalized in November 2011. The archeological and cultural resources of Robins AFB have been summarized in the ICRMP.

The ICRMP and the draft PA specify the constraints on activities in or near the 26 eligible historic structures and two eligible historic districts. Basically, no activity is allowed that will detract from the attributes that made the structure or district eligible for the NRHP. If potential adverse effects threaten any eligible resource, and if the undertaking cannot feasibly be redesigned to avoid the effects, the adverse effects are to be mitigated through data recovery investigations and documentation under a plan reviewed and accepted by the SHPO.

Table 6-1. NRHP Eligible Historic Structures and Districts on Robins AFB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NRHP Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>NRHP Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armaments Production/Assembly Facility (Building 94)</td>
<td>Built in 1960.</td>
<td>Eligible. SHPO concurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentry Police Administration Facility (Building 107)</td>
<td>Built in 1960.</td>
<td>Eligible. SHPO concurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Tower and Operations Hangars (Building 110)</td>
<td>The original control tower/operations building, built in 1942.</td>
<td>Eligible. SHPO concurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Hangar (Building 125)</td>
<td>Largest building at Robins AFB, constructed in 1942.</td>
<td>Eligible. SHPO concurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Post Headquarters (Building 220)</td>
<td>The original base headquarters, built in 1942.</td>
<td>Eligible. SHPO concurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer’s Circle District (Buildings 400, 405, 410-412, 415, 450)</td>
<td>Five two-story residential buildings and two storage structures constructed 1942; Colonial Revival style.</td>
<td>Eligible. SHPO concurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>NRHP Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief’s Circle District</td>
<td>Five two-story residential buildings, constructed 1942; Colonial Revival style.</td>
<td>Eligible. SHPO concurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Buildings 500-502, 504, 505)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Building 1400)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Building 2067)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Building 2081)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Building 2108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.0 LAND USE

Not relevant to this EA. This section describes existing land use conditions on Robins AFB and in surrounding areas and also discusses factors affecting land use.

### 7.1 On-Base Land Use

The fourteen land use categories are based on the type of facilities occupying a site and the nature of activities that occur there. Twelve of the land use categories are those defined in the *Land Use Planning Bulletin* (USAF, 1986). Two additional categories, cemetery and forest [taken from the Tri-Service Commission Spatial Data Standards (TSSDS)], also are included to better describe land uses at Robins AFB.

The predominant land uses on Robins AFB are forest and airfield, which together account for almost 58 percent of the total base area. Industrial, accompanied housing, outdoor recreation, and aircraft operations and maintenance occupy another 35 percent of the total base area. The other eight land use categories together occupy the remaining 7 percent of the base.

Following are descriptions of the land use categories and the major facilities in each category:

1) Administrative. The administrative land use category includes military command and tenant activity management, wing/group headquarters, and civilian administrative activities. It also
covers security police operations, including gate/visitor management and military operations security. The largest administrative area at Robins AFB is located along the west side of the base, along SR 247. It is concentrated in the vicinity of Gate 2, the main base entrance. These administrative buildings, including WR-ALC headquarters (Building 215) and the worldwide headquarters of the Air Force Reserve (Building 210), are the most prominent feature of the main entrance and serve as the front door of the base. This area is located south and west of aircraft operational maintenance and north and west of industrial land use areas. Other administrative areas are found in the southern part of the base in association with the Community Center.

2) Aircraft Operations and Maintenance. The aircraft operations and maintenance land use category includes all facilities that directly support the flying and maintenance missions of WR-ALC and its tenant organizations. Aircraft operations and maintenance land uses are located mainly in the northern part of the base, east, west, and south of the airfield. This category includes facilities such as maintenance hangars and docks, avionics facilities, air freight terminals, wash racks, and other aircraft maintenance facilities. Additional aircraft operations and maintenance facilities are found in the southern part of the base, including the Avionics Complex, which borders SR 247, and facilities associated with the TI Directorate.

3) Airfield. The airfield land use category consists of the entire airfield pavement system (runway, taxiways, aprons, overruns, paved shoulders, and pads), navigational aids, and related open space. The airfield is located in the northern part of the Base. There are 17 numbered taxiways, seven major parking aprons, and a Hazardous Cargo Pad.

4) Cemetery. The cemetery land use category includes two cemeteries: King Cemetery is located in the northwest part of the base near Perimeter Road; Feagin Cemetery is located in the southern part of the base in the community center area, behind the existing child care center off Tenth Street and west of the new child care center.

5) Community (Commercial). The community center is the part of the base that functions as the central location for the shopping, service, recreation, and day-to-day living needs of base personnel, their families, and military retirees within the area. The Air Force land use classification system distinguishes between commercial and service community facilities. Community (commercial) facilities include the base Exchange, the Commissary, clubs (e.g., Aero Club, Officers Club, Enlisted Club), dining halls (e.g., Officers Open Mess, NCO Open Mess, base restaurant), Burger King restaurant, personal services such as banks and service station, and indoor recreational facilities such as a theater, bowling center, and gymnasium. The majority of community land use is in the southern part of the base.
6) Community (Service). The community (service) category contains the noncommercial activities that are important in day-to-day living. Community (service) land use includes educational facilities, library, Museum of Aviation, chapel, post office, hobby shop, and child care centers. Most of the areas in this land use category are located in the southern part of the base, in the community center.

7) Forest. The forest land use category includes those areas that contain forest stands and are otherwise vacant. Most of the areas on Robins AFB assigned to the forest land use category are forested wetlands, which represent a major constraint to any potential future use. Forest land use areas are found mainly in the eastern part of the base (associated with the Ocmulgee River floodplain), with smaller areas located at the northern tip and in the southern part of the base in the Sandy Run Creek floodplain.

8) Housing (Accompanied). Accompanied housing is family housing and temporary lodging facilities. Areas used for accompanied housing at Robins AFB are located north and east of the community center area. The Turner Park housing development is located north and west of Scout Lake.

9) Housing (Unaccompanied). Unaccompanied housing includes visiting officer’s quarters (VOQ), visiting airman’s quarters (VAQ), and dormitories. The VOQ are across from the Officer’s Club. The VAQ and dormitories are located just north of the community center. The unaccompanied housing areas at Robins AFB are convenient to commercial facilities, services, and outdoor recreation such as golf and parks.

10) Industrial. The industrial land use category includes warehouses, base maintenance and utilities functions, and base industrial services such as those belonging to transportation, communications, and civil engineering. The petroleum, oil, and lubricant (POL) yard, open storage, weapons storage, landfills, training areas, and firing ranges fall into this category. Industrial land uses are located throughout Robins AFB. The main industrial area is in the west-central part of the base, south of Second Street, where most of the warehouses are located.

11) Medical. The medical land use category includes the hospital, medical and dental clinics, medical storage, and veterinarian facilities. These facilities are also used by personnel living off-base and retired military staff. Medical land uses at Robins AFB are closely associated with the community center; the hospital is located directly to the north. The Occupational Medicine Clinic (Building 207), located near the Gate 1 (Green Street), is the only medical facility situated away from the community center.

12) Open Space/Buffer Zone. Open space may be undeveloped for three main reasons: 1) it is necessary to act as a buffer between incompatible land uses, 2) it is undevelopable due to
environmental or physical constraints, or 3) it is required for safety clearances, security areas, and utility easements. Open space at Robins AFB is found along the western side of the base, providing a buffer between the base and SR 247, and along the eastern side of the airfield.

13) Outdoor Recreation. A wide variety of outdoor recreational facilities are included in the outdoor recreation land use category. The three basic types of outdoor recreation spaces, as defined in the *Land Use Planning Bulletin* (USAF, 1986), are neighborhood, low density, and intensive use recreation areas. Outdoor recreation areas at Robins AFB are located near housing and in proximity to all three lakes. The largest outdoor recreation facility is the Pine Oaks golf course, which is centrally located and acts as a buffer between some housing areas and industrial uses. Other outdoor recreation facilities include the horse stables, campgrounds, Pine Oaks walking trail, nature trails, and archery club all located in the southern part of the base.

14) Water. Water land use includes lakes, ponds, and major streams. There are three lakes on Robins AFB: Duck Lake is centrally located, surrounded by housing and outdoor recreation land uses; Lake Luna and Scout Lake are located in the southeast part of the base. There are three main creeks on Robins AFB: Sandy Run Creek on the southern border; Horse Creek on the east side of the base; and Echeconnee Creek, which crosses the extreme northern tip of the base. Also included in the water land use category are various weirs and retention ponds along the east side of the runway.

7.2 Off-Base Land Use

Robins AFB is located in northeastern Houston County, immediately east of the city of Warner Robins. It is situated mainly to the east of SR 247 and includes a predominantly residential area of approximately 332 acres located just west of the highway within the city limits of Warner Robins. The northern corner of the base is adjacent to Bibb County, and Twiggs County is to the east across the Ocmulgee River. The city of Macon is located approximately 18 miles northwest of the base, in Bibb County.

7.2.1 Adjacent Land Uses

Not relevant to this EA.

7.2.2 Zoning

Not relevant to this EA.

7.2.3 AICUZ Program

Not relevant to this EA.
7.3 References


8.0 NOISE ENVIRONMENT

The noise environment at Robins AFB is dominated by military aircraft operations, along with numerous aircraft in transit. Light civilian aircraft and civilian cargo planes also operate at Robins AFB on a limited basis. Other noise sources such as construction activities or heavy machinery are minor in comparison to the aircraft noise generated on approach, landing, and take-off, and during maintenance-related engine runs.

9.0 SAFETY

Safety refers to those issues that directly affect the protection of human life and property. At Robins AFB, the predominant safety issues involve aviation, munitions, and fire prevention.

10.0 SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES

In 1994, Executive Order (EO) 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*, was issued to focus attention of Federal agencies on human health and environmental conditions in minority and low-income communities. In addition, EO 12898 aims to ensure that disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on these communities are identified and addressed.

Based on review of U.S. Census Bureau data (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010), RAFB has a minority population greater than 40 percent and less than 5 percent of RAFB is below poverty level. The majority of the area adjacent to RAFB has a minority population of approximately 40 percent and greater than 13 percent of the area adjacent to RAFB is below poverty level (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Houston County has a minority population of approximately 36 percent and approximately 11 percent of Houston County is below poverty level (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010).

In 1997, EO 13045, *Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks*, was introduced to minimize environmental health and safety risks to children. EO 13045 prioritized the identification and assessment of environmental health risks and safety risks that may affect children and to ensure that Federal agencies, policies, programs, activities, and standards to address environmental risks and safety risks to children.

According to Houston County Environmental Health Department, RAFB does not have any known environmental health and safety risks to children (Stewart, 2005).
The city of Warner Robins, Houston County, and the remaining Macon-Bibb County Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) constitute one of Georgia’s fastest growing urban areas. From a town of 52 in 1940, before construction began on Robins AFB in 1941, Warner Robins had grown into a regional center of approximately 43,726 persons by 1990. During that time, the population of nearby Macon nearly doubled from 57,865 in 1940 to 106,210 in 1990 (MGRDC, 1994). The population of Warner Robins had grown to approximately 48,804 by the end of 2002 (WRMPO, 2005). According to the 2010 Economic Impact Statement the resident population (military and dependents) at Robins AFB is 2,965 (RAFB, 2010). The 2009 population of Houston County was estimated to be 135,715 and the nearby counties of Bibb and Twiggs had estimated populations of 156,060 and 10,111, respectively (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010).

The primary mission of Robins AFB, providing logistical support for the Air Force, requires substantial industrial activity and manpower requirements at the base. Robins AFB is the largest industrial complex in Georgia, containing 4.2 million square feet of maintenance shops, 1.8 million square feet of administrative space, 3.3 million square feet of storage space, 92.5 miles of roads (74.5 miles of which are paved), and 13 miles of railroad track. The runway is the largest in Georgia (12,000 feet long by 300 feet wide, with two 1,000-foot overruns). In addition to military and industrial facilities, Robins AFB includes a community which contains more than 1,400 family housing units and dormitories to accommodate 4,948 residents. Base residents are supported by services that include a 20-bed hospital, commissary, base exchange, bank, post office, library, chapel, recreational facilities, theater, and two elementary schools. In 2005, the replacement value of Robins AFB facilities was estimated to be $5.2 billion (RAFB, 2005).

Over the period 1995-2010, the number of personnel employed at Robins AFB has gradually increased from 17,022 (12,409 civilian and 4,613 military) in 1995 to 20,938 (14,324 civilian and 6,614 military) in 2010. This resulted in an overall increase of 23 percent in total employment, including a 15 percent increase in civilian personnel and a 43 percent increase in the number of military employees (RAFB, 2010). Houston County is the residence of the vast majority (71 percent) of base employees, followed by Bibb County (11 percent) and Peach County (4 percent). The remaining 14 percent of employees live in other counties, none supporting more than two percent of the workforce. Currently, Robins AFB employs a workforce of approximately 21,000 civilian and military personnel.

In fiscal year 2009, the base payroll, representing the combined gross salaries of all military and civilian employees, totaled approximately $1.6 billion. Both military and civilian salary totals have increased steadily since 1995 ($740.7 million). The standard Air Force calculation of the economic impact of Robins AFB on Middle Georgia includes an annual payroll of $1.6 billion, annual expenditures of $282 million, and an estimated dollar value of indirect jobs created of
$1.6 billion (based on a job multiplier of 2.51). Including retiree payroll, the total annual impact was approximately $4.1 billion in 2009 (RAFB, 2010).

10.1 References


11.0 INFRASTRUCTURE

The infrastructure of Robins AFB provides an overview of existing utilities (water supply, wastewater collection and treatment systems, and energy distribution systems) and transportation systems.

11.1 Water Supply System

11.1.1 Existing Conditions

The existing water system consists of water supply wells, water pumping stations, treatment equipment, and distribution piping (approximately 625,000 feet with the main supply in a loop configuration). It serves military, civilian, and contractor personnel and provides necessary water for the base’s workload. All water supplied to the base is derived from groundwater wells located on the base. Robins AFB is permitted to operate their water system under the state of Georgia Permit No. CG1530042.

Currently, there are seven groundwater wells on Robins AFB. Six of these wells are in use for supplying the potable water system. The capacity of these seven wells is 10.4 million gallons per day (MGD). However, constant use at this rate is not possible due to aquifer and permit limitations. Individual well capacities are listed in Table 11-1. Average water use during 2010 was 1.44 MGD. The current operating permit limits the withdrawal of water to 3.87 MGD (as an annual average) and 5.01 MGD (as a monthly average). Well No. 19 is offline due to contaminant levels above the Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL). Even with this well offline, Robins AFB retains a water supply capacity margin of approximately 4.1 MGD from peak
month demand levels. The other well, Well No. 12 (capacity of 0.28 MGD), is active and supplies make up water for Luna Lake, but does not supply the base potable water system.

11.1.2 Well Locations
Wells No. 1, 5, 16, and 17 are located in the main part of the base. Each of these wells is connected to water mains by 12-inch pipe. Well No. 1 is located in the central part of the base on Robins Drive across the street from the government gas station. Water produced by Well No. 1 is used for the steam plant chillers, as well as the potable water system. Well No. 5 is located on Robins Parkway south of Fifth Street, near military family housing. Well No. 16 is located near the Temporary Living Quarters, and Well No. 17 is located near Gate 1 (Green Street Gate) next to the Civilian Dispensary in the industrial area. Well Nos. 8 and 18 are located away from the main concentration of wells on the base. Well No. 8 is located at the north end of the Flightline East area and is connected to a water main by a 12-inch pipe running along Richard Bay Boulevard. This allows a two way supplementing capability between the Flightline East area and the remainder of the base. Well No. 18 is located at the north end of the runway and is connected by a 12-inch pipe to a 30-inch main. Well No. 19 is located south of Marchbanks Road on Macon Street and is connected by a 12-inch pipe into an 8-inch main.

11.2 Sanitary Sewer System

11.2.1 Existing Conditions
The sanitary sewage treatment system includes a collection system (combination of gravity feed and force mains) and a treatment plant. The sanitary treatment facility consists of Sanitary Treatment Plants (STP) No. 1 and No. 2. Sanitary Treatment Plant No. 1, constructed in 1975, processes all of the sanitary wastewater flow on the base. Sanitary Treatment Plant No. 2 has been inactive since 1979. All base operations (including industrial, housing, and food services) contribute wastewater to the sanitary sewer system. There are no off-base areas connected to the sanitary sewer collection system.

11.2.2 Collection System
The sanitary sewerage collection system includes over 48 miles of gravity sewers, approximately 45 sanitary wastewater lift stations, and 13 miles of force main. Each lift station has two pumps, and the pumps range from 1 to 40 horsepower. Pipe sizes range from 4-inch to 18-inch mains and are constructed from various materials, including HDPE, PVC, clay tile, and cast iron. The discharge from the industrial wastewater treatment plant #1 is pumped to the head of the sewage treatment plant.
11.3 Industrial Wastewater System
Not relevant to this EA.

11.4 Electrical System
Not relevant to this EA.

11.5 Central Heating and Cooling Systems
Not relevant to this EA.

11.6 Natural Gas System
Not relevant to this EA.

11.7 Liquid Fuels Systems
Not relevant to this EA.

11.8 Air-Propane Mixing System
Not relevant to this EA.

11.9 Utility Systems Summary
Not relevant to this EA

11.10 Transportation Systems

11.10.1 Off-Base Transportation System
Not relevant to this EA.

11.10.2 On-Base Transportation System
This section discusses the transportation system on Robins AFB. Transportation data were collected from prior reports and studies, as presented in the Base Comprehensive Plan (RAFB, 1990), as well as from ongoing transportation planning activities at the base.

Roadways
The general layout of the system consists of streets running east-west and north-south, concentrated in the administrative/industrial area between First and Fifth Streets and in the community center area between Seventh and Twelfth Streets. Perimeter Road extends northward from Gate 1 around to the east side of the airfield, with Hannah Road continuing southward to Seventh Street. South Perimeter Road wraps around the southern end of the base, and Page Road parallels SR 247 on the eastern border of the base.
Approximately 27,000 people enter and leave the base on an average workday, not including other vehicle trips associated with base activities. Access to the base is through six gates along the western perimeter of the base. All gates are controlled by military personnel during hours of operation. The gates are located at the major east-west streets: First Street (Gate 1), Watson Blvd (Gate 3), Peacekeeper Way (Gate 4), Fifth Street (Gate 5), and the south end of Robins Parkway (Gate 14). Gate 3 is classified as the main entrance gate and is open 24 hours daily. The visitors’ center is located adjacent to this gate.

Robins Parkway is the major north-south artery within the Robins AFB street system, connecting at its south end with Russell Parkway at Gate 14. Gate 3 is located on the west end of Watson Blvd at Byron Street. Traffic control on Robins AFB is maintained by signalized intersections, base security police, and signage. The access road that carries the largest traffic volume entering and leaving the base is SR 247, followed by Watson Boulevard, Green Street, and Russell Parkway.

12.0 WASTE MANAGEMENT

12.1 Solid Waste

12.1.1 Regulations

In 1965, the Solid Waste Disposal Act (SWDA) was passed to improve solid waste disposal methods and eliminate open dumps. In 1976, a portion of RCRA (Subtitle D) directed the EPA to develop national performance standards to ensure that no reasonable probability of adverse effects on health or the environment would result from solid waste disposal facilities or practices. The federal regulations establish the minimum criteria for the operation of solid waste disposal facilities. The EPA requirements are contained in 40 CFR 240 through 244, 257, and 258. The Georgia solid waste management regulations are applicable to Robins AFB. The state and federal solid waste regulations address all aspects of solid waste management, from storage of solid waste in containers prior to collection, to collection and transportation, to design and operation of disposal facilities. All solid waste must be disposed of in a permitted solid waste landfill or in another permitted disposal facility such as an incinerator.

12.1.2 Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling

Solid wastes are generated from all areas of Robins AFB, including base housing, municipal operations, office complexes, industrial facilities, and construction/demolition areas. An Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan (ISWMP) has been developed to establish an integrated approach to dealing with solid waste management issues at Robins AFB (Robins AFB, 2010). The approach includes source reduction, recycling and disposal. Solid waste must be
disposed of in accordance with Section 01560 Environmental Requirements, and Section 01572 Construction & Demolition Waste Management of the Robins AFB Civil Engineering Specifications. Reuse, recycling, and composting are strongly encouraged. Scrap pipe is recycled through the Base Qualified Recycling Program (QRP) Recycling Center. Solid wastes destined for recycling are collected at various locations on the base in waste-specific containers or are turned in to the DLADS.

Currently, there are no active solid waste disposal areas on base property. A former inert waste landfill, known as Landfill 2, is located on the northwest corner of the base. Solid wastes that cannot be recycled are collected by contractors for transportation to off-base disposal at the Houston County landfill for disposal. Houston County has committed to providing solid waste disposal services to Robins AFB and has a MSW landfill with current permitted capacity of 9 years and a C&D landfill with current permitted capacity of 33 years. Additional capacity could be acquired through expansion of the landfill if appropriate permits were obtained.

The solid waste management program at Robins AFB has a history of compliance with Air Force, state, and federal requirements, and the program has received awards for recent activities related to recycling and solid waste reduction.

12.2 Hazardous Materials and Waste

Robins AFB has implemented a Hazardous Waste Reduction Plan (HWRP) (WR–ALC, 2010) that focuses on reducing or eliminating the use of hazardous materials. Reduction of hazardous materials used and hazardous wastes generated is an essential aspect of a successful pollution prevention program. Three categories of hazardous waste generated at Robins AFB include: process wastes, sludges from wastewater treatment, and excess/expired-shelf-life hazardous materials. Robins AFB is implementing a Hazardous Material Management Plan with the intent of improving the quality of hazardous materials management in each of a material’s life cycle phases, from the decision to procure the material through receipt, storage, issue, use and eventual disposition of the material (RAFB, 1996).

12.3 Toxic Materials and Waste

Prior to any renovation and/or demolition activity, an inspection/survey of the affected area for the presence of asbestos-containing material (ACM) and lead-based paint (LBP) is required. All potentially hazardous or contaminated waste must be sampled to ensure it is properly characterized and reviewed by Environmental Management for proper disposal. Wastes contaminated with LBP, ACM, or other hazardous materials at levels below their respective regulatory thresholds require the submission of a Special Waste Acceptance Application with
analytical data to Environmental Management in order to obtain preapproval for disposal at Houston County Landfill prior to start of work.

12.3.1 Pesticides

Pesticides are regulated under Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and are used on the base mainly to control insects that are turf and ornamental plant pests, structural pests, and disease vectors. Pesticides are applied by licensed personnel from the Base Pest Management Shop, and an integrated pest management approach is used to minimize the quantities used. Pesticides are stored in the Pest Management Shop (Building 1549), the Self Help Center (Building 667), and the Golf Course Maintenance Facility (Building 596).

12.3.2 Asbestos Containing Materials

A base-wide asbestos survey for friable asbestos-containing material (ACM) was completed in March 1988. The known friable ACM then was removed in four phases. Friable ACM has now been removed from approximately 98 percent of base facilities. Friable ACM continues to be removed from base facilities through renovation and construction activities. ACM surveying and sampling are included in renovation and construction project activities. Costs for ACM removal also are included in renovation/construction project cost estimates.

12.3.3 Polychlorinated Biphenyls

Robins AFB completed inspection and removal of all transformers and other large capacitors containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) at concentrations greater than 50 ppm in July 1991, thereby achieving “PCB-free” status. PCB management programs now focus on proper disposal of smaller capacitors, including fluorescent light ballasts that are not regulated under TSCA but pose a risk of liability to the base under CERCLA if they are disposed of as municipal solid waste and contaminate municipal landfills.

12.4 Contaminated Sites

12.5 References
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Deborah Calloway  
Archives Technician  
The National Park Service  
100 Alabama Street, SW  
1924 Building  
NPS/Atlanta Federal Center  
Atlanta, GA 30303

RE: Chiefs’ Circle HABS Documentation, Warner Robins/Air Logistics Center,  
Robins Air Force Base, Houston County, Georgia, 31098

Dear Ms. Calloway:

Please find enclosed one unbound copy of the draft HABS documentation for the five Chiefs’  
Circle buildings, including the cover card, index to photographs, written and historical data,  
large-format photographs in mount cards, and the negatives.

We appreciate your review of this draft submission and look forward to your response. Should  
you have any questions, please call me at (609) 386-5444.

Sincerely,

URS Corporation

Stephen W. Tull  
Vice President  
Archaeology and Historic Architecture Group

cc: Rebecca Crader, Robins Air Force Base  
Bob Sargent, Robins Air Force Base  
Kenneth Branton, URS Corporation  
Chris Taylor, URS Corporation
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HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDING SURVEY

500 CHIEFS’ CIRCLE

Location:

500 Chiefs’ Circle
Warner Robins/Air Logistics Center, Robins Air Force Base, Houston County, Georgia 31098
500 Chiefs’ Circle is located in the northwest portion of a cul-de-sac south of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, roughly 700 feet to the west of Robins Parkway. Its primary façade faces the circle at a southeasterly angle. The house is located on Robins Air Force Base, east of the city of Warner Robins.

USGS Warner Robins SE Quadrangle (7.5’
Universal Transverse Mercator Coordinates: 17 256910.0E 3611321.0N

Present Owner:

Robins Air Force Base

Present Occupant:

Airman’s Attic (Charitable Organization)

Present Use:

Airman’s Attic activities

Statement of Significance:

500 Chiefs’ Circle is one of five identical plan duplexes constructed adjacent to each other on Chiefs’ Circle in 1942. These dwellings are two-story duplexes and were built with Colonial Revival influences. All five buildings are sited around a circular street (Chiefs’ Circle) and face one another.
PART I. HISTORICAL INFORMATION

A. Physical History

1. Date of erection: 1942

2. Engineer: United States Corp of Engineers, Savannah District

3. Original and subsequent owners: Robins Air Force Base

4. Builder: Griffin, Mion, and Shepard

5. Original plans and construction: The building’s original cost was $17,119 (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1987).

6. Alterations and additions: There is an enclosed porch or sunroom on each side elevation and a non-historic car port connected to each half of the duplex by a breezeway on the rear (north). The date of the enclosing of the porches is unknown. The date of the attached carports is 1986.

B. Historical Context

The initial incarnation of Robins Air Force Base was constructed in 1941, and was operational in early 1942. It was originally called the Wellston Air Depot, though its name was changed before its completion to Robins Field. In 1943, the base was officially designated Warner Robins Army Air Depot in honor of Brigadier General Augustine Warner Robins, one of the Army Air Corps’ first General Staff Officers. Later, in 1947, when President Truman made the U.S. Air Force a separate and independent branch of the military, the base was again renamed Robins Air Force Base. The base went through several more incarnations as its mission changed and its role expanded over the years.

In the years preceding WWII, the civic leaders of Macon courted military facilities to move into central Georgia, such as Camp Wheeler and Cochran Field, as well as military industrial producers, such as the Naval Ordinance Plant. When a new air depot was slated for the southeast as part of an Army Air Corps expansion effort under the 1935 Wilcox-Wilson Bill, Macon provided the Air Corps with several suitable sites. A 3,000-acre site at Wellston (in Houston County) was chosen, and the construction contract was awarded to Griffin, Mion, and Shepherd of Atlanta. The site was developed under the guidance of Brigadier General Charles E. Thomas, the commanding officer of the base from 1941 through 1944 (Chapman 1944).

Construction of the Wellston Air Depot commenced in June 1941 and included construction of the airfield and 15 structures, consisting of aircraft maintenance and repair facilities, warehouse facilities, administrative offices, utilities, and a
housekeeping facility (temporary housing). In addition to the operational facilities, 10 permanent structures were also constructed as military family housing. These 10 structures include the five mirror duplex houses at Chiefs’ Circle and five single-family homes in an area called Officer’s Circle, later part of the Forest Park housing area.

Portions of the air depot were still under construction at the commencement of hostilities for U.S. involvement in WWII, in December 1941. Under the command of General Thomas, the air depot doubled in size and became the Air Service Command HQ for the 3rd Air Force; by 1943, all military aircraft in the southeastern United States were supplied and serviced by personnel from the Area Air Service Command at the Warner Robins Air Depot. During this period, filling staff positions, finding technically trained personnel, and housing the influx of soldiers were problematic logistical hurdles (Chapman 1944; Head et al. 2001).

Housing was an issue from the start. Before construction, the town of Wellston consisted of a general store, service station, and approximately a half dozen residences with a population of 50 (Westfall 2006). Capt. E. B. Boynton (U.S. Army, retired), area engineer for the construction of Wellston Air Depot, described the area as not having any suitable places to live and chose to operate out of Macon, to the north (Head et al. 2001). Likewise, Lt. Col. G. E. Kegin (USAF, retired) described a similar scenario, renting a “closet apartment” in Macon and eventually moving into a semi-completed warehouse on the base during the spring of 1942 (Head et al. 2001).

The installation at Wellston Air Depot was initially conceived as a flying field with an operational complement of 350 personnel, officers and enlisted men—as stated in a telegram to the Macon Chamber of Commerce from U.S. Congressman Carl Vinson in 1941 (Westfall 2006). Housing at the base initially consisted of 15 family units, five standalone single-family dwellings, and five two-family duplexes. The duplexes at Chiefs’ Circle were originally conceived as housing for noncommissioned officers (NCO) able to accommodate 10 families. Conceivably, housing for the remaining personnel would follow, but with the country going to war—and the role of Warner Robins as aviation training and maintenance hub—things changed rapidly and with urgency. Provisions needed to be made to accommodate a rapid influx of personnel in spite of lacking local infrastructure.

At the height of its growth, Warner Robins employed 23,500 people, military and civilian. By 1943, there were 35,000 troops in training at facilities within the Warner Robins Air Service Command Area, and approximately 50,000 troops were deployed overseas (Chapman 1944). The influx of personnel overwhelmed the capacity of the town, which had few accommodations to begin with. Many of the troops and trainees were housed at a 3,000-acre cantonment area built to house incoming personnel. Civilian employees and others were housed in federally sponsored housing and in trailers. Housing was being utilized as rapidly as it was constructed. A 1944 document discussing the housing situation at Warner Robins states that
Housing is frequently mentioned as a cause for dissatisfaction with employment or possible employment at Robins Field. Rural Housing is admittedly poor. The surrounding towns, especially Macon and Perry, are grossly overcrowded and inadequate housing is in use in many instances [Unidentified 1944].

Federally sponsored construction was providing new housing at a rapid rate. In early 1943, there were 405 Federal Public Housing Authority (FPHA) units under construction, which were being released for occupation at a rate of 40 to 50 per week. New Federal Housing Authority (FHA) construction consisted of 200 homes to be completed at a rate of four to five per week. Lists of occupied housing indicate rapid growth from new construction. Segregation is evident in listings showing separate provisions for minority, “Colored” occupation (Unidentified 1944).

Although constructed as NCO housing, Chiefs’ Circle was rescheduled as officer’s quarters. Given the general housing conditions and the relative dearth of accommodations, newly constructed quarters would likely have been billeted for officer use; this occurred at various points during the history of the base. In 1952, the Status of Housing and Occupancy Report, AF Form 132, indicated that in May of that year, the status of the Double Officer Family Quarters were changed to “NCO Family Quarters” at the request of headquarters (Bush 1952). Later, in 1957, maintenance records indicated the buildings were “Junior Officers Quarters” (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1987).

The NCO quarters were originally designated buildings No. 1431, 1432, 1433, 1434, and 1435. At some point between 1952 and 1957, the buildings were renumbered and became buildings 500, 501, 502, 504, and 505 (Bush 1952; Robins Air Force Base 1957–1987). Building 1434 became 501. This change in the numbering suggests reorganization or possible expansion of the base, and likely coincides with changes in mission focus during the 1950s, though it could also be due to recovery from a natural disaster.

In 1953, a tornado hit the city of Warner Robins and the air base. There were 19 deaths and approximately 300 people were injured. Most of the deaths were people in base housing (Tornado Project 2008). As a result of this natural disaster, a major rebuilding effort was undertaken and the city continued to grow and develop.

In March 1946, immediately following WWII, the working population on the base dropped precipitously to approximately 3,900 people. As soldiers readjusted to civilian life, many of them returned to their original homes. Others stayed, gambling that the base would remain as other installations in the area were decommissioned. Robins Air Force Base continued to play a critical role, participating in the Berlin Air Lift in 1948 and 1949. In the 1950s, the base became a logistical hub for maintaining C-130 aircraft; during the Korean War, the base
expanded to support the addition of the Nineteenth Bombardment Wing of the Strategic Air Command. During the Vietnam War, the base provided a critical link for aircraft maintenance and troop resupply. It managed support of bombers and helicopter gunships, as well as AC-130 gunships and a vital suite of cargo aircraft. Through the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, Warner Robins continued to provide maintenance and support, as the Warner Robins Air Materiel Area, for a variety of attack and cargo aircraft, and provided material supply to ground forces during conflicts in the Middle East, Caribbean, and Eastern Europe (Head 2001).

Today, Robins Air Force Base consists of 8,435 acres with a compliment of over 19,000 personnel, civilian and military (Jorgenson and Cassidy 2006). It continues to provide a vital air support and maintenance role, and since 2001 has played a major role in the United States’ nation-building efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq.
A. General Statement:

1. Architectural character: 500 Chiefs’ Circle is a modest but comfortable duplex residence built on a cul-de-sac along with four other duplexes, all facing the circular road. The duplex features fine brick detailing. Mature trees and landscaping create a tranquil setting amidst the busy Air Force base. Built with Colonial Revival elements, the building is among a small number of historic buildings on the base.

2. Condition of fabric: Overall, the building is in good condition.

B. Description of Exterior

The Colonial Revival style duplex residence is U-shaped in plan and has one-story, flat-roofed entry porches in the crook of each arm of the main (south) façade (see sketch plan). The duplex residence is 65 feet, 6 inches wide and 30 feet, 2 inches deep. It is six bays wide and two bays deep. The duplex residence is two stories high and has a low-pitched cross-gable roof. The gable of the spine faces east/west, and the gables of the arms face north/south. 500A is located in the eastern half of the duplex and 500B is located in the western half. 500B is the mirror image of 500A.

500 Chiefs’ Circle has a concrete and brick foundation and exterior walls finished in brick with a running bond pattern. The upper portions of the gables are finished with vinyl siding and have triangular vents. The exterior walls are decorated with two belt courses. The first consists of a sailor course of oversized bricks and is located about 1 foot above the ground. The first-floor windows are articulated by header-course sills below and sailor-course lintels above. The kitchen windows on the rear elevation are the exceptions and do not have brick courses above and below. A sailor course also tops each of the doors. On either side of the rear doorway into the furnace room, the detailing of the sailor course differs—here it consists of two headers sandwiching one stretcher. The second brick course consists of a row of headers and is located immediately below the second-story windows.

There is an enclosed porch on each side elevation and a non-historic carport connected to each half of the duplex via a breezeway on the rear (north). The date of the attached carports is 1986. The date of the enclosing of the porches is unknown. In addition to the sunroom and carports, there is a flat-roofed, wooden entry porch at the front of each unit. The underside of the entry porch is clad with vinyl and weathering stripping is located above the roof.

The one-story, flat-roof sunrooms have brick foundations, tar and pebble clad roofs, and vinyl clad walls. Cornices crown the walls. Weathering stripping is located above the sunroom roof. Openings in the front elevation include one vent and two
windows. The side elevations have two vents beneath the row of four windows. The rear elevations feature one vent with two windows above.

As noted above, the carports are connected to the duplexes via covered breezeways. The wood framed structures are built on concrete pads and supported by square brick columns. A brick-faced storage space is incorporated into the design. A soldier course is located below the door into the storage space. The roofs are clad with asphalt shingle.

There are two brick central interior chimneys, one in each unit. The front and rear doors are centrally located and a third entrance provides egress from the furnace room. All of the doors are modern and fitted with metal and glass storm doors. The windows are wood framed with replacement vinyl double-hung one-over-one sash. The main cross-gable roof is clad with asphalt shingle. The sunroom and flat entry porch roofs are clad with tar and pebbles.

**Additional Description**

**Front elevation:** On the front elevation, the main entrances of each half are located under the entry porches in the two crooks of the U-shaped duplex. Concrete steps lead up to the landings—three steps at 500A and two steps at 500B. Six square wooden posts with bases and capitols support the entablatures and flat roofs. The entablature has only a plain frieze and cornice, and no architrave. The door casing is wood, while the metal replacement door has six panels (four rectangles panels topped by two small glass panels) with a glass storm door.

There are vents beneath the dining room and living room windows. First-floor openings consist of two entrances and four windows. From the center of the duplex out to the exterior walls, the first opening is a window looking into the dining room, the second is the entry, and the third is a window looking into the living room. There are three windows on the second floor. From the center of the duplex out to the exterior walls, the first window looks into the bathroom, the second looks into the hallway, and the third looks into the master bedroom. The windows on the front elevation have shutters.

**Side elevations:** There are two vents in the sunroom beneath the row of windows. On the first floor, openings consist of a door into the sunroom and one window looking into the current furnace room (formerly the family room).

**Rear elevation:** There is one vent under each of the kitchen windows. Openings on the first floor, from the middle of the duplex outwards, include a kitchen window, an entry door into the kitchen, an entry door into the furnace room, and a window looking into the furnace room. The kitchen window juts out from the wall. The raised entry into the kitchen is accessed via four concrete steps with a metal railing and covered by a breezeway supported by brick columns and connecting the duplex to the carport. The metal door has two panels at the bottom and a nine-light window.
above. There is a glass and metal storm door, as well. The entry into the furnace room is located at grade level and is accessed by a concrete threshold. The six-panel door has four rectangular panels topped by two small square panels. There is a metal and glass storm door. On the second floor, from the middle of the duplex outwards, is a double-window looking into one of the two rear bedrooms and a single window looking into the other rear bedroom. An area of brick has been replaced above the breezeway. Some staining has occurred to brick below a pipe on the rear elevation adjacent to the top of the breezeway.

C. Description of Interior:

500 A

Floor plans: 500A has a central stair plan (see sketch plan). Working clockwise from the foyer on the first floor, the dining room is in the southwest corner, the kitchen is in the northwest corner, the furnace room (former family room) is located in the northeast corner (situated two steps down from the rest of the house), and the living room is in the southeast corner. The sunroom is located off the living room. In between the kitchen and furnace room is a rear hallway, powder room, and access to the exterior of the house under the breezeway. There is a closet just to the northeast of the stair. On the second floor, clockwise from the central hallway, there is a bathroom in the southwest corner, a bedroom in the northwest corner, a second bedroom in the northeast corner, and the master bedroom in the southeast corner of the duplex.

Stairways: The staircase is carpeted and incorporates 11 stairs, a landing, and one more stair before reaching the second-floor hallway. The original wood banister remains—the banister and newel caps have a polyurethane varnish and the newel posts and balusters are painted. The banister was refurbished in 1998 (Baker Support Services 1998).

Flooring: The floors are primarily carpeted with the exception of the foyer, in which oak block flooring was installed in 1959 (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1987); the kitchen, rear hallway, and powder room, which have linoleum tiled floors; the furnace room, which has a paneled concrete floor; and the second-floor bathroom, which has a tiled floor.

Wall and ceiling finish: The interior walls are plaster. The second-floor bathroom was redone in 1998 (Baker Support Services 1998). The sunroom’s three walls are covered with vertical boards about 8 inches wide, and the ceiling is covered with wood strips 3 to 4 inches wide. The brick on the interior wall of the sunroom is painted. The sunroom threshold is slightly lower than the rest of the duplex.

Openings – Doorways and doors: Typical doors—such as the door between the foyer and dining room and the bedroom doors on the second floor—are painted
Windows: Windows have simple trim with shallow windowsills. Natural light filters through the windows. Before the sunroom was enclosed, a second window was located in the living room on the other side of the door; this window has now been converted to a built-in bookcase.

Decorative features and trim: The first-floor walls are articulated by crown moldings in the dining and living rooms, baseboards, and moldings around the door and window openings. The second-floor walls are articulated by baseboards and moldings around door and window openings. The kitchen is outfitted with oak cabinets installed in 1998 and modern appliances (Baker Support Services 1998). There is a louvered slatted pantry door on a track. The powder room has modern fixtures and a built-in cabinet. In the living room, there is a central fireplace with built-in cabinets on either side, one of which now houses a vent. The fireplace has an unpainted brick surround and a tile hearth, and is decorated by moldings and a wood mantle. In the sunroom is a chair rail/sill on the three sidewalls under the windows.

There are two closets in the second-floor hallway—one in between the two bedrooms in the northeast and southeast corners and one in the southwest corner adjacent to the bathroom with built-in shelves. The bathroom has a modern sink and medicine cabinet installed in 1998 and a wooden threshold (Baker Support Services 1998). The master (front) bedroom has two closets, one shallow and closer to the hall and one square. They have built-in shelves and the square closet has a built-in shoe rack. The two smaller bedrooms have one closet each with built-ins. The bedroom on the northwest side has a bump out near the entrance.

Hardware: Original hardware remains on most of the doors, including that leading from the foyer into the dining room and the bedroom doors on the second floor.

Mechanical equipment: The gas furnace and water heater are located in the furnace room and were installed in late 1971 and early 1972 to replace an oil furnace and electric water heater (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1987). There is an old furnace door in the furnace room stamped with “Taylor Iron Works, Macon, GA.” An attic exhaust fan was installed in 1977 (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1987).

500B

The interior of 500B is the mirror image of 500A. For example, the dining room is located in the southwest corner of 500A on the first floor; it is located in the southeast corner of 500B on the first floor. Consequently, only the differences between the two halves are provided in the following description.
Dining room: While the dining room in 500A is carpeted, here the same oak block flooring in the foyer extends into the dining room.

Living room: Unlike the central fireplace in 500A, which has an unpainted brick surround, the fireplace in 500B has a painted brick surround.

Sunroom: In 500A there is no door between the living room and sunroom, but in 500B there is a glass door with 15-lights.

D. Site

500 Chiefs’ Circle faces southeast and the duplex is situated on a cul-de-sac. The yard features a manicured lawn, landscaping, and mature trees. The house blends with the landscape. In the circle, benches, picnic tables, and swings invite leisurely enjoyment of the outdoors. Chiefs’ Circle is an oasis in the midst of modern facilities. While playing fields and plain, unarticulated office buildings are located across Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and a large warehouse is located beyond the circle to the west, there is a gently wooded slope leading down to a creek on the southeast side of the circle.

A concrete walkway leads from the cul-de-sac to the duplex splitting off closer to the house. Hedges and low plantings grow close to the front and sides of the duplex, and a fir tree stands among the low plantings in the middle of the front of the house. At the rear of the duplex, the walkway leading to the furnace door of 500A is lined with white pebbles and a few scattered terracotta stepping stones. The walkway leading to the furnace door of 500B is lined with concrete stepping stones and framed with low plantings. Deciduous and fir trees of varying maturity offer some shade to the property.
PART III. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

The sketch plan is available as part of Robins Air Force Base’s AF Forms 1430 and 1450, Real Property Accountable Record – Buildings, available at Real Property Office AKA 78 CEG/CERR, Warner Robins / Air Logistics Center, Robins Air Force Base, Georgia.
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PART IV.  PROJECT INFORMATION

As part of the Military Family Housing Privatization Initiative at Robins Air Force Base, it is proposed to demolish 500 Chiefs’ Circle, constituting an adverse effect on the National Register district contributing building.

Prepared by: Kate Jefferson, Architectural Historian
Zana Wolf, Architectural Historian,
Jeffrey Harbison, Archaeologist

Affiliation: URS Corporation

Date: June 18, 2008
Location: 501 Chiefs’ Circle
Warner Robins/Air Logistics Center, Robins Air Force Base, Houston County, Georgia 31098
501 Chiefs’ Circle is located in the northwest portion of a cul-de-sac off of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard roughly 700 feet to the west of Robins Parkway. Its primary façade faces the circle at a southwesterly angle. The house is located on Robins Air Force Base east of the city of Warner Robins.

USGS Warner Robins SE Quadrangle (7.5’)
Universal Transverse Mercator Coordinates: 17 256975.0E 3611313.5N

Present Owner: Robins Air Force Base

Present Occupant: Vacant

Present Use: None

Statement of Significance: 501 Chiefs’ Circle is one of five identical plan duplexes constructed adjacent to each other on Chiefs’ Circle in 1942. These dwellings are two-story duplexes and were built with Colonial Revival influences. All five buildings are sited around a circular street (Chiefs’ Circle) and face one another.
PART I. HISTORICAL INFORMATION

A. Physical History

1. Date of erection: 1942

2. Engineer: United States Corp of Engineers, Savannah District

3. Original and subsequent owners: Robins Air Force Base

4. Builder: Griffin, Mion, and Shepard

5. Original plans and construction: The building’s original cost was $17,119 (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989).

6. Alterations and additions: There is an enclosed porch or sunroom on each side elevation and a non-historic car port connected to each half of the duplex via a breezeway on the rear (north). The date of the enclosing of the porches is unknown. The date of the attached carports is 1986.

B. Historical Context

The initial incarnation of Robins Air Force Base was constructed in 1941, and was operational in early 1942. It was originally called the Wellston Air Depot, though its name was changed before its completion to Robins Field. In 1943, the base was officially designated Warner Robins Army Air Depot in honor of Brigadier General Augustine Warner Robins, one of the Army Air Corps’ first General Staff Officers. Later, in 1947, when President Truman made the U.S. Air Force a separate and independent branch of the military, the base was again renamed Robins Air Force Base. The base went through several more incarnations as its mission changed and its role expanded over the years.

In the years preceding WWII, the civic leaders of Macon courted military facilities to move into central Georgia, such as Camp Wheeler and Cochran Field, as well as military industrial producers, such as the Naval Ordinance Plant. When a new air depot was slated for the southeast as part of an Army Air Corps expansion effort under the 1935 Wilcox-Wilson Bill, Macon provided the Air Corps with several suitable sites. A 3,000-acre site at Wellston (in Houston County) was chosen, and the construction contract was awarded to Griffin, Mion, and Shepherd of Atlanta. The site was developed under the guidance of Brigadier General Charles E. Thomas, the commanding officer of the base from 1941 through 1944 (Chapman 1944).

Construction of the Wellston Air Depot commenced in June 1941 and included construction of the airfield and 15 structures, consisting of aircraft maintenance and repair facilities, warehouse facilities, administrative offices, utilities, and a
housekeeping facility (temporary housing). In addition to the operational facilities, 10 permanent structures were also constructed as military family housing. These 10 structures include the five mirror duplex houses at Chiefs’ Circle and five single-family homes in an area called Officer’s Circle, later part of the Forest Park housing area.

Portions of the air depot were still under construction at the commencement of hostilities for U.S. involvement in WWII, in December 1941. Under the command of General Thomas, the air depot doubled in size and became the Air Service Command HQ for the 3rd Air Force; by 1943, all military aircraft in the southeastern United States were supplied and serviced by personnel from the Area Air Service Command at the Warner Robins Air Depot. During this period, filling staff positions, finding technically trained personnel, and housing the influx of soldiers were problematic logistical hurdles (Chapman 1944; Head et al. 2001).

Housing was an issue from the start. Before construction, the town of Wellston consisted of a general store, service station, and approximately a half dozen residences with a population of 50 (Westfall 2006). Capt. E. B. Boynton (U.S. Army, retired), area engineer for the construction of Wellston Air Depot, described the area as not having any suitable places to live and chose to operate out of Macon, to the north (Head et al. 2001). Likewise, Lt. Col. G. E. Kegin (USAF, retired) described a similar scenario, renting a “closet apartment” in Macon and eventually moving into a semi-completed warehouse on the base during the spring of 1942 (Head et al. 2001).

The installation at Wellston Air Depot was initially conceived as a flying field with an operational complement of 350 personnel, officers and enlisted men—as stated in a telegram to the Macon Chamber of Commerce from U.S. Congressman Carl Vinson in 1941 (Westfall 2006). Housing at the base initially consisted of 15 family units, five standalone single-family dwellings, and five two-family duplexes. The duplexes at Chiefs’ Circle were originally conceived as housing for noncommissioned officers (NCO) able to accommodate 10 families. Conceivably, housing for the remaining personnel would follow, but with the country going to war—and the role of Warner Robins as aviation training and maintenance hub—things changed rapidly and with urgency. Provisions needed to be made to accommodate a rapid influx of personnel in spite of lacking local infrastructure.

At the height of its growth, Warner Robins employed 23,500 people, military and civilian. By 1943, there were 35,000 troops in training at facilities within the Warner Robins Air Service Command Area, and approximately 50,000 troops were deployed overseas (Chapman 1944). The influx of personnel overwhelmed the capacity of the town, which had few accommodations to begin with. Many of the troops and trainees were housed at a 3,000-acre cantonment area built to house incoming personnel. Civilian employees and others were housed in federally sponsored housing and in trailers. Housing was being utilized as rapidly as it was
A 1944 document discussing the housing situation at Warner Robins states that

Housing is frequently mentioned as a cause for dissatisfaction with employment or possible employment at Robins Field. Rural Housing is admittedly poor. The surrounding towns, especially Macon and Perry, are grossly overcrowded and inadequate housing is in use in many instances [Unidentified 1944].

Federally sponsored construction was providing new housing at a rapid rate. In early 1943, there were 405 Federal Public Housing Authority (FPHA) units under construction, which were being released for occupation at a rate of 40 to 50 per week. New Federal Housing Authority (FHA) construction consisted of 200 homes to be completed at a rate of four to five per week. Lists of occupied housing indicate rapid growth from new construction. Segregation is evident in listings showing separate provisions for minority, “Colored” occupation (Unidentified 1944).

Although constructed as NCO housing, Chiefs’ Circle was rescheduled as officer’s quarters. Given the general housing conditions and the relative dearth of accommodations, newly constructed quarters would likely have been billeted for officer use; this occurred at various points during the history of the base. In 1952, the Status of Housing and Occupancy Report, AF Form 132, indicated that in May of that year, the status of the Double Officer Family Quarters were changed to “NCO Family Quarters” at the request of headquarters (Bush 1952). Later, in 1957, maintenance records indicated the buildings were “Junior Officers Quarters” (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989).

The NCO quarters were originally designated buildings No. 1431, 1432, 1433, 1434, and 1435. At some point between 1952 and 1957, the buildings were renumbered and became buildings 500, 501, 502, 504, and 505 (Bush 1952; Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989). Building 1434 became 501. This change in the numbering suggests reorganization or possible expansion of the base, and likely coincides with changes in mission focus during the 1950s, though it could also be due to recovery from a natural disaster.

In 1953, a tornado hit the city of Warner Robins and the air base. There were 19 deaths and approximately 300 people were injured. Most of the deaths were people in base housing (Tornado Project 2008). As a result of this natural disaster, a major rebuilding effort was undertaken and the city continued to grow and develop.

In March 1946, immediately following WWII, the working population on the base dropped precipitously to approximately 3,900 people. As soldiers readjusted to civilian life, many of them returned to their original homes. Others stayed, gambling that the base would remain as other installations in the area were decommissioned. Robins Air Force Base continued to play a critical role,
participating in the Berlin Air Lift in 1948 and 1949. In the 1950s, the base became a logistical hub for maintaining C-130 aircraft; during the Korean War, the base expanded to support the addition of the Nineteenth Bombardment Wing of the Strategic Air Command. During the Vietnam War, the base provided a critical link for aircraft maintenance and troop resupply. It managed support of bombers and helicopter gunships, as well as AC-130 gunships and a vital suite of cargo aircraft. Through the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, Warner Robins continued to provide maintenance and support, as the Warner Robins Air Materiel Area, for a variety of attack and cargo aircraft, and provided material supply to ground forces during conflicts in the Middle East, Caribbean, and Eastern Europe (Head 2001).

Today, Robins Air Force Base consists of 8,435 acres with a compliment of over 19,000 personnel, civilian and military (Jorgenson and Cassidy 2006). It continues to provide a vital air support and maintenance role, and since 2001 has played a major role in the United States’ nation-building efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq.
PART II. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION

A. General Statement:

1. Architectural character: 501 Chiefs’ Circle is a modest but comfortable duplex residence built on a cul-de-sac along with four other duplexes, all facing the circular road. The duplex features fine brick detailing. Mature trees and landscaping create a tranquil setting amidst the busy Air Force base. Built with Colonial Revival elements, the building is among a small number of historic buildings on the base.

2. Condition of fabric: Overall, the building is in good condition.

B. Description of Exterior

The Colonial Revival style duplex residence is U-shaped in plan and has one-story, flat-roofed entry porches in the crook of each arm of the main (south) façade (see sketch plan). The duplex residence is 65 feet, 6 inches wide and 30 feet, 2 inches deep. It is six bays wide and two bays deep. The duplex residence is two stories high and has a low-pitched cross-gable roof. The gable of the spine faces east/west and the gables of the arms face north/south. 501A is located in the eastern half of the duplex and 501B is located in the western half. 501B is the mirror image of 501A.

501 Chiefs’ Circle has a concrete and brick foundation and exterior walls finished in brick with a running bond pattern. The upper portions of the gables are finished with vinyl siding and have triangular vents. The exterior walls are decorated with two belt courses. The first consists of a sailor course of oversized bricks and is located about 1 foot above the ground. The first-floor windows are articulated by header-course sills below and sailor-course lintels above. The kitchen windows on the rear elevation are the exceptions and do not have brick courses above and below. A sailor course also tops each of the doors. On either side of the rear doorway into the furnace room the detailing of the sailor course differs—here it consists of two headers sandwiching one stretcher. The second brick course consists of a row of headers and is located immediately below the second-story windows.

There is an enclosed porch on each side elevation and a non-historic carport connected to each half of the duplex via a breezeway on the rear (north). The date of the attached carports is 1986. The date of the enclosing of the porches is unknown. In addition to the sunroom and carports, there is a flat-roofed, wooden entry porch at the front of each unit. The underside of the entry porch is clad with vinyl, and weathering stripping is located above the roof.
The one-story, flat-roof sunrooms have brick foundations, tar and pebble clad roofs, and vinyl clad walls. Cornices crown the walls. Weathering stripping is located above the sunroom roof. Openings in the front elevation include one vent and two windows. The side elevations have two vents beneath the row of four windows. The rear elevations feature one vent with two windows above.

As noted above, the carports are connected to the duplexes via covered breezeways. The wood framed structures are built on concrete pads and supported by square brick columns. A brick-faced storage space is incorporated into the design. A soldier course is located below the door into the storage space. The roofs are clad with asphalt shingle.

There are two brick central interior chimneys, one in each unit. The front and rear doors are centrally located, and a third entrance provides egress from the furnace room. All of the doors are modern and fitted with metal and glass storm doors. The windows are wood framed with replacement vinyl double-hung one-over-one sash. The main cross-gable roof is clad with asphalt shingle. The sunroom and flat entry porch roofs are clad with tar and pebbles.

**Additional Description:**

**Front elevation:** On the front elevation, the main entrances of each half are located under the entry porches in the two crooks of the U-shaped duplex. One concrete step leads up to the landings of both 501A and 501B. Six square wooden posts with bases and capitols support the entablatures and flat roofs. The entablature has only a plain frieze, clad with vertical slats, and cornice and no architrave. The door casing is wood while the metal replacement door has six panels (four rectangles panels topped by two small glass panels) with a glass storm door.

There are vents beneath the dining room and living room windows. First-floor openings consist of two entrances and four windows. From the center of the duplex out to the exterior walls, the first opening is a window looking into the dining room, the second opening is the entry, and the third opening is a window looking into the living room. There are three windows on the second floor. From the center of the duplex out to the exterior walls, the first window looks into the bathroom, the second looks into the hallway, and the third looks into the master bedroom. The windows on the front elevation have shutters.

**Side elevations:** There are two vents in the sunroom beneath the row of windows. On the first floor, openings consist of a door into the sunroom and one window looking into the current furnace room (formerly the family room).

**Rear elevation:** There is one vent under each of the kitchen windows. Openings on the first floor, from the middle of the duplex outwards, include a kitchen window, an entry door into the kitchen, an entry door into the furnace room, and a window looking into the furnace room. The kitchen window juts out from the wall.
The raised entry into the kitchen is accessed via four concrete steps with a metal railing and covered by a breezeway supported by brick columns and connecting the duplex to the carport. The metal door has two panels at the bottom and a nine-light window above. There is a glass and metal storm door, as well. The entry into the furnace room is located at grade level and is accessed by a concrete threshold. The six-panel door has four rectangular panels topped by two small square panels. There is a metal and glass storm door. On the second floor, from the middle of the duplex outwards, is a double-window looking into one of the two rear bedrooms and a single window looking into the other rear bedroom. An area of brick has been replaced above the breezeway. Some staining has occurred to brick below a pipe on the rear elevation adjacent to the top of the breezeway.

C. Description of Interior:

501A

Floor plans: 501A has a central stair plan (see sketch plan). Working clockwise from the foyer on the first floor, the dining room is in the southwest corner, the kitchen is in the northwest corner, the furnace room (former family room) is located in the northeast corner, situated two steps down from the rest of the house, and the living room is in the southeast corner. The sunroom is located off the living room. In between the kitchen and furnace room is a rear hallway, powder room, and access to the exterior of the house under the breezeway. There is a closet just to the northeast of the stair. On the second floor, clockwise from the central hallway, there is a bathroom in the southwest corner, a bedroom in the northwest corner, a second bedroom in the northeast corner, and the master bedroom in the southeast corner of the duplex.

Stairways: The staircase is carpeted and incorporates 11 stairs, a landing, and one more stair before reaching the second floor hallway. The original wood banister remains—the banister and newel caps have a polyurethane varnish and the newel posts and balusters are painted.

Flooring: The floors are primarily carpeted, with the exception of the foyer, which has oak block flooring; the kitchen, rear hallway, and powder rooms, which have linoleum tiled floors; the furnace room, which has a paneled concrete floor; and the second-floor bathroom, which has a tiled floor.

Wall and ceiling finish: The interior walls are plaster. The sunroom’s three walls are covered with vertical boards about 8 inches wide, and the ceiling is covered with wood strips 3 to 4 inches wide. The brick on the interior wall of the sunroom is painted. The threshold is slightly lower than the rest of the duplex. There is evidence of mold around the vent in the second-floor hallway and adjacent closet. The paint is peeling in the sunroom and master bedroom.
Openings – Doorways and doors: Typical doors, such as the bedroom doors on the second floor, are painted white and two-paneled, with one larger rectangular panel over a smaller square panel. There is a glass door with 15-lights between the living room and sunroom. Simple trim surrounds the door openings.

Windows: Windows have simple trim with shallow windowsills. Natural light filters through the windows. Before the sunroom was enclosed, a second window was located in the living room on the other side of the door; this window has now been converted to a built-in bookcase.

Decorative features and trim: The first-floor walls are articulated by crown moldings in the dining and living rooms, baseboards, and moldings around the door and window openings. The second-floor walls are articulated by baseboards and moldings around door and window openings. The kitchen is outfitted with faux wood cabinets and modern appliances. There is a louvered slatted pantry door on a track. The powder room has modern fixtures and a built-in cabinet. In the living room, there is a central fireplace with built-in cabinets on either side, one of which now houses a vent. The fireplace has a painted brick surround and a tile hearth, and is decorated by moldings and a wood mantle. In the sunroom is a chair rail/sill on the three sidewalls under the windows.

There are two closets in the second-floor hallway—one in between the two bedrooms in the northeast and southeast corners, and one in the southwest corner adjacent to the bathroom with built-in shelves. The bathroom has a modern sink, a medicine cabinet, and a wooden threshold. The master (front) bedroom has two closets, one shallow and closer to the hall, and one square. They have built-in shelves and the square closet has a built-in shoe rack. The two smaller bedrooms have one closet each with built-ins. The bedroom on the northeast side has a bump out near the entrance.

Hardware: Original hardware remains on most of the doors, including the bedroom doors on the second floor, with the exception of the bedroom in the northwest corner.

Mechanical equipment: The gas furnace and water heater are located in the furnace room and were installed in late 1971 and early 1972 to replace an oil furnace and electric water heater (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989). There is an old furnace door in the furnace room stamped with “Taylor Iron Works, Macon, GA.” An attic exhaust fan was installed in 1977 (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989).

501B

The interior of 501B is the mirror image of 501A. For example, the dining room is located in the southwest corner on the first floor of 501A; it is located in the
southeast corner of 501B on the first floor. Consequently, only the differences between the two halves are provided in the following description.

**Stairways:** The banister was refurbished in 2000 (Baker Support Services 2000).

**Dining room:** While the dining room in 501A is carpeted, in 501B the same oak block flooring in the foyer extends into the dining room. The carpeting was removed and the underlying parquet floor refinished in 2000 (Baker Support Services 2000). There are wood double slatted doors between the dining room and the kitchen.

**Kitchen:** 501A features faux wood cabinets, while in 501B, the kitchen was outfitted with oak cabinets installed in 2000 (Baker Support Services 2000).

**Powder room:** The fixtures were replaced in 2000 (Baker Support Services 2000).

**Living room:** Unlike the central fireplace in 501A, which has a painted brick surround, the fireplace in 501B has an unpainted brick surround.

**Bathroom:** Hall bath walls and fixtures were replaced in 2000 (Baker Support Services 2000).

**Mechanical equipment:** The plumbing system was replaced in 2000 (Baker Support Services 2000).

**D. Site**

501 Chiefs’ Circle faces southwest and the duplex is situated on a cul-de-sac. The yard features a manicured lawn, landscaping, and mature trees. The house blends with the landscape. In the circle, benches, picnic tables, and swings invite leisurely enjoyment of the outdoors. Chiefs’ Circle is an oasis in the midst of modern facilities. While playing fields and plain, unarticulated office buildings are located across Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and a large warehouse is located beyond the circle to the west, there is a gently wooded slope leading down to a creek on the southeast side of the circle.

A concrete walkway leads from the cul-de-sac to the duplex splitting off closer to the house. Hedges and low plantings grow close to the front and sides of the duplex and a fir tree stands among the low plantings in the middle of the front of the house. At the rear of the duplex, the walkway leading to the furnace door of 501A is lined with white pebbles and a few scattered terracotta stepping stones. The walkway leading to the furnace door of 501B is lined with pairs of concrete stepping stones and framed with low plantings. Deciduous and fir trees of varying maturity offer some shade to the property.
PART III. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

The attached sketch plan is available as part of Robins Air Force Base’s AF Forms 1430 and 1450, Real Property Accountable Record – Buildings, available at Real Property Office AKA 78 CEG/CERR, Warner Robins / Air Logistics Center, Robins Air Force Base, Georgia.
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PART IV. PROJECT INFORMATION

As part of the Military Family Housing Privatization Initiative at Robins Air Force Base, it is proposed to demolish 501 Chiefs’ Circle, constituting an adverse effect on the National Register District contributing building.
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Zana Wolf, Architectural Historian,  
Jeffrey Harbison, Archaeologist

Affiliation: URS Corporation

Date: June 18, 2008
HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDING SURVEY

502 CHIEFS’ CIRCLE

Location: 502 Chiefs’ Circle
Warner Robins/Air Logistics Center, Robins Air Force Base, Houston County, Georgia 31098
502 Chiefs’ Circle is located in the southern portion of a cul-de-sac off of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard roughly 700 feet to the west of Robins Parkway. Its primary façade faces the circle at a northwesterly angle. The house is located on Robins Air Force Base, east of the city of Warner Robins.

USGS Warner Robins SE Quadrangle (7.5")
Universal Transverse Mercator Coordinates: 17 25695.0E
3611258.5N

Present Owner: Robins Air Force Base

Present Occupant: Vacant

Present Use: None

Statement of Significance: 502 Chiefs’ Circle is one of five identical plan duplexes constructed adjacent to each other on Chiefs’ Circle in 1942. These dwellings are two-story duplexes and were built with Colonial Revival influences. All five buildings are sited around a circular street (Chiefs’ Circle) and face one another.
PART I. HISTORICAL INFORMATION

A. Physical History

1. **Date of erection:** 1942

2. **Engineer:** United States Corp of Engineers, Savannah District

3. **Original and subsequent owners:** Robins Air Force Base

4. **Builder:** Griffin, Mion, and Shepard

5. **Original plans and construction:** The building’s original cost was $17,119 (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989).

6. **Alterations and additions:** There is an enclosed porch or sunroom on each side elevation and a non-historic carport connected to each half of the duplex via a breezeway on the rear (southeast). The date of the enclosing of the porches is unknown. The date of the attached carports is 1986.

B. Historical Context

The initial incarnation of Robins Air Force Base was constructed in 1941, and was operational in early 1942. It was originally called the Wellston Air Depot, though its name was changed before its completion to Robins Field. In 1943, the base was officially designated Warner Robins Army Air Depot in honor of Brigadier General Augustine Warner Robins, one of the Army Air Corps’ first General Staff Officers. Later, in 1947, when President Truman made the U.S. Air Force a separate and independent branch of the military, the base was again renamed Robins Air Force Base. The base went through several more incarnations as its mission changed and its role expanded over the years.

In the years preceding WWII, the civic leaders of Macon courted military facilities to move into central Georgia, such as Camp Wheeler and Cochran Field, as well as military industrial producers, such as the Naval Ordinance Plant. When a new air depot was slated for the southeast as part of an Army Air Corps expansion effort under the 1935 Wilcox-Wilson Bill, Macon provided the Air Corps with several suitable sites. A 3,000-acre site at Wellston (in Houston County) was chosen, and the construction contract was awarded to Griffin, Mion, and Shepherd of Atlanta. The site was developed under the guidance of Brigadier General Charles E. Thomas, the commanding officer of the base from 1941 through 1944 (Chapman 1944).

Construction of the Wellston Air Depot commenced in June 1941 and included construction of the airfield and 15 structures, consisting of aircraft maintenance and repair facilities, warehouse facilities, administrative offices, utilities, and a
housekeeping facility (temporary housing). In addition to the operational facilities, 10 permanent structures were also constructed as military family housing. These 10 structures include the five mirror duplex houses at Chiefs’ Circle and five single-family homes in an area called Officer’s Circle, later part of the Forest Park housing area.

Portions of the air depot were still under construction at the commencement of hostilities for U.S. involvement in WWII, in December 1941. Under the command of General Thomas, the air depot doubled in size and became the Air Service Command HQ for the 3rd Air Force; by 1943, all military aircraft in the southeastern United States were supplied and serviced by personnel from the Area Air Service Command at the Warner Robins Air Depot. During this period, filling staff positions, finding technically trained personnel, and housing the influx of soldiers were problematic logistical hurdles (Chapman 1944; Head et al. 2001).

Housing was an issue from the start. Before construction, the town of Wellston consisted of a general store, service station, and approximately a half dozen residences with a population of 50 (Westfall 2006). Capt. E. B. Boynton (U.S. Army, retired), area engineer for the construction of Wellston Air Depot, described the area as not having any suitable places to live and chose to operate out of Macon, to the north (Head et al. 2001). Likewise, Lt. Col. G. E. Kegin (USAF, retired) described a similar scenario, renting a “closet apartment” in Macon and eventually moving into a semi-completed warehouse on the base during the spring of 1942 (Head et al. 2001).

The installation at Wellston Air Depot was initially conceived as a flying field with an operational complement of 350 personnel, officers and enlisted men—as stated in a telegram to the Macon Chamber of Commerce from U.S. Congressman Carl Vinson in 1941 (Westfall 2006). Housing at the base initially consisted of 15 family units, five standalone single-family dwellings, and five two-family duplexes. The duplexes at Chiefs’ Circle were originally conceived as housing for noncommissioned officers (NCO) able to accommodate 10 families. Conceivably, housing for the remaining personnel would follow, but with the country going to war—and the role of Warner Robins as aviation training and maintenance hub—things changed rapidly and with urgency. Provisions needed to be made to accommodate a rapid influx of personnel in spite of lacking local infrastructure.

At the height of its growth, Warner Robins employed 23,500 people, military and civilian. By 1943, there were 35,000 troops in training at facilities within the Warner Robins Air Service Command Area, and approximately 50,000 troops were deployed overseas (Chapman 1944). The influx of personnel overwhelmed the capacity of the town, which had few accommodations to begin with. Many of the troops and trainees were housed at a 3,000-acre cantonment area built to house incoming personnel. Civilian employees and others were housed in federally sponsored housing and in trailers. Housing was being utilized as rapidly as it was
A 1944 document discussing the housing situation at Warner Robins states that

Housing is frequently mentioned as a cause for dissatisfaction with employment or possible employment at Robins Field. Rural Housing is admittedly poor. The surrounding towns, especially Macon and Perry, are grossly overcrowded and inadequate housing is in use in many instances [Unidentified 1944].

Federally sponsored construction was providing new housing at a rapid rate. In early 1943, there were 405 Federal Public Housing Authority (FPHA) units under construction, which were being released for occupation at a rate of 40 to 50 per week. New Federal Housing Authority (FHA) construction consisted of 200 homes to be completed at a rate of four to five per week. Lists of occupied housing indicate rapid growth from new construction. Segregation is evident in listings showing separate provisions for minority, “Colored” occupation (Unidentified 1944).

Although constructed as NCO housing, Chiefs’ Circle was rescheduled as officer’s quarters. Given the general housing conditions and the relative dearth of accommodations, newly constructed quarters would likely have been billeted for officer use; this occurred at various points during the history of the base. In 1952, the Status of Housing and Occupancy Report, AF Form 132, indicated that in May of that year, the status of the Double Officer Family Quarters were changed to “NCO Family Quarters” at the request of headquarters (Bush 1952). Later, in 1957, maintenance records indicated the buildings were “Junior Officers Quarters” (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989).

The NCO quarters were originally designated buildings No. 1431, 1432, 1433, 1434, and 1435. At some point between 1952 and 1957, the buildings were renumbered and became buildings 500, 501, 502, 504, and 505 (Bush 1952; Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989). Building 1434 became 501. This change in the numbering suggests reorganization or possible expansion of the base, and likely coincides with changes in mission focus during the 1950s, though it could also be due to recovery from a natural disaster.

In 1953, a tornado hit the city of Warner Robins and the air base. There were 19 deaths and approximately 300 people were injured. Most of the deaths were people in base housing (Tornado Project 2008). As a result of this natural disaster, a major rebuilding effort was undertaken and the city continued to grow and develop.

In March 1946, immediately following WWII, the working population on the base dropped precipitously to approximately 3,900 people. As soldiers readjusted to civilian life, many of them returned to their original homes. Others stayed, gambling that the base would remain as other installations in the area were decommissioned. Robins Air Force Base continued to play a critical role,
participating in the Berlin Air Lift in 1948 and 1949. In the 1950s, the base became a logistical hub for maintaining C-130 aircraft; during the Korean War, the base expanded to support the addition of the Nineteenth Bombardment Wing of the Strategic Air Command. During the Vietnam War, the base provided a critical link for aircraft maintenance and troop resupply. It managed support of bombers and helicopter gunships, as well as AC-130 gunships and a vital suite of cargo aircraft. Through the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, Warner Robins continued to provide maintenance and support, as the Warner Robins Air Materiel Area, for a variety of attack and cargo aircraft, and provided material supply to ground forces during conflicts in the Middle East, Caribbean, and Eastern Europe (Head 2001).

Today, Robins Air Force Base consists of 8,435 acres with a compliment of over 19,000 personnel, civilian and military (Jorgenson and Cassidy 2006). It continues to provide a vital air support and maintenance role, and since 2001 has played a major role in the United States’ nation-building efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq.
PART II. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION

A. General Statement:

1. Architectural character: 502 Chiefs’ Circle is a modest but comfortable duplex residence built on a cul-de-sac along with four other duplexes, all facing the circular road. The duplex features fine brick detailing. Mature trees and landscaping create a tranquil setting amidst the busy Air Force base. Built with Colonial Revival elements, the building is among a small number of historic buildings on the base.

2. Condition of fabric: Overall, the building is in good condition.

B. Description of Exterior

The Colonial Revival style duplex residence is U-shaped in plan and has one-story, flat-roofed entry porches in the crook of each arm of the main (west) façade (see sketch plan). The duplex residence is 65 feet, 6 inches wide and 30 feet, 2 inches deep. It is six bays wide and two bays deep. The duplex residence is two stories high and has a low-pitched cross-gable roof. The gable of the spine faces north/south and the gables of the arms face east/west. 502A is located in the eastern half of the duplex and 502B is located in the western half. 502B is the mirror image of 502A.

502 Chiefs’ Circle has a concrete and brick foundation and exterior walls finished in brick with a running bond pattern. The upper portions of the gables are finished with vinyl siding and have triangular vents. The exterior walls are decorated with two belt courses. The first consists of a sailor course of oversized bricks and is located about 1 foot above the ground. The first-floor windows are articulated by header-course sills below and sailor-course lintels above. The kitchen windows on the rear elevation are the exceptions and do not have brick courses above and below. A sailor course also tops each of the doors. On either side of the rear doorway into the furnace room the detailing of the sailor course differs—here it consists of two headers sandwiching one stretcher. The second brick course consists of a row of headers and is located immediately below the second-story windows.

There is an enclosed porch on each side elevation and a non-historic carport connected to each half of the duplex via a breezeway on the rear (southeast). The date of the attached carports is 1986. The date of the enclosing of the porches is unknown. In addition to the sunroom and carports, there is a flat-roofed, wooden entry porch at the front of each unit. The underside of the entry porch is clad with vinyl, and weathering stripping is located above the roof.

The one-story, flat-roof sunrooms have brick foundations, tar and pebble clad roofs, and vinyl clad walls. Cornices crown the walls. Weathering stripping is located
above the sunroom roof. Openings in the front elevation include one vent and two windows. The side elevations have two vents beneath the row of four windows. The rear elevations feature one vent with two windows above.

As noted above, the carports are connected to the duplexes via covered breezeways. The wood framed structures are built on concrete pads and supported by square brick columns. A brick-faced storage space is incorporated into the design. A soldier course is located below the door into the storage space. The roofs are clad with asphalt shingle.

There are two brick central interior chimneys, one in each unit. The front and rear doors are centrally located and a third entrance provides egress from the furnace room. All of the doors are modern and fitted with metal and glass storm doors. The windows are wood framed with replacement vinyl double-hung one-over-one sash. The main cross-gable roof is clad with asphalt shingle. The sunroom and flat entry porch roofs are clad with tar and pebbles.

Additional Description:

Front elevation: On the front elevation, the main entrances of each half are located under the entry porches in the two crooks of the U-shaped duplex. One concrete step leads up to the landings of both 502A and 502B. Six square wooden posts with bases and capitols support the entablatures and flat roofs. The entablature has only a plain frieze, clad with vertical slats, a cornice, and no architrave. 502A has horizontal brackets between the front posts. The door casing is wood, while the metal replacement door has six panels (four rectangles panels topped by two small glass panels) with a glass storm door.

There are vents beneath the dining room and living room windows. First-floor openings consist of two entrances and four windows. From the center of the duplex out to the exterior walls, the first opening is a window looking into the dining room, the second opening is the entry, and the third opening is a window looking into the living room. There are three windows on the second floor. From the center of the duplex out to the exterior walls, the first window looks into the bathroom, the second looks into the hallway, and the third looks into the master bedroom. The windows on the front elevation have shutters.

Side elevations: There are two vents in the sunroom beneath the row of windows. On the first floor, openings consist of a door into the sunroom and one window looking into the current furnace room (formerly the family room).

Rear elevation: There is one vent under each of the kitchen windows. Openings on the first floor, from the middle of the duplex outwards, include a kitchen window, an entry door into the kitchen, an entry door into the furnace room, and a window looking into the furnace room. The kitchen window juts out from the wall. The raised entry into the kitchen is accessed via four concrete steps with a metal
railing and covered by a breezeway supported by brick columns and connecting the
duplex to the carport. The metal door has two panels at the bottom and a nine-light
window above. There is a glass and metal storm door, as well. The entry into the
furnace room is located at grade level and is accessed by a concrete threshold. The
six-panel door has four rectangular panels topped by two small square panels.
There is a metal and glass storm door. On the second floor, from the middle of the
duplex outwards, is a double-window looking into one of the two rear bedrooms
and a single window looking into the other rear bedroom. An area of brick has
been replaced above the breezeway. Some staining has occurred to brick below a
pipe on the rear elevation adjacent to the top of the breezeway.

C. Description of Interior:

Floor plans: 502A has a central stair plan (see sketch plan). Working clockwise
from the foyer on the first floor, the dining room is in the southwest corner, the
kitchen is in the northwest corner, the furnace room (former family room) is
located in the northeast corner, situated two steps down from the rest of the house,
and the living room is in the southeast corner. The sunroom is located off the
living room. In between the kitchen and furnace room is a rear hallway, powder
room, and access to the exterior of the house under the breezeway. There is a
closet just to the northeast of the stair. On the second floor, clockwise from the
central hallway, there is a bathroom in the southwest corner, a bedroom in the
northwest corner, a second bedroom in the northeast corner, and the master
bedroom in the southeast corner of the duplex.

Stairways: The staircase is carpeted and incorporates 11 stairs, a landing, and one
more stair before reaching the second floor hallway. The original wood banister
remains—the banister and newel caps have a polyurethane varnish and the newel
posts and balusters are painted. The banister was refinished in 1998 (Baker
Support Services 1998).

Flooring: The floors are primarily carpeted with the exception of the dining room,
which has oak block flooring; the kitchen, rear hallway, and powder rooms, which
have linoleum tiled floors; the furnace room, which has a paneled concrete floor;
and the second-floor bathroom, which has a tiled floor. Although parquet tile was
installed in the foyer in January 1961, it is now carpeted (Robins Air Force Base

Wall and ceiling finish: The interior walls are plaster. The sunroom’s three walls
are covered with vertical boards about 8 inches wide, and the ceiling is covered
with wood strips 3 to 4 inches wide. The brick on the interior wall of the sunroom
is painted. The threshold is slightly lower than the rest of the duplex.

Openings – Doorways and doors: Typical doors such as the bedroom doors on
the second floor are painted white and two-paneled, with one larger rectangular
panel over a smaller square panel. There is a glass door with 15-lights between the living room and sunroom. Simple trim surrounds the door openings.

**Windows:** Windows have simple trim with shallow windowsills. Natural light filters through the windows. Before the sunroom was enclosed, a second window was located in the living room on the other side of the door; this window has now been converted to a built-in bookcase.

**Decorative features and trim:** The first-floor walls are articulated by crown moldings in the dining and living rooms, baseboards, and moldings around the door and window openings. The second-floor walls are articulated by baseboards and moldings around door and window openings. The kitchen is outfitted with oak cabinets installed in 1998, at which time some modern appliances were also installed (Baker Support Services 1998). There is a louvered slatted pantry door on a track. The powder room has modern fixtures and a built-in cabinet. In the living room, there is a central fireplace with built-in cabinets on either side, one of which now houses a vent. The fireplace has a painted brick surround and a tile hearth, and is decorated by moldings and a wood mantle. In the sunroom is a chair rail/sill on the three sidewalls under the windows.

There are two closets in the second-floor hallway—one in between the two bedrooms in the northeast and southeast corners, and one in the southwest corner adjacent to the bathroom with built-in shelves. The bathroom has a wooden threshold. The fixtures were replaced in 1998, as were the walls (Baker Support Services 1998). The master (front) bedroom has two closets, one shallow and closer to the hall, and one square. They have built-in shelves and the square closet has a built-in shoe rack. The two smaller bedrooms have one closet each with built-ins. The bedroom on the southeast side has a bump out near the entrance.

**Hardware:** Original hardware remains on most of the doors, including the bedroom doors on the second floor.

**Mechanical equipment:** The gas furnace and water heater are located in the furnace room and were installed in late 1971 and early 1972 to replace an oil furnace and electric water heater (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989). There is an old furnace door in the furnace room stamped with “Taylor Iron Works, Macon, GA.” An attic exhaust fan was installed in 1977 (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989).

**502B**

The interior of 502B is the mirror image of 502A. For example, the dining room is located in the southwest corner on the first floor of 502A; it is located in the southeast corner of 502B. Consequently, only the differences between the two halves are provided in the following description.
Foyer: Unlike in 502A, where the foyer is carpeted, there is oak block flooring in the foyer of 502B.

Kitchen: The kitchen is outfitted with oak cabinets and modern appliances (Baker Support Services 1998).

Living room: Unlike the fireplace in 502A, which has a painted brick surround, the fireplace in 502B has an unpainted brick surround.

Sunroom: Unlike 502A, where there is a glass door with 15-lights between the living room and sunroom, there is no glass door between the living room and sunroom in 502B. Some of the paint is peeling.

Mechanical equipment: The plumbing was replaced in 1998 (Baker Support Services 1998).

D. Site

502 Chiefs’ Circle faces northwest. The duplex is situated on a cul-de-sac. The yard features a manicured lawn, landscaping, and mature trees. The house blends with the landscape. In the circle, benches, picnic tables, and swings invite leisurely enjoyment of the outdoors. Chiefs’ Circle is an oasis in the midst of modern facilities. While playing fields and plain, unarticulated office buildings are located across Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and a large warehouse is located beyond the circle to the west, there is a gently wooded slope leading down to a creek on the southeast side of the circle.

A concrete walkway leads from the cul-de-sac to the duplex splitting off closer to the house. Hedges and low plantings grow close to the front and sides of the duplex and a fir tree stands among the low plantings in the middle of the front of the house. At the rear of the duplex, the walkway leading to the furnace door of 502A is lined with wood railroad ties or steps. The walkway leading to the furnace door of 502B is lined with concrete stepping stones. Deciduous and fir trees of varying maturity offer some shade to the property.
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PART IV. PROJECT INFORMATION

As part of the Military Family Housing Privatization Initiative at Robins Air Force Base, it is proposed to demolish 502 Chiefs’ Circle, constituting an adverse effect on the National Register District contributing building.

Prepared by: Kate Jefferson, Architectural Historian
Zana Wolf, Architectural Historian,
Jeffrey Harbison, Archaeologist

Affiliation: URS Corporation

Date: June 18, 2008
504 CHIEFS’ CIRCLE

Location: 504 Chiefs’ Circle
Warner Robins/Air Logistics Center, Robins Air Force Base, Houston County, Georgia 31098
504 Chiefs’ Circle is located in the southern portion of a cul-de-sac off of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard roughly 700 feet to the west of Robins Parkway. Its primary façade faces the circle at a northern angle. The house is located on Robins Air Force Base, east of the city of Warner Robins.

USGS Warner Robins SE Quadrangle (7.5’)
Universal Transverse Mercator Coordinates: 17 256945.0E 3611223.5N

Present Owner: Robins Air Force Base

Present Occupant: Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts

Present Use: Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts Activities

Statement of Significance: 504 Chiefs’ Circle is one of five identical plan duplexes constructed adjacent to each other on Chiefs’ Circle in 1942. These dwellings are two-story duplexes and were built with Colonial Revival influences. All five buildings are sited around a circular street (Chiefs’ Circle) and face one another.
PART I. HISTORICAL INFORMATION

A. Physical History

1. Date of erection: 1942

2. Engineer: United States Corp of Engineers, Savannah District

3. Original and subsequent owners: Robins Air Force Base

4. Builder: Griffin, Mion, and Shepard

5. Original plans and construction: The building’s original cost was $17,119 (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989).

6. Alterations and additions: There is an enclosed porch or sunroom on each side elevation and a non-historic carport connected to each half of the duplex via a breezeway on the rear (south). The date of the enclosing of the porches is unknown. The date of the attached carports is 1986.

B. Historical Context

The initial incarnation of Robins Air Force Base was constructed in 1941, and was operational in early 1942. It was originally called the Wellston Air Depot, though its name was changed before its completion to Robins Field. In 1943, the base was officially designated Warner Robins Army Air Depot in honor of Brigadier General Augustine Warner Robins, one of the Army Air Corps’ first General Staff Officers. Later, in 1947, when President Truman made the U.S. Air Force a separate and independent branch of the military, the base was again renamed Robins Air Force Base. The base went through several more incarnations as its mission changed and its role expanded over the years.

In the years preceding WWII, the civic leaders of Macon courted military facilities to move into central Georgia, such as Camp Wheeler and Cochran Field, as well as military industrial producers, such as the Naval Ordnance Plant. When a new air depot was slated for the southeast as part of an Army Air Corps expansion effort under the 1935 Wilcox-Wilson Bill, Macon provided the Air Corps with several suitable sites. A 3,000-acre site at Wellston (in Houston County) was chosen, and the construction contract was awarded to Griffin, Mion, and Shepherd of Atlanta. The site was developed under the guidance of Brigadier General Charles E. Thomas, the commanding officer of the base from 1941 through 1944 (Chapman 1944).

Construction of the Wellston Air Depot commenced in June 1941 and included construction of the airfield and 15 structures, consisting of aircraft maintenance and repair facilities, warehouse facilities, administrative offices, utilities, and a
housekeeping facility (temporary housing). In addition to the operational facilities, 10 permanent structures were also constructed as military family housing. These 10 structures include the five mirror duplex houses at Chiefs’ Circle and five single-family homes in an area called Officer’s Circle, later part of the Forest Park housing area.

Portions of the air depot were still under construction at the commencement of hostilities for U.S. involvement in WWII, in December 1941. Under the command of General Thomas, the air depot doubled in size and became the Air Service Command HQ for the 3rd Air Force; by 1943, all military aircraft in the southeastern United States were supplied and serviced by personnel from the Area Air Service Command at the Warner Robins Air Depot. During this period, filling staff positions, finding technically trained personnel, and housing the influx of soldiers were problematic logistical hurdles (Chapman 1944; Head et al. 2001).

Housing was an issue from the start. Before construction, the town of Wellston consisted of a general store, service station, and approximately a half dozen residences with a population of 50 (Westfall 2006). Capt. E. B. Boynton (U.S. Army, retired), area engineer for the construction of Wellston Air Depot, described the area as not having any suitable places to live and chose to operate out of Macon, to the north (Head et al. 2001). Likewise, Lt. Col. G. E. Kegin (USAF, retired) described a similar scenario, renting a “closet apartment” in Macon and eventually moving into a semi-completed warehouse on the base during the spring of 1942 (Head et al. 2001).

The installation at Wellston Air Depot was initially conceived as a flying field with an operational complement of 350 personnel, officers and enlisted men—as stated in a telegram to the Macon Chamber of Commerce from U.S. Congressman Carl Vinson in 1941 (Westfall 2006). Housing at the base initially consisted of 15 family units, five standalone single-family dwellings, and five two-family duplexes. The duplexes at Chiefs’ Circle were originally conceived as housing for noncommissioned officers (NCO) able to accommodate 10 families. Conceivably, housing for the remaining personnel would follow, but with the country going to war—and the role of Warner Robins as aviation training and maintenance hub—things changed rapidly and with urgency. Provisions needed to be made to accommodate a rapid influx of personnel in spite of lacking local infrastructure.

At the height of its growth, Warner Robins employed 23,500 people, military and civilian. By 1943, there were 35,000 troops in training at facilities within the Warner Robins Air Service Command Area, and approximately 50,000 troops were deployed overseas (Chapman 1944). The influx of personnel overwhelmed the capacity of the town, which had few accommodations to begin with. Many of the troops and trainees were housed at a 3,000-acre cantonment area built to house incoming personnel. Civilian employees and others were housed in federally sponsored housing and in trailers. Housing was being utilized as rapidly as it was
constructed. A 1944 document discussing the housing situation at Warner Robins states that

Housing is frequently mentioned as a cause for dissatisfaction with employment or possible employment at Robins Field. Rural Housing is admittedly poor. The surrounding towns, especially Macon and Perry, are grossly overcrowded and inadequate housing is in use in many instances [Unidentified 1944].

Federally sponsored construction was providing new housing at a rapid rate. In early 1943, there were 405 Federal Public Housing Authority (FPHA) units under construction, which were being released for occupation at a rate of 40 to 50 per week. New Federal Housing Authority (FHA) construction consisted of 200 homes to be completed at a rate of four to five per week. Lists of occupied housing indicate rapid growth from new construction. Segregation is evident in listings showing separate provisions for minority, “Colored” occupation (Unidentified 1944).

Although constructed as NCO housing, Chiefs’ Circle was rescheduled as officer’s quarters. Given the general housing conditions and the relative dearth of accommodations, newly constructed quarters would likely have been billeted for officer use; this occurred at various points during the history of the base. In 1952, the Status of Housing and Occupancy Report, AF Form 132, indicated that in May of that year, the status of the Double Officer Family Quarters were changed to “NCO Family Quarters” at the request of headquarters (Bush 1952). Later, in 1957, maintenance records indicated the buildings were “Junior Officers Quarters” (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989).

The NCO quarters were originally designated buildings No. 1431, 1432, 1433, 1434, and 1435. At some point between 1952 and 1957, the buildings were renumbered and became buildings 500, 501, 502, 504, and 505 (Bush 1952; Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989). Building 1434 became 501. This change in the numbering suggests reorganization or possible expansion of the base, and likely coincides with changes in mission focus during the 1950s, though it could also be due to recovery from a natural disaster.

In 1953, a tornado hit the city of Warner Robins and the air base. There were 19 deaths and approximately 300 people were injured. Most of the deaths were people in base housing (Tornado Project 2008). As a result of this natural disaster, a major rebuilding effort was undertaken and the city continued to grow and develop.

In March 1946, immediately following WWII, the working population on the base dropped precipitously to approximately 3,900 people. As soldiers readjusted to civilian life, many of them returned to their original homes. Others stayed, gambling that the base would remain as other installations in the area were decommissioned. Robins Air Force Base continued to play a critical role,
participating in the Berlin Air Lift in 1948 and 1949. In the 1950s, the base became a logistical hub for maintaining C-130 aircraft; during the Korean War, the base expanded to support the addition of the Nineteenth Bombardment Wing of the Strategic Air Command. During the Vietnam War, the base provided a critical link for aircraft maintenance and troop resupply. It managed support of bombers and helicopter gunships, as well as AC-130 gunships and a vital suite of cargo aircraft. Through the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, Warner Robins continued to provide maintenance and support, as the Warner Robins Air Materiel Area, for a variety of attack and cargo aircraft, and provided material supply to ground forces during conflicts in the Middle East, Caribbean, and Eastern Europe (Head 2001).

Today, Robins Air Force Base consists of 8,435 acres with a compliment of over 19,000 personnel, civilian and military (Jorgenson and Cassidy 2006). It continues to provide a vital air support and maintenance role, and since 2001 has played a major role in the United States’ nation-building efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq.
PART II. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION

A. General Statement:

1. Architectural character: 504 Chiefs’ Circle is a modest but comfortable duplex residence built on a cul-de-sac along with four other duplexes, all facing the circular road. The duplex features fine brick detailing. Mature trees and landscaping create a tranquil setting amidst the busy Air Force base. Built with Colonial Revival elements, the building is among a small number of historic buildings on the base.

2. Condition of fabric: Overall, the building is in good condition.

B. Description of Exterior

The Colonial Revival style duplex residence is U-shaped in plan and has one-story, flat-roofed entry porches in the crook of each arm of the main (north) façade (see sketch plan). The duplex residence is 65 feet, 6 inches wide and 30 feet, 2 inches deep. It is six bays wide and two bays deep. The duplex residence is two stories high and has a low-pitched cross-gable roof. The gable of the spine faces east/west and the gables of the arms face north/south. 504A is located in the eastern half of the duplex and 504B is located in the western half. 504B is the mirror image of 504A.

504 Chiefs’ Circle has a concrete and brick foundation and exterior walls finished in brick with a running bond pattern. The upper portions of the gables are finished with vinyl siding and have triangular vents. The exterior walls are decorated with two belt courses. The first consists of a sailor course of oversized bricks and is located about 1 foot above the ground. The first-floor windows are articulated by header-course sills below and sailor-course lintels above. The kitchen windows on the rear elevation are the exceptions and do not have brick courses above and below. A sailor course also tops each of the doors. On either side of the rear doorway into the furnace room, the detailing of the sailor course differs—here it consists of two headers sandwiching one stretcher. The second brick course consists of a row of headers and is located immediately below the second-story windows.

There is an enclosed porch on each side elevation and a non-historic carport connected to each half of the duplex via a breezeway on the rear (south). The date of the attached carports is 1986. The date of the enclosing of the porches is unknown. In addition to the sunroom and carports, there is a flat-roofed, wooden entry porch at the front of each unit. The underside of the entry porch is clad with vinyl, and weathering stripping is located above the roof.

The one-story, flat-roof sunrooms have brick foundations, tar and pebble clad roofs, and vinyl clad walls. Cornices crown the walls. Weathering stripping is located above the sunroom roof. Openings in the front elevation include one vent and two
windows. The side elevations have two vents beneath the row of four windows. The rear elevations feature one vent with two windows above.

As noted above, the carports are connected to the duplexes via covered breezeways. The wood framed structures are built on concrete pads and supported by square brick columns. A brick-faced storage space is incorporated into the design. A soldier course is located below the door into the storage space. The roofs are clad with asphalt shingle.

There are two brick central interior chimneys, one in each unit. The front and rear doors are centrally located and a third entrance provides egress from the furnace room. All of the doors are modern and fitted with metal and glass storm doors. The windows are wood framed with replacement vinyl double-hung one-over-one sash. The main cross-gable roof is clad with asphalt shingle. The sunroom and flat entry porch roofs are clad with tar and pebbles.

**Additional Description:**

**Front elevation:** On the front elevation, the main entrances of each half are located under the entry porches in the two crooks of the U-shaped duplex. Three concrete steps lead up to the landings of both 504A and 504B. Six square wooden posts with bases and capitols support the entablatures and flat roofs. The entablature has only a plain frieze, clad with vertical slats, a cornice, and no architrave. The door casing is wood, while the metal replacement door has six panels (four rectangles panels topped by two small glass panels) with a glass storm door.

There are vents beneath the dining room and living room windows. First-floor openings consist of two entrances and four windows. From the center of the duplex out to the exterior walls, the first opening is a window looking into the dining room, the second opening is the entry, and the third opening is a window looking into the living room. There are three windows on the second floor. From the center of the duplex out to the exterior walls, the first window looks into the bathroom, the second looks into the hallway, and the third looks into the master bedroom. The windows on the front elevation have shutters.

**Side elevations:** There are two vents in the sunroom beneath the row of windows. On the first floor, openings consist of a door into the sunroom and one window looking into the current furnace room (formerly the family room).

**Rear elevation:** There is one vent under each of the kitchen windows. Openings on the first floor, from the middle of the duplex outwards, include a kitchen window, an entry door into the kitchen, an entry door into the furnace room, and a window looking into the furnace room. The kitchen window juts out from the wall. The raised entry into the kitchen is accessed via four concrete steps with a metal railing and covered by a breezeway supported by brick columns and connecting the duplex to the carport. The metal door has two panels at the bottom and a nine-light window.
above. There is a glass and metal storm door, as well. The entry into the furnace room is located at grade level and is accessed by a concrete threshold. The six-panel door has four rectangular panels topped by two small square panels. There is a metal and glass storm door. On the second floor, from the middle of the duplex outwards, is a double-window looking into one of the two rear bedrooms and a single window looking into the other rear bedroom. An area of brick has been replaced above the breezeway. Some staining has occurred to brick below a pipe on the rear elevation adjacent to the top of the breezeway.

C. Description of Interior:

504A

Floor plans: 504A has a central stair plan (see sketch plan). Working clockwise from the foyer on the first floor, the dining room is in the southwest corner, the kitchen is in the northwest corner, the furnace room (former family room) is located in the northeast corner, situated two steps down from the rest of the house, and the living room is in the southeast corner. The sunroom is located off the living room. In between the kitchen and furnace room is a rear hallway, powder room, and access to the exterior of the house under the breezeway. There is a closet just to the northeast of the stair. On the second floor, clockwise from the central hallway, there is a bathroom in the southwest corner, a bedroom in the northwest corner, a second bedroom in the northeast corner, and the master bedroom in the southeast corner of the duplex. From July 1965 to March 1968, 504 Chiefs’ Circle was used as a single-family unit. In March 1968, sheetrock was installed to close the doors between units A and B, restoring the building’s original status as a two-family unit (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989).

Stairways: The staircase is carpeted and incorporates 11 stairs, a landing, and one more stair before reaching the second-floor hallway. The original wood banister remains—the banister and newel caps have a polyurethane varnish and the newel posts and balusters are painted. The banister was refinished in 1998 (Baker Support Services 1998).

Flooring: The floors are primarily carpeted, with the exception of the foyer, which has oak block flooring installed in 1959 and refinished in 1999 (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989; Baker Support Services 1999); the kitchen, rear hallway, and first-floor bathroom, which have linoleum tiled floors; the furnace room, which has a paneled concrete floor; and the second-floor bathroom, which has a tiled floor. In December 1960, parquet flooring was installed in the dining room; it was covered with carpet at an unknown date (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989).

Wall and ceiling finish: The interior walls are plaster. The sunroom’s three walls are covered with vertical boards about 8 inches wide, and the ceiling is covered with
wood strips 3 to 4 inches wide. The brick on the interior wall of the sunroom is painted. The threshold is slightly lower than the rest of the duplex.

**Openings – Doorways and doors:** Typical doors, such as the bedroom doors on the second floor, are painted white and two-paneled, with one larger rectangular panel over a smaller square panel. Simple trim surrounds the door openings. There is a glass door with 15-lights between the living room and sunroom.

**Windows:** Windows have simple trim with shallow windowsills. Natural light filters through the windows. Before the sunroom was enclosed, a second window was located in the living room on the other side of the door; this window has now been converted to a built-in bookcase.

**Decorative features and trim:** The first-floor walls are articulated by crown moldings in the dining and living rooms, baseboards, and moldings around the door and window openings. The second-floor walls are articulated by baseboards and moldings around door and window openings. The kitchen is outfitted with oak cabinets installed in 1998, at which time some modern appliances were also installed (Baker Support Services 1998). There is a louvered slatted pantry door on a track. The powder room has modern fixtures and a built-in cabinet. In the living room, there is a central fireplace with built-in cabinets on either side, one of which now houses a vent. The fireplace has a painted brick surround and a tile hearth, and is decorated by moldings and a wood mantle. In the sunroom is a chair rail/sill on the three sidewalls under the windows.

There are two closets in the second floor hallway—one in between the two bedrooms in the northeast and southeast corners, and one in the southwest corner adjacent to the bathroom with built-in shelves. The bathroom has a wooden threshold. The fixtures were replaced in 1998, as were the walls (Baker Support Services 1998). The master (front) bedroom has two closets, one shallow and closer to the hall, and one square. They have built-in shelves and the square closet has a built-in shoe rack. The two smaller bedrooms have one closet each with built-ins. The bedroom on the southwest side has a bump out near the entrance.

**Hardware:** Original hardware remains on most of the doors, including the bedroom doors on the second floor.

**Mechanical equipment:** The gas furnace and water heater are located in the furnace room and were installed in late 1971 and early 1972 to replace an oil furnace and electric water heater (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989). There is an old furnace door in the furnace room stamped with “Taylor Iron Works, Macon, GA.” An attic exhaust fan was installed in 1977 (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989). The plumbing was replaced in 1998 (Baker Support Services 1998).
504B

504B is the mirror image of 504A. For example, the dining room is located in the southwest corner of 504A on the first floor; it is located in the southeast corner of 504B on the first floor. Consequently, only the differences between the two halves are provided in the following description.

**Mechanical equipment:** The plumbing, including the fresh water and hot water lines and the waste water system, was replaced in 1999 (Baker Support Services 1999).

**D. Site**

The Chiefs’ Circle duplex faces north and is situated on a cul-de-sac. The yard features a manicured lawn, landscaping, and mature trees. The house blends with the landscape. In the circle, benches, picnic tables, and swings invite leisurely enjoyment of the outdoors. Chiefs’ Circle is an oasis in the midst of modern facilities. While playing fields and plain, unarticulated office buildings are located across Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and a large warehouse is located beyond the circle to the west, there is a gently wooded slope leading down to a creek on the southeast side of the circle.

A concrete walkway leads from the cul-de-sac to the duplex splitting off closer to the house. Hedges and low plantings grow close to the front and sides of the duplex and a fir tree stands among the low plantings in the middle of the front of the house. At the rear of the duplex, the walkway leading to the furnace door of 504A is lined with brick pavers. The walkway leading to the furnace door of 504B is concrete. Deciduous and fir trees of varying maturity offer some shade to the property.
PART III. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

The attached sketch plan is available as part of Robins Air Force Base’s AF Forms 1430 and 1450, Real Property Accountable Record – Buildings, available at Real Property Office AKA 78 CEG/CERR, Warner Robins / Air Logistics Center, Robins Air Force Base, Georgia.
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PART IV. PROJECT INFORMATION

As part of the Military Family Housing Privatization Initiative at Robins Air Force Base, it is proposed to demolish 504 Chiefs’ Circle, constituting an adverse effect on the National Register District contributing building.

Prepared by: Kate Jefferson, Architectural Historian
Zana Wolf, Architectural Historian,
Jeffrey Harbison, Archaeologist

Affiliation: URS Corporation

Date: June 18, 2008
505 Chiefs’ Circle

Location:
505 Chiefs’ Circle
Warner Robins/Air Logistics Center, Robins Air Force Base, Houston County, Georgia 31098
505 Chiefs’ Circle is located in the southwest portion of a cul-de-sac off of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard roughly 700 feet to the west of Robins Parkway. Its primary façade faces the circle at a northeasterly angle. The house is located on Robins Air Force Base, east of the city of Warner Robins.

USGS Warner Robins SE Quadrangle (7.5’)
Universal Transverse Mercator Coordinates: 17 256895.0E 3611223.5N

Present Owner:
Robins Air Force Base

Present Occupant:
Vacant

Present Use:
None

Statement of Significance:
505 Chiefs’ Circle is one of five identical plan duplexes constructed adjacent to each other on Chiefs’ Circle in 1942. These dwellings are two-story duplexes and were built with Colonial Revival influences. All five buildings are sited around a circular street (Chiefs’ Circle) and face one another.
PART I. HISTORICAL INFORMATION

A. Physical History

1. Date of erection: 1942

2. Engineer: United States Corp of Engineers, Savannah District

3. Original and subsequent owners: Robins Air Force Base

4. Builder: Griffin, Mion, and Shepard

5. Original plans and construction: The building’s original cost was $17,119 (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989).

6. Alterations and additions: There is an enclosed porch or sunroom on each side elevation and a non-historic carport connected to each half of the duplex via a breezeway on the rear (west). The date of the enclosing of the porches is unknown. The date of the attached carports is 1986.

B. Historical Context

The initial incarnation of Robins Air Force Base was constructed in 1941, and was operational in early 1942. It was originally called the Wellston Air Depot, though its name was changed before its completion to Robins Field. In 1943, the base was officially designated Warner Robins Army Air Depot in honor of Brigadier General Augustine Warner Robins, one of the Army Air Corps’ first General Staff Officers. Later, in 1947, when President Truman made the U.S. Air Force a separate and independent branch of the military, the base was again renamed Robins Air Force Base. The base went through several more incarnations as its mission changed and its role expanded over the years.

In the years preceding WWII, the civic leaders of Macon courted military facilities to move into central Georgia, such as Camp Wheeler and Cochran Field, as well as military industrial producers, such as the Naval Ordinance Plant. When a new air depot was slated for the southeast as part of an Army Air Corps expansion effort under the 1935 Wilcox-Wilson Bill, Macon provided the Air Corps with several suitable sites. A 3,000-acre site at Wellston (in Houston County) was chosen, and the construction contract was awarded to Griffin, Mion, and Shepherd of Atlanta. The site was developed under the guidance of Brigadier General Charles E. Thomas, the commanding officer of the base from 1941 through 1944 (Chapman 1944).

Construction of the Wellston Air Depot commenced in June 1941 and included construction of the airfield and 15 structures, consisting of aircraft maintenance and repair facilities, warehouse facilities, administrative offices, utilities, and a
housekeeping facility (temporary housing). In addition to the operational facilities, 10 permanent structures were also constructed as military family housing. These 10 structures include the five mirror duplex houses at Chiefs’ Circle and five single-family homes in an area called Officer’s Circle, later part of the Forest Park housing area.

Portions of the air depot were still under construction at the commencement of hostilities for U.S. involvement in WWII, in December 1941. Under the command of General Thomas, the air depot doubled in size and became the Air Service Command HQ for the 3rd Air Force; by 1943, all military aircraft in the southeastern United States were supplied and serviced by personnel from the Area Air Service Command at the Warner Robins Air Depot. During this period, filling staff positions, finding technically trained personnel, and housing the influx of soldiers were problematic logistical hurdles (Chapman 1944; Head et al. 2001).

Housing was an issue from the start. Before construction, the town of Wellston consisted of a general store, service station, and approximately a half dozen residences with a population of 50 (Westfall 2006). Capt. E. B. Boynton (U.S. Army, retired), area engineer for the construction of Wellston Air Depot, described the area as not having any suitable places to live and chose to operate out of Macon, to the north (Head et al. 2001). Likewise, Lt. Col. G. E. Kegin (USAF, retired) described a similar scenario, renting a “closet apartment” in Macon and eventually moving into a semi-completed warehouse on the base during the spring of 1942 (Head et al. 2001).

The installation at Wellston Air Depot was initially conceived as a flying field with an operational complement of 350 personnel, officers and enlisted men—as stated in a telegram to the Macon Chamber of Commerce from U.S. Congressman Carl Vinson in 1941 (Westfall 2006). Housing at the base initially consisted of 15 family units, five standalone single-family dwellings, and five two-family duplexes. The duplexes at Chiefs’ Circle were originally conceived as housing for noncommissioned officers (NCO) able to accommodate 10 families. Conceivably, housing for the remaining personnel would follow, but with the country going to war—and the role of Warner Robins as aviation training and maintenance hub—things changed rapidly and with urgency. Provisions needed to be made to accommodate a rapid influx of personnel in spite of lacking local infrastructure.

At the height of its growth, Warner Robins employed 23,500 people, military and civilian. By 1943, there were 35,000 troops in training at facilities within the Warner Robins Air Service Command Area, and approximately 50,000 troops were deployed overseas (Chapman 1944). The influx of personnel overwhelmed the capacity of the town, which had few accommodations to begin with. Many of the troops and trainees were housed at a 3,000-acre cantonment area built to house incoming personnel. Civilian employees and others were housed in federally sponsored housing and in trailers. Housing was being utilized as rapidly as it was
constructed. A 1944 document discussing the housing situation at Warner Robins states that

Housing is frequently mentioned as a cause for dissatisfaction with employment or possible employment at Robins Field. Rural Housing is admittedly poor. The surrounding towns, especially Macon and Perry, are grossly overcrowded and inadequate housing is in use in many instances [Unidentified 1944].

Federally sponsored construction was providing new housing at a rapid rate. In early 1943, there were 405 Federal Public Housing Authority (FPHA) units under construction, which were being released for occupation at a rate of 40 to 50 per week. New Federal Housing Authority (FHA) construction consisted of 200 homes to be completed at a rate of four to five per week. Lists of occupied housing indicate rapid growth from new construction. Segregation is evident in listings showing separate provisions for minority, “Colored” occupation (Unidentified 1944).

Although constructed as NCO housing, Chiefs’ Circle was rescheduled as officer’s quarters. Given the general housing conditions and the relative dearth of accommodations, newly constructed quarters would likely have been billeted for officer use; this occurred at various points during the history of the base. In 1952, the Status of Housing and Occupancy Report, AF Form 132, indicated that in May of that year, the status of the Double Officer Family Quarters were changed to “NCO Family Quarters” at the request of headquarters (Bush 1952). Later, in 1957, maintenance records indicated the buildings were “Junior Officers Quarters” (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989).

The NCO quarters were originally designated buildings No. 1431, 1432, 1433, 1434, and 1435. At some point between 1952 and 1957, the buildings were renumbered and became buildings 500, 501, 502, 504, and 505 (Bush 1952; Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989). Building 1434 became 501. This change in the numbering suggests reorganization or possible expansion of the base, and likely coincides with changes in mission focus during the 1950s, though it could also be due to recovery from a natural disaster.

In 1953, a tornado hit the city of Warner Robins and the air base. There were 19 deaths and approximately 300 people were injured. Most of the deaths were people in base housing (Tornado Project 2008). As a result of this natural disaster, a major rebuilding effort was undertaken and the city continued to grow and develop.

In March 1946, immediately following WWII, the working population on the base dropped precipitously to approximately 3,900 people. As soldiers readjusted to civilian life, many of them returned to their original homes. Others stayed, gambling that the base would remain as other installations in the area were decommissioned. Robins Air Force Base continued to play a critical role,
participating in the Berlin Air Lift in 1948 and 1949. In the 1950s, the base became a logistical hub for maintaining C-130 aircraft; during the Korean War, the base expanded to support the addition of the Nineteenth Bombardment Wing of the Strategic Air Command. During the Vietnam War, the base provided a critical link for aircraft maintenance and troop resupply. It managed support of bombers and helicopter gunships, as well as AC-130 gunships and a vital suite of cargo aircraft. Through the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, Warner Robins continued to provide maintenance and support, as the Warner Robins Air Materiel Area, for a variety of attack and cargo aircraft, and provided material supply to ground forces during conflicts in the Middle East, Caribbean, and Eastern Europe (Head 2001).

Today, Robins Air Force Base consists of 8,435 acres with a compliment of over 19,000 personnel, civilian and military (Jorgenson and Cassidy 2006). It continues to provide a vital air support and maintenance role, and since 2001 has played a major role in the United States’ nation-building efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq.
PART II. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION

A. General Statement:

1. Architectural character: 505 Chiefs’ Circle is a modest but comfortable duplex residence built on a cul-de-sac along with four other duplexes, all facing the circular road. The duplex features fine brick detailing. Mature trees and landscaping create a tranquil setting amidst the busy Air Force base. Built with Colonial Revival elements, the building is among a small number of historic buildings on the base.

2. Condition of fabric: Overall, the building is in good condition.

B. Description of Exterior

The Colonial Revival style duplex residence is U-shaped in plan and has one-story, flat-roofed entry porches in the crook of each arm of the main (east) façade (see sketch plan). The duplex residence is 65 feet, 6 inches wide and 30 feet, 2 inches deep. It is six bays wide and two bays deep. The duplex residence is two stories high and has a low-pitched cross-gable roof. The gable of the spine faces east/west and the gable of the arms face north/south. 505A is located in the eastern half of the duplex and 505B is located in the western half. 505B is the mirror image of 505A.

505 Chiefs’ Circle has a concrete and brick foundation and exterior walls finished in brick with a running bond pattern. The upper portions of the gables are finished with vinyl siding and have triangular vents. The exterior walls are decorated with two belt courses. The first consists of a sailor course of oversized bricks and is located about 1 foot above the ground. The first-floor windows are articulated by header-course sills below and sailor-course lintels above. The kitchen windows on the rear elevation are the exceptions and do not have brick courses above and below. A sailor course also tops each of the doors. On either side of the rear doorway into the furnace room, the detailing of the sailor course differs—here it consists of two headers sandwiching one stretcher. The second brick course consists of a row of headers and is located immediately below the second-story windows.

There is an enclosed porch on each side elevation and a non-historic carport connected to each half of the duplex via a breezeway on the rear (west). The date of the attached carports is 1986. The date of the enclosing of the porches is unknown. In addition to the sunroom and carports there is a flat-roofed, wooden entry porch at the front of each unit. The underside of the entry porch is clad with vinyl, and weathering stripping is located above the roof.

The one-story, flat-roof sunrooms have brick foundations, tar and pebble clad roofs, and vinyl clad walls. Cornices crown the walls. Weathering stripping is located above the sunroom roof. Openings in the front elevation include one vent and two
windows. The side elevations have two vents beneath the row of four windows. The rear elevations feature one vent with two windows above.

As noted above, the carports are connected to the duplexes via covered breezeways. The wood framed structures are built on concrete pads and supported by square brick columns. A brick-faced storage space is incorporated into the design. A soldier course is located below the door into the storage space. The roofs are clad with asphalt shingle.

There are two brick central interior chimneys, one in each unit. The front and rear doors are centrally located and a third entrance provides egress from the furnace room. All of the doors are modern and fitted with metal and glass storm doors. The windows are wood framed with replacement vinyl double-hung one-over-one sash. The main cross-gable roof is clad with asphalt shingle. The sunroom and flat entry porch roofs are clad with tar and pebbles.

**Additional Description:**

**Front elevation:** On the front elevation, the main entrances of each half are located under the entry porches in the two crooks of the U-shaped duplex. Three concrete steps lead up to the landings of both 505A and 505B. Six square wooden posts with bases and capitols support the entablatures and flat roofs. The entablature has only a plain frieze, clad with vertical slats, a cornice, and no architrave. The door casing is wood, while the metal replacement door has six panels (four rectangles panels topped by two small glass panels) with a glass storm door.

There are vents beneath the dining room and living room windows. First-floor openings consist of two entrances and four windows. From the center of the duplex out to the exterior walls, the first opening is a window looking into the dining room, the second opening is the entry, and the third opening is a window looking into the living room. There are three windows on the second floor. From the center of the duplex out to the exterior walls, the first window looks into the bathroom, the second looks into the hallway, and the third looks into the master bedroom. The windows on the front elevation have shutters.

**Side elevations:** There are two vents in the sunroom beneath the row of windows. On the first floor, openings consist of a door into the sunroom and one window looking into the current furnace room (formerly the family room).

**Rear elevation:** There is one vent under each of the kitchen windows. Openings on the first floor, from the middle of the duplex outwards, include a kitchen window, an entry door into the kitchen, an entry door into the furnace room, and a window looking into the furnace room. The kitchen window juts out from the wall. The raised entry into the kitchen is accessed via four concrete steps with a metal railing and covered by a breezeway supported by brick columns and connecting the duplex to the carport. The metal door has two panels at the bottom and a nine-light window.
above. There is a glass and metal storm door, as well. The entry into the furnace room is located at grade level and is accessed by a concrete threshold. The six-panel door has four rectangular panels topped by two small square panels. There is a metal and glass storm door. On the second floor, from the middle of the duplex outwards, is a double-window looking into one of the two rear bedrooms and a single window looking into the other rear bedroom. An area of brick has been replaced above the breezeway. Some staining has occurred to brick below a pipe on the rear elevation adjacent to the top of the breezeway.

C. Description of Interior:

505A

Floor plans: 505A has a central stair plan (see sketch plan). Working clockwise from the foyer on the first floor, the dining room is in the southwest corner, the kitchen is in the northwest corner, the furnace room (former family room) is located in the northeast corner, situated two steps down from the rest of the house, and the living room is in the southeast corner. The sunroom is located off the living room. In between the kitchen and furnace room is a rear hallway, powder room, and access to the exterior of the house under the breezeway. There is a closet just to the northeast of the stair. On the second floor, clockwise from the central hallway, there is a bathroom in the southwest corner, a bedroom in the northwest corner, a second bedroom in the northeast corner, and the master bedroom in the southeast corner of the duplex.

Stairways: The staircase is carpeted and incorporates 11 stairs, a landing, and one more stair before reaching the second floor hallway. The original wood banister remains—the banister and newel caps have a polyurethane varnish and the newel posts and balusters are painted.

Flooring: The floors are primarily carpeted, with the exception of the foyer and dining room, which have oak block flooring installed in 1959 and refinished in 1999 (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989; Baker Support Services 1999); the kitchen, rear hallway, and first-floor bathroom, which have linoleum tiled floors; the furnace room, which has a paneled concrete floor; and the second-floor bathroom, which has a tiled floor.

Wall and ceiling finish: The interior walls are plaster. The sunroom’s three walls are covered with vertical boards about 8 inches wide, and the ceiling is covered with wood strips 3 to 4 inches wide. The brick on the interior wall of the sunroom is painted. The threshold is slightly lower than the rest of the duplex.

Openings – Doorways and doors: Typical doors, such as the bedroom doors on the second floor, are painted white and two-paneled, with one larger rectangular panel
over a smaller square panel. Simple trim surrounds the door openings. There is a glass door with 15-lights between the living room and sunroom.

**Windows:** Windows have simple trim with shallow windowsills. Natural light filters through the windows. Before the sunroom was enclosed, a second window was located in the living room on the other side of the door; this window has now been converted to a built-in bookcase.

**Decorative features and trim:** The first-floor walls are articulated by crown moldings in the dining and living rooms, baseboards, and moldings around the door and window openings. The second-floor walls are articulated by baseboards and moldings around door and window openings. The kitchen is outfitted with oak cabinets installed in 1999, at which time some modern appliances were also installed (Baker Support Services 1999). There is a louvered slatted pantry door on a track. The powder room has modern fixtures and a built-in cabinet. In the living room, there is a central fireplace with built-in cabinets on either side, one of which now houses a vent. The fireplace has an unpainted brick surround and a tile hearth, and is decorated by moldings and a wood mantle. In the sunroom is a chair rail/sill on the three side walls under the windows.

There are two closets in the second floor hallway—one in between the two bedrooms in the northeast and southeast corners, and one in the southwest corner adjacent to the bathroom with built-in shelves. The bathroom has a wooden threshold. The master (front) bedroom has two closets, one shallow and closer to the hall, and one square. They have built-in shelves and the square closet has a built-in shoe rack. The two smaller bedrooms have one closet each with built-ins. The bedroom on the northwest side has a bump out near the entrance.

**Hardware:** Original hardware remains on most of the doors, including those on the bedroom doors on the second floor.

**Mechanical equipment:** The gas furnace and water heater are located in the furnace room and were installed in late 1971 and early 1972 to replace an oil furnace and electric water heater (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989). There is an old furnace door in the furnace room stamped with “Taylor Iron Works, Macon, GA.” An attic exhaust fan was installed in 1977 (Robins Air Force Base 1957–1989). The plumbing was replaced in 1998 (Baker Support Services 1998).

**505B**

505B is the mirror image of 505A. For example, the dining room is located in the southwest corner of 505A on the first floor; it is located in the southeast corner of 505B on the first floor. Consequently, only the differences between the two halves are provided in the following description.
Exterior: A ramp was removed from the front door in 1999 (Baker Support Services 1999).

Stairways: The banister was refinished in 1999 (Baker Support Services 1999).

Dining room: The carpet was removed in 1999 (Baker Support Services 1999).

Living room: Unlike 505A, the fireplace brick surround in 505B is unpainted.

Second-floor bathroom: In 1999, the fixtures were replaced, as were the walls (Baker Support Services 1999).

Sunroom: The cornice boards were removed and replaced with crown moldings in 1999 (Baker Support Services 1999).

Mechanical equipment: The plumbing, including the fresh water and hot water lines and the waste water system, was replaced in 1999 (Baker Support Services 1999).

D. Site

The Chiefs’ Circle duplex is situated on a cul-de-sac. The yard features a manicured lawn, landscaping, and mature trees. The house blends with the landscape. In the circle, benches, picnic tables, and swings invite leisurely enjoyment of the outdoors. Chiefs’ Circle is an oasis in the midst of modern facilities. While playing fields and plain, unarticulated office buildings are located across Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and a large warehouse is located beyond the circle to the west, there is a gently wooded slope leading down to a creek on the southeast side of the circle.

A concrete walkway leads from the cul-de-sac to the duplex splitting off closer to the house. Hedges and low plantings grow close to the front and sides of the duplex and a fir tree stands among the low plantings in the middle of the front of the house. At the rear of the duplex, the walkway leading to the furnace door of 505A is lined with wood beams and filled with white pebbles. The walkway leading to the furnace door of 505B is concrete. Deciduous and fir trees of varying maturity offer some shade to the property.
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The attached sketch plan is available as part of Robins Air Force Base’s AF Forms 1430 and 1450, Real Property Accountable Record – Buildings, available at Real Property Office AKA 78 CEG/CERR, Warner Robins / Air Logistics Center, Robins Air Force Base, Georgia.
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HABS No. GA-

GA-    - 1 General view of the Chiefs’ Circle in context. View looking south.

GA-    - 2 General view of the Chiefs’ Circle entrance sign in context. View looking southeast.

GA-    - 3 General view of the Chiefs’ Circle from the roof of Building 502. View looking west.

GA-    - 4 General view of the Chiefs’ Circle from drive of Building 504. View looking northeast.

GA-    - 5 General view of Building 500 in context from Building 505 carport. View looking north.

GA-    - 6 South front elevation. View looking north.

GA-    - 7 West elevation. View looking east.

GA-    - 8 Oblique view of west and north rear elevations. View looking southeast.

GA-    - 9 West half of north rear elevation. View looking south.

GA-    - 10 East elevation. View looking west.

GA-    - 11 Detail of front entrance to “A” side. View looking north.

GA-    - 12 Interior view within “A” side of bedroom and closet doors along 2nd floor hallway. View looking west.

GA-    - 13 Interior view of built in closet in 2nd floor bedroom in northeast corner. View looking west.

GA-    - 14 General view of Building 501 in context from Building 505. View looking north.

GA-    - 15 General view of Building 501 in context from the circle interior. View
looking northeast.

GA - 16 South front elevation. View looking north.

GA - 17 Oblique view of north and west elevations. View looking southeast.

GA - 18 East elevation. View looking west.

GA - 19 Detail of north rear entrance and covered walk to garage. View looking west.

GA - 20 Interior view within “A” side of 2nd floor stairhall and banister/balustrade treatment from Intermediate landing. View looking west.

GA - 21 Interior view of utility room within “A” side, looking through to the kitchen. View looking east.


GA - 23 General view of Building 502 in context from across the circle. View looking southeast.

GA - 24 General view of Building 502 in context from the front yard of Building 504 (with Building 501 visible to left). View looking east.


GA - 26 Northeast elevation. Looking southwest.

GA - 27 Southeast rear elevation. Looking northwest.

GA - 28 Southwest elevation. Looking northeast.

GA - 29 Detail of “A” side carport connection to dwelling, rear entrance, and general configuration of the dwelling backside. Looking south.

GA - 30 Detail of “B” side carport. Looking northeast.

GA - 31 Interior view of “B” side living room and looking into front foyer. View looking southeast.

GA - 32 Interior of “A” side 1st floor enclosed porch. View looking south.

GA - 33 Interior of “B” side 2nd floor stairhall. View looking west.
GA- - 34 Interior of “B” side 2nd floor bathroom. View looking north.

GA- - 35 General view of Building 504 in context from the Chiefs’ Circle drive. View looking south.

GA- - 36 General view of Building 504 in context from Building 502 side yard. View looking southwest.

GA- - 37 North front elevation. View looking south.

GA- - 38 East elevation. Looking west.


GA- - 40 West elevation. View looking east.

GA- - 41 Interior view in “B” side of living room. View looking south.

GA- - 42 Interior view in “B” side within front foyer. View looking south.

GA- - 43 Interior view in “A” side of kitchen. View looking south.

GA- - 44 Interior view in “B” side of 2nd floor stairhall. View looking southeast.

GA- - 45 General view of Building 505 in context from across the circle. View looking south.

GA- - 46 General view of Building 505 in context from Chiefs’ Circle drive. View looking southeast.

GA- - 47 East front elevation. View looking west.

GA- - 48 South elevation. View looking north.

GA- - 49 Oblique view of west rear and south elevations. View looking northeast.

GA- - 50 North elevation. View looking south.

GA- - 51 Interior view in “A” side of enclosed porch door and window that has been converted to shelving. View looking south.
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APPENDIX E

AGENCY / PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE
### Table E-1. Summary of Chief’s Circle Section 106 Consultation Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>To/From</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-Jan-07</td>
<td>To SHPO</td>
<td>Notified SHPO of Robins’ intent to convert Chief’s Circle to admin space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Feb-07</td>
<td>From SHPO</td>
<td>Response to letter dated 12 Jan 07 requesting additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Feb-07</td>
<td>To SHPO</td>
<td>Response to letter dated 14 Feb 07 providing additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Mar-07</td>
<td>From SHPO</td>
<td>SHPO concurs on a finding of no adverse effect on the Chief’s Circle conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Aug-07</td>
<td>To SHPO</td>
<td>Proposed Demolition of Chief’s Circle - CE has made a different decision and now wants to demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Aug-07</td>
<td>To ACHP</td>
<td>Notified ACHP at the same time as SHPO about the proposed demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Sep-07</td>
<td>From ACHP</td>
<td>Notified Robins’ of their intent to participate in the consultation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Sep-07</td>
<td>From SHPO</td>
<td>Advising Robins’ that the next step in the Section 106 process in considering alternatives to the demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Jun-08</td>
<td>From SHPO</td>
<td>References their site visit and again stresses the importance of alternatives to demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Jun-08</td>
<td>To SHPO</td>
<td>Sent DRAFT Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for their review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Jun-08</td>
<td>To ACHP</td>
<td>Sent DRAFT MOA for their review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Jun-08</td>
<td>From ACHP</td>
<td>Will not comment on the MOA until all alternatives have been considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Jun-08</td>
<td>To SHPO</td>
<td>Sent DRAFT Environmental Assessment (EA) for their review that includes alternatives to demolition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25-Jun-08  To ACHP  Sent DRAFT EA for their review that includes alternatives to demolition

30-Jun-08  From SHPO  Will not comment on the MOA until all alternatives have been considered

28-Jul-08  From ACHP  Does not feel the EA adequately addresses or considers alternatives to demolition

31-Jul-08  From SHPO  Does not feel the EA adequately addresses or considers alternatives to demolition

17-Sep-08  To ACHP  Response to EA review comments clarifying efforts to find alternatives to demolition

17-Sep-08  To SHPO  Response to EA review comments clarifying efforts to find alternatives to demolition

28-Oct-08  From SHPO  Questioned the conclusion that is no possible reuse/Planning & analysis has been bias toward demolition/Suggests providing as low-income housing or housing for homeless

10-Nov-08  From ACHP  Questioned the conclusion that is no possible reuse/Planning & analysis has been bias toward demolition/Suggests providing as low-income housing or housing for homeless

3-Mar-09  To SHPO  Sent table of alternatives for their review & informed of commander's 2 preferred alternatives: keep 1 building as representative of district and maintain for soft uses or keep 1 building and move it to another location on or off base

20-Mar-09  To ACHP  Sent table of alternatives for their review & informed of commander's 2 preferred alternatives: keep 1 building as representative of district and maintain for soft uses or keep 1 building and move it to another location on or off base

3-Apr-09  From ACHP  Questioned the level of effort that AF has put into determining that only 1 building can be retained/Requests a more detailed account of AF efforts

3-Apr-09  From SHPO  Questioned the level of effort put into determining that only 1 building can be retained/Suggested using houses for homeless veterans
11-Dec-09 To SHPO
Informed of the search for logistically and economically feasible options/Most economically feasible and logistically practical alternatives are to demolish 4 and keep 1 building and either keep on base or relocate/Attached list of alternatives and cost estimates for each alternative

11-Dec-09 To ACHP
Informed of the search for logistically and economically feasible options/Most economically feasible and logistically practical alternatives are to demolish 4 and keep 1 building and either keep on base or relocate/Attached list of alternatives and cost estimates for each alternative

26-Jan-10 From ACHP
Suggested that relocating all 5 buildings should be the minimal target objective

26-Jan-10 From SHPO
Suggested that relocating all 5 buildings should be the minimal target objective

26-Jan-11 To SHPO
Informed that City of WR no longer interested in acquiring one house and that no other potential users have been found/requested guidance & assistance

26-Jan-11 To ACHP
Informed that City of WR no longer interested in acquiring one house and that no other potential users have been found/requested guidance & assistance

24-Feb-11 Call from ACHP
Requested Conference call regarding Chiefs' Circle

24-Feb-11 Email to SHPO
Informed of future conference call and established date for conference call

28-Mar-11 Conference call with ACHP & SHPO
Told ACHP & SHPO all alternatives considered and the cost estimates for each/Told them that we were recently informed of one potential use for 1 house/Told them that we feel the best option is to demo four houses and keep 1/ACHP & SHPO agreed to this alternative and asked us to draft MOA
Table E-2. CHIEF’S CIRCLE ALTERNATIVES COMMUNICATION LOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PHONE/EMAIL</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debra Jones</td>
<td>Keep Warner Robins Beautiful</td>
<td>23-Jul-08</td>
<td>478-929-7258</td>
<td>Contacted to help get the word out to the community She sent building information and pictures to several area contractors and developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24-Jul-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Carpenter</td>
<td>Carpenter Construction</td>
<td>31-Jul-08</td>
<td>478-929-4159</td>
<td>Contacted to give an expert opinion of the feasibility and practicality of moving the Chief's Circle duplexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Lords</td>
<td>Lords of Macon</td>
<td>23-Jul-08</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gahustler@cox.net">gahustler@cox.net</a></td>
<td>Contacted to give an expert opinion on the feasibility and practicality of moving the Chief's Circle duplexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-Jul-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Ford</td>
<td>NewTown Macon</td>
<td>23-Jul-08</td>
<td>478-722-9909</td>
<td>President of NewTown Macon and is instrumental to the revitalization effort in downtown Macon We contacted him to see if his or any other organization he has contacts with would be interested in the buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-Jul-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sillers</td>
<td>Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td>23-Jun-08</td>
<td>478-328-3388</td>
<td>Site visit to Chief's Circle - is VERY interested in utilizing several components of Chief's Circle in new housing projects in the Middle Georgia area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23-Jul-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Hardegree</td>
<td>Georgia Recycling Coalition</td>
<td>23-Jul-08</td>
<td>404-637-3095</td>
<td>Contacted in regards to the reuse/recycling of the buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Busch</td>
<td>Georgia Department of Natural</td>
<td>28-Jul-08</td>
<td>404-362-2539</td>
<td>Contacted in regards to the reuse/recycling of the buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha Buzzell</td>
<td>City of Warner Robins</td>
<td>21-Oct-09</td>
<td>478-922-5100</td>
<td>Met to discuss the City of Warner Robins potentially obtaining one of the Chiefs' Circle buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Company/Position</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Contact Information</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha Buzzell</td>
<td>City of Warner Robins</td>
<td>9-Nov-09</td>
<td>478-922-5100</td>
<td>Gave a tour of Chiefs' Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Mary Therese</td>
<td>21st Century Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Bluhm</td>
<td>Museum of Aviation</td>
<td>24-Nov-09</td>
<td>478-926-7311</td>
<td>Contacted in regards to acquiring one of the buildings, but Mr. Bluhm stated that they don't have the expertise or resources to care for cultural resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Head</td>
<td>RAFB Historian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha Buzzell</td>
<td>City of Warner Robins</td>
<td>31-Mar-10</td>
<td>478-922-5100</td>
<td>Discussed the history of Chiefs' Circle &amp; funding of moving one of the buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Mary Therese</td>
<td>21st Century Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21st Century Partnership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha Buzzell</td>
<td>City of Warner Robins</td>
<td>30-Apr-10</td>
<td>478-922-5100</td>
<td>City of Warner Robins requested quotes to move one of the buildings &amp; said that they were applying for a grant to fund the move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Mary Therese</td>
<td>21st Century Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sent quotes from several companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21st Century Partnership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha Buzzell</td>
<td>City of Warner Robins</td>
<td>13-Aug-10</td>
<td>478-922-5100</td>
<td>Marsha said that the grant was not funded and the City has indicated any further interest in acquiring the building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Mary Therese</td>
<td>21st Century Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Chivira</td>
<td>Hunt Housing Company</td>
<td>28-Jul-10</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Daniel.Chavira@huntcompanies.com">Daniel.Chavira@huntcompanies.com</a></td>
<td>Gave a tour of Chiefs' Circle Not interested in using the houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Sharples</td>
<td>RAFB</td>
<td>26-Oct-10</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robert.sharples@robins.af.mil">robert.sharples@robins.af.mil</a></td>
<td>Checked with lodging to see if they are interested in using Chiefs' Circle for storage but they said they are not interested not interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzie O'neal</td>
<td>RAFB Space Utilization</td>
<td>29-Oct-10</td>
<td><a href="mailto:suzanne.oneal@robins.af.mil">suzanne.oneal@robins.af.mil</a></td>
<td>Checked to see if they could find alternative uses for Chiefs' Circle but she could not find any use for them OSI may be able to use one unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
78th Air Base Wing (AFMC)
Robins Air Force Base Georgia

78 CEG/CEVP
755 Macon St., Bldg 1555
Robins AFB, GA 31098

12 January 2007

Betsy Shirk
Environmental Review Coordinator
Historic Preservation Division
Department of Natural Resources
34 Peachtree Street, NW Suite 1600
Atlanta, GA 30303-2316

RE: Conversion of Chief’s Circle Historic Buildings to Administrative Function

Ms. Shirk

As you know, the number of housing units on Robins Air Force Base will soon be dramatically reduced, as the Air Force has determined that fewer houses will be needed in the future to support the mission. The purpose of this letter is to notify your office that the five buildings which comprise our Chief’s Circle Historic District are no longer slated to be used as housing, and will likely be converted to some type of administrative function such as general office use. Consequently, the base housing office is now relinquishing its management responsibility for them. There are no plans at this time to perform modifications to the buildings. If another base organization decides to claim them for their use, we expect that they will request permission from our office to install additional phone and computer communication lines in each unit. We will, of course, ensure that the proper procedures are abided by to protect the integrity of these buildings, and will contact your office once we know more details concerning future uses for them.

Robins Air Force Base acknowledges a 30-day calendar day review period from the date we receive the return receipt. Should we not receive any comments within that time frame, we will assume you do not object to our request and we shall proceed with the project request as directed in 36 Code of Federal Regulation 800 and our State Historic Preservation Office approved Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan. Should you have any questions or need further information, please contact Becky Crader at 478/327-8288.

FRED HURSEY
Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
Environmental Management Division
February 14, 2007

Fred Hursey
Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
Environmental Management Division
Department of the Air Force
78th Air Base Wing (AFMC)
78 CEG/CEVP
755 Macon Street, Building 1555
Robins Air Force Base, Georgia 31098

RE: Robins AFB: Conversion of Chief's Circle HD Housing Units to Administrative Functions
Houston County, Georgia
HP-070118-050

Dear Mr. Hursey:

The Historic Preservation Division (HPD) has received the information submitted concerning the above referenced undertaking. Our comments are offered to assist the US Department of the Air Force and Robins Air Force Base in complying with the provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA).

Based on the information contained in your letter, it appears that changing the function of the Chief's Circle Historic District buildings from housing to administrative use would have no adverse effect to these historic properties. However, we need additional information to agree that this is indeed the case. Please tell us how long these housing units will be left vacant, to whom you are relinquishing their maintenance in the interim, and what the plans are for the future of the buildings. If another base organization does not claim them for their use, it will be necessary to stabilize the buildings while vacant and provide for their care. The Air Force remains responsible for the maintenance of these buildings under provisions of Section 110 of the NHPA.

We look forward to working with you as this project progresses. Please refer to project number HP-070118-050 in any future correspondence regarding this undertaking. If we may be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact Michelle Volkema, Environmental Review Specialist, at (404) 651-6546, or myself, at (404) 651-6624.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Shirk
Environmental Review Coordinator

ES:mv

cc: Kristina Harpst, Middle Georgia RDC
RE: HP-070118-050; Conversion of Chief's Circle HD Housing Units to Administrative Functions, Houston County, Georgia

Ms. Shirk

Per our recent communication with your office regarding the conversion of Robins' Chief's Circle Historic District to administrative use (HP-070118-050), the Base is simply desirous of transferring management responsibility for the District from the Military Family Housing office to the Real Property office. Both offices work for the 78 Civil Engineering Group, as does our Environmental Management Division. The word "conversion" is actually misleading, as it implies that the buildings will promptly be reconfigured for administrative use once the housing office relinquishes control over them. In reality, they will remain as they are until a decision is reached concerning their use as administrative facilities, they will continue to be maintained by the same civil engineering staff as before, and our office will continue to inspect them to ensure that their historical integrity remains intact. We have not yet seen specific plans for their use, but it appears that they will likely be used within one year as office space for the Air Force Reserve Command, and that use will obviously entail some form of actual conversion such as the installation of computer communication lines. We will send a status report to your office within one year of the date of this letter providing an update concerning the maintenance of these buildings and any details we might have received concerning their future use. We have notified all interested parties concerning the regulatory process involved in reviewing design plans for potential modifications to these buildings, and we will, of course, strive to minimize the impact of any needed modifications, emphasize the principles of adaptive reuse, and notify your office promptly once conversion details have been drafted.

Robins Air Force Base acknowledges a 30-day calendar day review period from the date we receive the return receipt. Should we not receive any comments within that time frame, we will assume you do not object to our request and we shall proceed with the project request as directed.
in 36 Code of Federal Regulation 800 and our State Historic Preservation Office approved Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan. Should you have any questions or need further information, please contact Becky Crader at 478/327-8288.

FRED HURSEY
Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
Environmental Management Division
March 15, 2007

Fred Hursey  
Chief, Environmental Programming Branch  
Environmental Management Division  
Department of the Air Force  
78th Air Base Wing (AFMC)  
78 CEG/CEVP  
755 Macon Street, Building 1555  
Robins Air Force Base, Georgia 31098

RE: Robins AFB: Conversion of Chief's Circle HD Housing Units to Administrative Functions  
Houston County, Georgia  
HP-070118-050

Dear Mr. Hursey:

The Historic Preservation Division (HPD) has received the additional information submitted concerning the above referenced undertaking. Our comments are offered to assist the US Department of the Air Force and Robins Air Force Base in complying with the provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA).

Based on the information submitted, we agree that the project as proposed will have no adverse effect to the Chief’s Circle Historic District. We understand that conversion plans, when available, will be submitted to our office for review and comment. If not within one year, we will look forward to receiving a status report that provides an update concerning the maintenance of these buildings and any details that are available concerning their future use.

We look forward to working with you as this project progresses. Please refer to project number HP-070118-050 in any future correspondence regarding this undertaking. If we may be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact Elizabeth (Betsy) Shirk, Environmental Review Coordinator, at (404) 651-6624.

Sincerely,

Karen Anderson Cordova  
Manager, Planning and Local Assistance Unit

KAC/ECS

cc: Kristina Harpst, Middle Georgia RDC
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
78th Air Base Wing (AFMC)
Robins Air Force Base Georgia

78 CEG/CEVP
775 Macon St., Bldg 1555
Robins AFB, GA 31098

Betsy Shirk
Environmental Review Coordinator
Historic Preservation Division
Department of Natural Resources
34 Peachtree Street, NW Suite 1600
Atlanta, GA 30303-2316

29 August 2007

RE: Proposed Demolition of Chief's Circle Historic District: Robins AFB, Georgia

Ms. Shirk

This letter officially notifies the Georgia State Historic Preservation Office of the United States Air Force's (USAF) intention of demolishing five National Register-eligible structures on Robins Air Force Base. Chief's Circle Historic District, which consists of five two-story duplexes containing ten residential housing units was briefly considered for conversion to administrative office space, but the USAF has rejected this plan due to prohibitive costs associated with installing up-to-date communications lines inside the structures. Other alternatives, which are enumerated below, were also considered and rejected.

A future Environmental Assessment on the demolition project will describe in detail the various alternative uses that have been considered for Chief's Circle, and will be forwarded to the SHPO when it is completed. These alternatives include: using the buildings for administrative office space, which could cost as much as $400,000 for the installment of new communications lines; preserving the buildings through third parties who would be willing to remove and permanently relocate them off of base property; whole-building recycling, in which salvaged historic materials could be reused by third parties; mothballing, or placing the buildings into caretaker status for an undetermined amount of time; and demolition.

An existing programmatic agreement (PA) covering all activities concerning Chief's Circle was signed into effect on April 1, 1999, and was recently extended by your office until August 31, 2007. This is the Programmatic Agreement Among Robins Air Force Base, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Georgia State Historic Preservation Officer for the Rehabilitation, Maintenance, and Development of the Chief's Circle and Officer's Circle Historic Districts at Robins Air Force Base, Warner Robins Georgia. Section 5 of this PA lists the procedures for demolition. A draft Comprehensive PA covering all National Register-eligible historic buildings and archaeological sites on Robins Air Force Base has also gone out to you under separate cover. This document will take the place of and expand upon the more limited 1999 agreement that expires later this month. We hope that you will find that this new
RE: Proposed Demolition of Chief’s Circle Historic District and Draft Comprehensive Programmatic Agreement: Robins AFB, Georgia

Ms. Yasaitis Fanizzo

This letter officially notifies the Advisory Council on Historic Places of the United States Air Force’s (USAF) intention of demolishing five National Register-eligible structures on Robins Air Force Base. Chief’s Circle Historic District, which consists of five two-story duplexes containing ten residential housing units was briefly considered for conversion to administrative office space, but the USAF has rejected this plan due to prohibitive costs associated with installing up-to-date communications lines inside the structures. Other alternatives, which are enumerated below, were also considered and rejected.

A future Environmental Assessment on the demolition project will describe in detail the various alternative uses that have been considered for Chief’s Circle, and will be forwarded to the Georgia State Historic Preservation Office (GA SHPO) when it is completed. These alternatives include: using the buildings for administrative office space, which could cost as much as $400,000 for the installation of new communications lines; preserving the buildings through third parties who would be willing to remove and permanently relocate them off of base property; whole-building recycling, in which salvaged historic materials could be reused by third parties; mothballing, or placing the buildings into caretaker status for an undetermined amount of time; and demolition.

An existing programmatic agreement (PA) covering all activities concerning Chief’s Circle was signed into effect on April 1, 1999, and was recently extended until August 31, 2007. This is the Programmatic Agreement Among Robins Air Force Base, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Georgia State Historic Preservation Officer for the Rehabilitation, Maintenance, and Development of the Chief’s Circle and Officer’s Circle Historic Districts at Robins Air Force Base, Warner Robins Georgia. Section 5 of this PA lists the procedures for demolition. A draft Comprehensive PA covering all National Register-eligible historic buildings and archaeological sites on Robins Air Force Base has also been included for your review and
This document will take the place of and expand upon the more limited 1999 agreement that expires later this month. We hope that you will find that this new PA will substantially improve communications between our agencies concerning the management of cultural resources at Robins.

Upon the expiration of the existing PA, and if it is acceptable to the ACHP, the following stipulations for the demolition of eligible buildings, which are taken from the existing PA and the draft Comprehensive PA, will be followed by Robins AFB: Robins will provide a letter of intent along with 1) current exterior and interior photographs, 2) a current structural report, 3) reasons for the proposed demolition, and 4) alternatives to demolition and the reasons for their rejection. This first stipulation is met by this letter and its attachments. Secondly, Robins will next await a response from the ACHP and GA SHPO. The third stipulation regarding communication with the HABS has already been performed. Robins has contacted Deborah Calloway of the National Park Service’s HABS office, and she has agreed with the Georgia SHPO’s previous determination that HABS Level II documentation is satisfactory. Additionally, she asked that Robins send her sample drafts of photos, drawings and building histories, as well as a copy of the two agreements before we send to her the final documentation. Robins will honor these requests and is aware that HABS must also accept the recordation, and that the ACHP and GA SHPO must be notified of this acceptance prior to demolition. Finally, Robins will follow the provisions of 36 CFR 800 if the SHPO objects to the demolition at any point during this process.

Robins Air Force Base acknowledges a 15-day calendar day review period from the date of this letter’s return receipt. Should we not receive any comments within that time frame, we will assume that you concur with the proposed demolition and have no comments for the draft comprehensive agreement. We will then move forward with the HABS Level II documentation of Chief’s Circle Historic District. We look forward to your response, and should you have any questions or need further information, please do not hesitate to contact Bob Sargent at (478) 327-3974/bob.sargent@robins.af.mil, or Becky Crader at (478) 327-288/becky.crader@robins.af.mil.

ROBERT SARGENT
Acting Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
Environmental Management Division
78th Civil Engineer Group

Attachments:
1. Photos of Each Chief’s Circle Duplex
2. Map of Chief’s Circle Historic District
3. Chief’s Circle Structural Report
4. DRAFT Comprehensive Programmatic Agreement
September 19, 2007

Robert Sargent  
Acting Chief  
Environmental Programming Branch  
78th Civil Engineer Group  
775 Macon St., Bldg 1555  
Robins Air Force Base, GA 31098

Ref: Proposed Demolition of Chief’s Circle Historic District and Draft Comprehensive Programmatic Agreement: Robins Air Force Base, Georgia

Dear Mr. Sargent:

In response to your August 29, 2007 notification letter regarding the referenced project, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) will participate in consultation to develop a comprehensive programmatic agreement (PA) for Robins AFB, Georgia. We are enclosing a copy of the letter to the Secretary of the Air Force regarding our decision to participate in the consultation.

The notification from the Air Force included several issues that are of concern to us. The letter stated that if the Air Force did not receive any comments within a 15-day review period, the agency “will assume that you concur with the proposed demolition and have no comments for the draft comprehensive agreement.” The 15-day calendar review period from the date of the letter’s receipt applies to the decision about whether the ACHP will participate in consultation per 36 CFR Part 800.6(a)(1)(iii). It does not apply to comments on a draft PA or concurrence with a proposed undertaking. Further, the letter implied that the demolition of the Chief’s Circle Historic District could move forward either under the expired PA, which was finalized on April 1, 1999 and valid for five years, or under the draft comprehensive PA that was enclosed with your letter. Until a new PA has been concluded and signed by all signatories, the Air Force can proceed with this proposed demolition only after meeting its responsibilities under 36 CFR Part 800.

We look forward to consulting with your agency and other consulting parties on the PA. Please contact Nancy J. Brown at 202.606.8582, or nbrown@achp.gov, should you have any questions or wish to discuss this further.

Sincerely,

Reid J. Nelson  
Assistant Director  
Federal Property Management Section  
Office of Federal Agency Programs

Enclosure
RE: Robins AFB: Demolition of Chief’s Circle Historic District
Houston County, Georgia
HP-070831-005

Dear Mr. Sargent:

The Historic Preservation Division (HPD) has received the information submitted concerning the above referenced undertaking. Our comments are offered to assist the US Department of the Air Force and Robins Air Force Base (AFB) in complying with the provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA).

As previously stated, HPD agrees that the Chief’s Circle Historic District, consisting of five two-story duplexes containing ten residential housing units, should be considered eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Furthermore, HPD understands that the Air Force intends to demolish these buildings rather than convert the units from housing to administrative office space as proposed by letter dated February 27, 2007 (file HP-070118-050). In our opinion, consideration of alternatives to demolition should be the next step in the Section 106 process. Our office is very interested in assisting the Air Force and Robins AFB in evaluating potential reuse options for this complex and as such propose a site visit by our staff to discuss alternative uses that may justify keeping these buildings.

We look forward to working with you on this undertaking. Please contact Elizabeth (Betsy) Shirk, Environmental Review Coordinator, at (404) 651-6624 to arrange a site visit.

Sincerely,

Karen Anderson-Cordova
Manager, Planning and Local Assistance Unit

cc: Nancy Brown, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Kristina Harpst, Middle Georgia RDC
June 2, 2008

Robert Sargent
Acting Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
Environmental Management Division
Department of the Air Force
78th Civil Engineer Group
78 CEG/CEVP
775 Macon Street, Building 1555
Robins Air Force Base, Georgia 31098

RE: Robins AFB: Demolition of Chief's Circle Historic District
Houston County, Georgia
HP-070831-005

Dear Mr. Sargent:

The Historic Preservation Division (HPD) has received the information submitted concerning the above referenced undertaking. Our comments are offered to assist the US Department of the Air Force and Robins Air Force Base (AFB) in complying with the provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA).

As previously stated, HPD agrees that the Chief's Circle Historic District, consisting of five two-story duplexes containing ten residential housing units, should be considered eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Furthermore, as previously stated in our letter dated September 26, 2007, in our opinion consideration of alternatives to demolition should be the next step in the Section 106 process. As you know, HPD staff made site visit in February of this year to your installation to assist the Air Force and Robins AFB in evaluating potential reuse options for this complex. We anticipated a full evaluation of alternatives, such as moving the printing and other non-administration offices, as discussed at the site meeting. Until the study of alternatives is formalized, it is our opinion that entering into an agreement to demolish the buildings is premature.

We look forward to working with you on this undertaking. Please contact Elizabeth (Betsy) Shirk, Environmental Review Coordinator, at (404) 651-6624.

Sincerely,

W. Ray Luce
Division Director

WRL/ECS

cc: Nancy Brown, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Kristina Harpst, Middle Georgia RDC
RE: Final Comprehensive Programmatic Agreement for Signature and Draft Memorandum of Agreement for the Demolition of Chief’s Circle, Robins AFB, Georgia

Ms. Shirk,

We would sincerely like to thank you for all your guidance regarding our Comprehensive Programmatic Agreement (PA) between Robins Air Force Base, The Georgia State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and The Advisory Council on Historic Places. We have made all the recommended changes we received from your office, the Advisory Council of Historic Places, Office, our environmental law office and our own Air Force Material Command (AFMC) headquarters. We have attached the final Comprehensive PA for signature.

In addition, we are including the DRAFT Memorandum of Agreement regarding the demolition of Chief’s Circle (National Register-eligible housing duplexes) for your review. We sent this first draft to you via email in early May while we waited for comments from our environmental lawyer and AFMC headquarters. We have made their recommended changes and are now sending it to your office to officially begin the consultation process per Section 106 of the NHPA.

If you have additional questions, please contact either Becky Crader at 478-327-8288 or Bob Sargent at 478-327-3974.

BOB SARGENT
Acting Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
Environmental Management Division
78th Civil Engineer Group

Attachments:
1. Final Comprehensive Programmatic Agreement for Signature
2. Draft Memorandum of Agreement – Chief’s Circle Demolition
RE: Final Comprehensive Programmatic Agreement for Signature and Draft Memorandum of Agreement for the Demolition of Chief's Circle: Robins AFB, Georgia

Ms. Brown:

We would sincerely like to thank you for all your guidance regarding our Comprehensive Programmatic Agreement (PA) between Robins Air Force Base, The Georgia State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and The Advisory Council on Historic Places. We have made all the recommended changes we received from your office, the Georgia State Historic Preservation Office, our environmental law office and our own Air Force Materiel Command (AFMC) headquarters. We have attached the final Comprehensive PA for signature.

In addition, we are including the DRAFT Memorandum of Agreement regarding the demolition of Chief's Circle (National Register-eligible housing duplexes) for your review. We sent this first draft to you via email in early May while we waited for comments from our environmental lawyer and AFMC headquarters. We have made their recommended changes and are now sending it to your office to officially begin the consultation process per Section 106 of the NHPA.

If you have additional questions, please contact either Becky Crader at 478-327-8288 or Bob Sargent at 478-327-3974.

BOB SARGENT
Acting Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
Environmental Management Division
78th Civil Engineer Group

Attachments:
1. Final Comprehensive Programmatic Agreement for Signature
2. Draft Memorandum of Agreement – Chief’s Circle
June 26, 2008

Mr. Robert Sargent
Acting Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
Department of the Air Force
78th Civil Engineer Group
775 Macon Street, Building 1555
Robins Air Force Base, GA 31098

Ref: Proposed Demolition of Chief’s Circle Historic District
Robins Air Force Base, Georgia

Dear Mr. Sargent:

The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) received your April 16, 2008 draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) proposing demolition of the Chief’s Circle Historic District. While we appreciate the work you have done to develop a comprehensive programmatic agreement for the management of Robins Air Force Base, we believe that it is premature to address mitigation of adverse effects for this particular undertaking. Per the regulations at § 800.6 Resolution of adverse effects, the agency has a responsibility to consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer and other consulting parties to develop and evaluate alternatives or modifications to the undertaking that could avoid and minimize the adverse effects. Should it be necessary after full consideration of the alternatives to demolition has taken place, consultation on mitigation would then be appropriate. We are hopeful that this consultation might identify alternatives to the demolition of these important historic properties.

We remain available to consult with your agency and other consulting parties on this proposed undertaking. Please contact Nancy Brown at 202-606-8582, or nbrown@achp.gov, should you have any questions or wish to discuss this further.

Sincerely,

Reid J. Nelson
Assistant Director
Federal Property Management Section
Office of Federal Agency Programs
RE: Environmental Assessment for the Demolition of Chiefs' Circle, Robins AFB, Georgia

Ms. Shirk

The Environmental Assessment (EA) for this action is enclosed. We received your letter regarding the proposed Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for this action, and understand how important it is that you review our alternatives analysis first before considering the MOA. This EA describes in detail the various alternative uses that have been considered for Chiefs' Circle, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act. It will interest you to know that we have met with representatives of Habitat for Humanity to discuss the possibility of recycling components of these buildings, and have contacted companies about this issue. We are also exploring the possibility of relocating the buildings to some off-base destination for a community or private use, but have had no success in that endeavor to date. Your thoughts and guidance on these efforts would be much appreciated.

As previously noted, the HABS Level II recordation has already been performed, and we have received minor comments regarding that documentation from Deborah Calloway of the National Park Service (NPS). We are revising that documentation and will notify your office once we have received a response from NPS concerning the next version.

We look forward to your response, and should you have any questions or need further information, please do not hesitate to contact Bob Sargent at (478) 327-3974 or Becky Crader at (478) 327-8288.

FRED HURSEY
Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
Environmental Management Division
78th Civil Engineer Group

Attachment:
Draft Environmental Assessment Demolition of Chiefs' Circle Residential Structures
RE: Environmental Assessment for the Demolition of Chiefs' Circle, Robins AFB, Georgia

Ms. Brown:

The Environmental Assessment (EA) for this action is enclosed. This EA describes in detail the various alternative uses that have been considered for Chiefs' Circle, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act. It will interest you to know that we have met with representatives of Habitat for Humanity to discuss the possibility of recycling components of these buildings, and have contacted companies about this issue. We are also exploring the possibility of relocating the buildings to some off-base destination for a community or private use, but have had no success in that endeavor to date. Your thoughts and guidance on these efforts would be much appreciated.

As previously noted, the HABS Level II recordation has already been performed, and we have received minor comments regarding that documentation from Deborah Calloway of the National Park Service (NPS). We are revising that documentation and will notify your office once we have received a response from NPS concerning the next version.

We look forward to your response, and should you have any questions or need further information, please do not hesitate to contact Bob Sargent at (478) 327-3974 or Becky Crader at (478) 327-8288.

FRED HURSEY
Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
Environmental Management Division
78th Civil Engineer Group

Attachment:
Draft Environmental Assessment Demolition of Chiefs' Circle Residential Structures
June 30, 2008

Robert Sargent  
Acting Chief, Environmental Programming Branch  
Environmental Management Division  
Department of the Air Force  
78th Civil Engineer Group  
78 CEG/CEVP  
775 Macon Street, Building 1555  
Robins Air Force Base, Georgia 31098

RE: Robins AFB: Demolition of Chief's Circle Historic District  
Houston County, Georgia  
HP-070831-005

Dear Mr. Sargent:

The Historic Preservation Division (HPD) has received the draft Memorandum of Agreement for the above referenced undertaking that was transmitted by letter dated June 6, 2008. Our comments are offered to assist the US Department of the Air Force and Robins Air Force Base (AFB) in complying with the provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA).

As previously stated, HPD agrees that the Chief's Circle Historic District, consisting of five two-story duplexes containing ten residential housing units, should be considered eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Furthermore, as previously stated in our letters dated June 2, 2008 and September 26, 2007, it is our opinion that consideration of alternatives to demolition should be the next step in the Section 106 process. Following our site visit in February of this year, we anticipated a full evaluation of alternatives to demolition for this important historic property. Therefore, until the study of alternatives is formalized, it is our opinion that entering into an agreement to demolish the buildings is premature.

We look forward to working with you on this undertaking. Please contact Elizabeth (Betsy) Shirk, Environmental Review Coordinator, at (404) 651-6624.

Sincerely,

W. Ray Luce  
Division Director

WRL/ECS

cc: Nancy Brown, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation  
Kristina Harpst, Middle Georgia RDC
July 28, 2008

Fred Hursey
Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
78th Civil Engineer Group
775 Macon St., Bldg 1555
Robins Air Force Base, GA 31098

Ref: Proposed Demolition of Chiefs’ Circle Historic District
Robins Air Force Base, Georgia

Dear Mr. Hursey:

The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) received the draft Environmental Assessment for the Demolition of Chiefs’ Circle Residential Structures (EA). In the cover letter, you indicated that this EA describes in detail the alternative uses considered for Chiefs’ Circle. While Appendix A shows the cost analysis for three alternatives, this document does not adequately address efforts to consult on avoiding and minimizing adverse effects to the historic district. The cover letter further indicates that efforts were made to work with Habitat for Humanity and others, but no details are provided.

As stated in our June 5, 2008 letter, the agency must consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer and other consulting parties to develop and evaluate alternatives or modifications to the undertaking that could avoid and minimize the adverse effects. At this time we do not believe that the Air Force has fulfilled this requirement or adequately documented its consideration of these alternatives. We request that the agency provide details about the efforts that go beyond internal cost analysis and demonstrate that the Air Force notified interested organizations and the public (i.e. public notices, community meetings, and other methods of outreach) that these buildings are available for non-military uses that might include removal from the base or reuse of building materials, and document the responses from the local community to these efforts.

We are also concerned that the EA states that a draft memorandum of agreement (MOA) for the demolition of the historic district exists between Robins Air Force Base, the Georgia State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and the ACHP. We believe this statement creates a misleading impression for members of the public reading the EA. While the Air Force has drafted such a document, the SHPO and ACHP have not agreed to proceed with an MOA for the demolition of the buildings nor have we commented on it in any way.
We remain available to consult with your agency and other consulting parties on this proposed undertaking. Please contact Nancy J. Brown at 202.606.8582 or nbrown@achp.gov, should you have any questions or wish to discuss this further.

Sincerely,

Reid J. Nelson
Assistant Director
Office of Federal Agency Programs
Federal Property Management Section
Dear Mr. Hursey:

The Historic Preservation Division (HPD) has received the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Demolition of Chiefs' Circle Residential Structures transmitted by letter dated June 25, 2008. Our comments are offered to assist the US Department of the Air Force and Robins Air Force Base (AFB) in complying with the provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA).

As previously stated, HPD agrees that the Chief's Circle Historic District, consisting of five two-story duplexes containing ten residential housing units, should be considered eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Furthermore, as previously stated in our letters dated June 30, 2008 and September 26, 2007, it is our opinion that consideration of alternatives to demolition should be the next step in the Section 106 process. Following our site visit in February of this year, we anticipated a full evaluation of alternatives to demolition for this important historic property and understood that these would be provided in the EA.

Based on the information contained in the draft EA, we offer the following discussion of our understanding of the process followed as well as recommendations for consideration of alternatives other than demolition. It appears that three main factors are included in the rationale for the proposed demolition of Chiefs' Circle as the (preferred) Proposed Alternative:

1. The buildings do not comply with the Robins AFB Area Development Plan (ADP), which realigns the base according to functions and operations proximity to areas associated with their services. In this plan, "hard" functions and operations, those that directly support fighter operations, are relocated to the northern portion of the base near the airfield, as necessary. "Soft" functions and operations, which provide supplemental or other services are relocated to the southern portion of the base, as necessary.
2. The site is not included in the Military Family Housing (MFH) Privatization Initiative program.
3. Use of site needs to be cost-effective.

As noted, Chiefs' Circle is located on the northern edge of the southern portion of Robins AFB, which might be considered a transitional zone. It is adjacent to large buildings to the west, open sites to the north, Robins Parkway to the east, and residential housing development to the south, from which it is separated by a creek and gully. The Robins AFB Area Development Plan apparently has identified Chiefs' Circle as a future development site for "hard" functions and operations, although acknowledging the site as not readily buildable because of topography. Other adjacent areas identified for future non-residential ("hard" functions/operations) are the residential housing areas south and southeast of Chiefs' Circle (Pine Oak and Lakeside – see Appendix B of the EA).
The EA included consideration of the following alternatives (summarized):

- **No-Action Alternative.** Structures continue underutilization. No funds allocated to maintaining the building and site. Deterioration by neglect.
- **Alternative 1.** Renovation for continued use as residential housing. Other available housing alleged to be better is available through MFH program. Costs ($615,000) to bring buildings to expected standards determined not cost-effective. No funds allocated for renovation. Alternative 1 does not conform to ADP.
- **Alternative 2.** Renovation for future use as administrative space in accordance with ADP. Costs ($1,666,000) and alteration requirements associated with Alternative 2 determined not cost-effective.
- **Alternative 3.** Expanded use of buildings without alterations by “soft” functions and operations. No additional “soft” functions and operations identified. Existing groups and such types do not have financial capacity to maintain buildings.

Because Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 do not conform to ADP and/or are not cost-effective, it has been determined not feasible, leaving the No-Action Alternative and the preferred demolition alternative for consideration.

In our opinion, the alternatives analysis provided in the EA for the Demolition of Chiefs’ Circle appears to analyze information with a bias toward a conclusion for its demolition. This appears to be the result of applying that analysis within the context of other planning processes that did not meaningfully address Chiefs’ Circle, rather than analysis that establishes the preservation of the historic buildings as the desired outcome. Under such analysis, any alternative with costs associated with it subjectively becomes not feasible and if any cost cannot be avoided, the lowest cost alternative becomes the preferred alternative.

Based on our analysis of the situation, it is our opinion that additional consideration of alternatives to demolition should include:

1. Modifying the MFH program to include Chiefs’ Circle, with the expectation that these buildings would not fall under the same housing standards as the privatized new construction, but would be considered exceptions, without being of lesser quality. In this context, different types of military families might live there, such as couples with no children or single personnel, if they qualify for such housing. Expectations for the rehabilitation of the buildings could also include additions or combining the duplex units into one residence. Cost of rehabilitation should be considered in relationship to the overall cost of the MFH program, rather than a comparison of relative costs of new construction.
2. Converting Chiefs’ Circle to Temporary Lodging Facilities (TLF) in lieu of the buildings at Lakeview, which are not identified as historic. As with the MFH program, strict adherence to size or other standards should not be used as a reason for such rehabilitation to not be considered feasible.

Other considerations that may be included are:

1. Site location should not be an overriding consideration for the feasibility of rehabilitating Chiefs’ Circle. Other similar properties appear to have the same locational constraints, i.e., being located in current or future “hard” functions/operations areas, including the TLFs at Lakeview, Officer’s Circle at Forest Park, and the base golf course.
2. The need to have readily available developable space for future “hard” functions/operations should not be an overriding consideration for the feasibility of rehabilitating Chiefs’ Circle. There appears to be large available spaces on the base for such use, including an area adjacent north of the site, large areas of parking, and the Forest Park, Pine Oak, and Lakeside areas to be cleared as part of the MFH program.
We look forward to working with you on this undertaking as it continues. If you have any questions or if we may be of further assistance, please contact Elizabeth (Betsy) Shirk, Environmental Review Coordinator, at (404) 651-6624.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

W. Ray Luce
Division Director

WRL/ECS

cc: Nancy Brown, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
    Kristina Harpst, Middle Georgia RDC
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
78th Air Base Wing (AFMC)
Robins Air Force Base Georgia

78 CEG/CEVP
755 Macon St., Bldg 1555
Robins AFB, GA 31098

Nancy Brown
Federal Property Management Section
Office of Federal Agency Programs
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
1100 Pennsylvania Ave., NW Room 803
Washington, DC 20004-2501

RE: Proposed Demolition of Chiefs’ Circle

Ms. Brown

Thank you for the ACHP’s recent comments in the letter dated 28 Jul 08 concerning the Environmental Assessment (EA) for this action. We agree that the EA did not contain a thorough record of our efforts to assess the alternatives to demolition. We have compiled that record and are providing it with this letter for your review and comments. It is our intention to include this documentation in an updated version of the EA. As for your other comments in that letter, we have responded to them in the following paragraphs.

The USAF considered and then excluded the Chiefs’ Circle site from the Military Family Housing (MFH) Privatization Initiative in that program’s early stages, primarily because the site did not fit the constraints of Robins’ Area Development Plan (ADP). The USAF also considered converting these buildings to a Temporary Living Facility (TLF). However, Robins has a fairly new TLF, which is centrally located in relation to shopping facilities, the gas station, eating establishments, and other day-to-day necessities. The base does not need a second TLF, especially one that is not located within walking distance of these amenities.

In January 2007 we contacted the Georgia SHPO explaining that we would like to convert Chiefs’ Circle to administrative uses. The SHPO approved that request, with stipulations. However, that proposal was eventually rejected because of the calculated cost for that conversion, as well as because the conversion would not be in keeping with the requirements of the base ADP. Since that time, we have consulted with the SHPO on several occasions by letter and by phone, as well as during a site visit in March of this year, to discuss the project and potential alternative uses for Chiefs’ Circle.

In August 2007 the USAF decided that the buildings should be demolished due to the requirements of the base ADP, as well as for budgetary reasons. We notified your office and the SHPO concerning this development, and initiated an EA to assess the environmental impacts of the proposed action (i.e., demolition), as well as the alternatives to that action. As mentioned
previously, two of the alternative uses we considered were converting the buildings to TLF or to administrative uses. As for the ADP, aspects of that plan have already been initiated in the landscape that surrounds Chiefs’ Circle. For instance, the open area to the north of the district will soon be occupied by a massive DLA warehouse. To the south, Pine Oaks Housing has already been demolished, and a plan has been floated to possibly build a command post and a new security forces facility on the site. Some of Officer’s Circle is currently slated for demolition, and the entire Lakeside Housing area will soon be demolished in preparation for the construction of an extensive Air Force Reserve Command Campus.

In addition to evaluating these buildings for possible use as administrative functions or as a TLF, we also attempted to find “soft uses” for all of them, similar to how one of them is currently being used as a Boy Scouts’ meeting facility. Unfortunately, we have had no success locating tenants for them, and even if we did, the new occupants would be charged with the financial responsibility of their upkeep – an obvious deterrent. As you may know, the buildings are currently mothballed, but maintaining them in this manner is not compatible with the requirements of the ADP, and the buildings, of course, will decay to the point that they will become unsafe. We attempted to find a buyer who was willing to pay for hauling the buildings off base in exchange for assuming ownership of them. This effort was not successful, as the parties we contacted stated the proposition would be much too expensive. We also contacted various entities in the local community concerning the possibility of recycling the materials that comprise the buildings, and have investigated deconstruction (i.e., reusing the materials on base) as an option. We had some success with this investigation, particularly in our dealings with the local Habitat for Humanity, and will continue to pursue this lead. We have also determined that, should the buildings be demolished, we can include language in the demolition contract requiring that up to 75 percent of the materials be recycled.

With regards to the draft memorandum of agreement (MOA) for the demolition of the district, we agree that it is premature to include mention of that document in the EA, and have removed any reference to it. We will include a thorough summary of the alternative uses mentioned above in the next draft of the EA, along with consultation notes and letters.

Please look over our documentation concerning the alternatives analysis, and contact Dr. Robert Sargent at 478/327-3974 if you have any questions or need further information.

Fred Hursey
Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
Environmental Management Division

Attachments:
1. Synopsis of efforts to find alternatives to demolition
2. Log of communications with regulators
Synopsis of Efforts to Convert Chiefs' Circle to Temporary Living Facilities, to Administrative Space, or for "Soft Uses"

During the first six months of 2007, various options for converting Chiefs' Circle from housing to administrative space were considered, proposed, and ultimately rejected. In January of that year 78 CEG/CEV (Environmental Management Division) notified the GA SHPO that Robins AFB wished to convert these buildings for that purpose. Shortly thereafter the base submitted a proposal to Air Staff concerning this conversion, but the proposal was rejected. The major factors that determined the infeasibility of this option pertained to the cost of installing communication lines, shoring up the floors of the buildings to support more people and equipment than they were originally designed for, upgrading the HVAC systems and the bathroom facilities to meet the needs of more people, and the cost of converting the few rooms in each house into office spaces for many people. Upstairs accessibility, especially to meet codes with respect to handicapped workers, was also a substantial potential expense. Another significant factor involved in the rejection of this conversion pertained to the fact that the location of Chiefs' Circle does not abide with the constraints of the base Area Development Plan. Under that plan, administrative and housing facilities are to be located in areas other than where Chiefs' Circle is currently located, as the central portion of the base is dedicated for industrial uses.

The following administrative functions were considered as possibilities for occupying Chiefs' Circle. Each entry is followed by secondary reasons, in addition to the problems outlined above, why the functions could not use Chiefs' Circle.

1) Judge Advocate Claims (currently in building 708) – This office must be co-located with the other branches of JA.
2) JA Sexual Assault (Building 708) – Same reason as Judge Advocate Claims.
3) Area Defense Council (Building 368) – This organization needs a more secure building.
4) TMO (Building 914) – The USAF wants this organization to be located near other infrastructure functions.
5) GSA Rep (Building 255)
6) DLA Reps (3 each) (Building 300) – Will likely be moved to the new DLA warehouse.
7) CARE (Building 300)
8) Housing Office (Building 706) – Has been substantially reduced in size since housing was privatized, and requires much less space than that provided by just one of the houses.
9) ANG Rep (Basement Building 300)
10) CFC – This organization did not like the location.

In addition to potentially using Chiefs' Circle for administrative functions, the buildings were also evaluated (during late 2006 and early 2007) for use as a potential Temporary Living Facility (TLF). However, a TLF was built across from the base commissary just a few years ago, and it was determined that Robins fulfills its TLF space requirements. Even if the base was in need of additional TLF space, the use of Chiefs' Circle for such a function would have been problematic, as these facilities are typically co-located with stores and eating establishments.
Chiefs’ Circle is not located within easy walking distance of these types of establishments on Robins AFB.

In addition to administrative functions, during the last half of 2007 we considered using the buildings for “soft functions,” i.e., on-base organizations that do not have the typical office communication line requirements such as “drops” for computer hook-ups. For example, one of the buildings is currently being used as a meeting location for a local Boy Scouts troop. There were two problems with this option: 1) No other organization expressed an interest in using the buildings, even when we contacted the City of Warner Robins about this option; and 2) If an interested organization does turn up, they would have to provide for the maintenance requirements for the building they used – a significant problem. In short, soft uses were determined to be an impractical long-term option for these buildings.

**Synopsis of Communications Regarding Moving Chiefs’ Circle**

In July 2008, several contacts were made regarding the possibility of moving the five structures that make up Chiefs’ Circle Historic District to an off-base location. The following organizations were contacted: 1) Keep Warner Robins Beautiful (a City of Warner Robins department); 2) Carpenter Construction (a firm that is involved in a number of construction and demolition projects on Robins AFB); 3) NewTown Macon (an organization that works with the City of Macon to revitalize its downtown area); and 4) Lords of Macon (a firm specializing in recycling Middle Georgia building materials).

Debra Jones of Keep Warner Robins Beautiful said that she would forward photos of the buildings to others in her network and re-contact 78 CEG/CEV if she found anyone interested in removing them from Robins AFB. We have had no success with this lead to-date.

Jerry Carpenter, of Carpenter Construction, informed the 78 CEG/CEV that it was too expensive to move those buildings, though it is technically possible. He felt that the expense was not worth the potential gains. Mike Ford, CEO of NewTown Macon, echoed Carpenter’s comments, but directed one of his contacts, Philip Lord of Lords of Macon, to contact CEG/CEV to arrange a site visit. While this visit fell through at the last moment, Mr. Lord did inform us that he looked at the photos we sent, and he thought it would be prohibitively expensive to move the buildings.

**Synopsis of Communications Regarding Recycling Chiefs’ Circle Material**

In June 2008, several contacts were made regarding recycling building materials in the event of the demolition of Chiefs Circle. The following organizations were contacted: 1) Habitat for Humanity; 2) the Georgia Recycling Coalition; 3) the Georgia Department of Natural Resources; and 4) Lords of Macon.

John Sillers of Habitat for Humanity visited the site in June and said that his organization might be interested in recycling some of the material, but not the bricks. Both Gloria Hardegree, of the Georgia Recycling Coalition, and Stephanie Busch, of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, supplied lists of recycling brokers in Georgia, but we have not had any success.
pursuing those leads thus far. A site visit was also arranged for Philip Lord of Lords of Macon, but he had a last minute conflict and canceled. Mr. Lord did say he looked at the photos of the buildings, and that he did not think the bricks (his specialty) were historic enough to warrant his involvement.

Robins AFB has an official contract specification called “Construction and Demolition Waste Management,” which would be followed in the event of the demolition of Chiefs’ Circle. This specification exceeds State of Georgia requirements on construction and demolition (solid waste) recycling, and allows the base to specify exactly how much material must be recycled from a demolition site. Section 1.2 of this document states that contractors must “use all reasonable means to divert construction and demolition waste from landfills and incinerators and to facilitate their recycling or reuse. A minimum of 50/75 percent by weight of total project solid waste shall be diverted from the landfill.” This would mean that any contractor bidding on the demolition job would be contractually bound to recycle whatever percentage Robins AFB deems appropriate. For instance, during the ongoing demolition of Military Family Housing on base, it has been found that by recycling brick, asphalt, concrete, windows, doors, and appliances, at least 75% of the solid waste was recyclable. It appears that a reasonable figure for recycling solid waste for Chiefs’ Circle would be 75-80% by weight.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>To/From</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-Jan-07</td>
<td>To SHPO</td>
<td>Notified SHPO of Robins' intent to convert Chiefs' Circle to admin space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Feb-07</td>
<td>From SHPO</td>
<td>Response to letter dated 12 Jan 07 requesting additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Feb-07</td>
<td>To SHPO</td>
<td>Response to letter dated 14 Feb 07 providing additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Mar-07</td>
<td>From SHPO</td>
<td>SHPO concurs on a finding of no adverse effect on the Chiefs' Circle conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Aug-07</td>
<td>To SHPO</td>
<td>Proposed Demolition of Chiefs' Circle - USAF now wants to demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Aug-07</td>
<td>To ACHP</td>
<td>Notified ACHP at the same time as SHPO about the proposed demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Sep-07</td>
<td>From ACHP</td>
<td>Notified Robins' of their intent to participate in the consultation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Sep-07</td>
<td>From SHPO</td>
<td>Advised that next step in Section 106 process is considering alternatives to demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Jun-08</td>
<td>From SHPO</td>
<td>References their site visit (3/14/08) &amp; stresses importance of alternatives to demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Jun-08</td>
<td>To SHPO</td>
<td>Sent DRAFT Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for their review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Jun-08</td>
<td>To ACHP</td>
<td>Sent DRAFT MOA for their review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Jun-08</td>
<td>From ACHP</td>
<td>Will not comment on the MOA until all alternatives have been considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Jun-08</td>
<td>To SHPO</td>
<td>Sent DRAFT EA for their review that includes alternatives to demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Jun-08</td>
<td>To ACHP</td>
<td>Sent DRAFT EA for their review that includes alternatives to demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>From/To</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Jun-08</td>
<td>From SHPO</td>
<td>Will not comment on the MOA until all alternatives have been considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Jul-08</td>
<td>From ACHP</td>
<td>Does not feel the EA adequately addresses or considers alternatives to demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Jul-08</td>
<td>From SHPO</td>
<td>Does not feel the EA adequately addresses or considers alternatives to demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Sep-08</td>
<td>To ACHP</td>
<td>Response to EA review comments clarifying efforts to find alternatives to demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Sep-08</td>
<td>To SHPO</td>
<td>Response to EA review comments clarifying efforts to find alternatives to demo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RE: Proposed Demolition of Chiefs’ Circle

Ms. Shirk

Thank you for the SHPO’s recent comments in the letter dated 31 Jul 08 concerning the Environmental Assessment (EA) for this action. We agree that the EA did not contain a thorough record of our efforts to assess the alternatives to demolition. We have compiled that record and are providing it with this letter for your review and comments. It is our intention to include this documentation in an updated version of the EA. As for your other comments in that letter, we have responded to them in the following paragraphs.

In your correspondence you stated that the analysis was biased toward a conclusion for demolition, rather than focusing on a result that established the preservation of the buildings as the desired outcome. The USAF proposal is that the buildings be demolished, so that is what we are required to analyze, in terms of the action’s potential environmental impacts, in an EA. The USAF excluded the Chiefs’ Circle site from the Military Family Housing (MFH) Privatization Initiative in that program’s early stages, primarily because the site did not fit the constraints of Robins’ Area Development Plan (ADP). You suggested in your letter that Robins AFB should consider modifying the MFH program to include Chiefs’ Circle, but modifying a USAF-wide policy is outside the scope of a base-level EA. As for converting these buildings to a Temporary Living Facility (TLF), that option was considered in the early stages of this analysis. However, Robins has a fairly new TLF, which is centrally located in relation to shopping facilities, the gas station, eating establishments, and other day-to-day necessities. The base does not need a second TLF, especially one that is not located within walking distance of these amenities.

As you may recall, we contacted your office in January 2007 explaining that we would like to convert Chiefs’ Circle to administrative uses. However, that proposal was eventually rejected by the USAF because of the calculated cost for that conversion, as well as because the conversion would not be in keeping with the requirements of the base ADP. You stated that Robins AFB was considering converting non-historic Lakeview Housing into TLF, rather than doing so with Chiefs’ Circle, and questioned this logic. Lakeview Housing has been demolished as part of the
MFH program. Just as with the Chiefs’ Circle TLF proposal, the USAF determined that a
second non-centrally located TLF (i.e., Lakeview) was not needed. In fact, much of the
landscape around Chiefs’ Circle, which you noted should have similar constraints, is already
undergoing significant changes in keeping with the ADP and the MFH Initiative. The open area
to the north of the district will soon be occupied by a massive DLA warehouse. To the south,
Pine Oaks Housing has already been demolished, and a plan has been floated to possibly build a
command post and a new security forces facility on the site. Some of Officer’s Circle is
currently slated for demolition, and the entire Lakeside Housing area will soon be demolished in
preparation for the construction of an extensive Air Force Reserve Command Campus. In short,
site location is not the sole consideration in evaluating the feasibility of rehabilitating Chiefs’
Circle; but it is major consideration, along with the cost and practicality of converting or
upgrading the buildings.

In addition to evaluating these buildings for possible use as administrative functions or as a
TLF, we also attempted to find “soft uses” for all of them, similar to how one of them is
currently being used as a Boy Scouts’ meeting facility. Unfortunately, we have had no success
locating tenants for them, and even if we did, the new occupants would be charged with the
financial responsibility of their upkeep – an obvious deterrent. We attempted to find a buyer
who was willing to pay for hauling the buildings off base in exchange for assuming ownership of
them. This effort was not successful, as the parties we contacted stated the proposition would be
much too expensive. As you know, the buildings are currently mothballed, but maintaining them
in this manner is not compatible with the requirements of the ADP, and the buildings, of course,
will eventually decay to the point that they will become unsafe. We also contacted various
entities in the local community concerning the possibility of recycling the materials that
comprise the buildings, and have investigated deconstruction (i.e., reusing the materials on base)
as an option. We had some success with this investigation, particularly in our dealings with the
local Habitat for Humanity, and will continue to pursue this lead. We have also determined that,
should the buildings be demolished, we can include language in the demolition contract requiring
that up to 75 percent of the materials be recycled.

Please look over our documentation concerning the alternatives analysis, and contact Dr.
Robert Sargent at 478/327-3974 if you have any questions or need further information.

Fred Hursey
Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
Environmental Management Division

Attachments:

1. Synopsis of efforts to find alternatives to demolition
2. Log of communications with regulators
Synopsis of Efforts to Convert Chiefs' Circle to Temporary Living Facilities, to Administrative Space, or for "Soft Uses"

During the first six months of 2007, various options for converting Chiefs' Circle from housing to administrative space were considered, proposed, and ultimately rejected. In January of that year 78 CEG/CEV (Environmental Management Division) notified the GA SHPO that Robins AFB wished to convert these buildings for that purpose. Shortly thereafter the base submitted a proposal to Air Staff concerning this conversion, but the proposal was rejected. The major factors that determined the infeasibility of this option pertained to the cost of installing communication lines, shoring up the floors of the buildings to support more people and equipment than they were originally designed for, upgrading the HVAC systems and the bathroom facilities to meet the needs of more people, and the cost of converting the few rooms in each house into office spaces for many people. Upstairs accessibility, especially to meet codes with respect to handicapped workers, was also a substantial potential expense. Another significant factor involved in the rejection of this conversion pertained to the fact that the location of Chiefs' Circle does not abide with the constraints of the base Area Development Plan. Under that plan, administrative and housing facilities are to be located in areas other than where Chiefs' Circle is currently located, as the central portion of the base is dedicated for industrial uses.

The following administrative functions were considered as possibilities for occupying Chiefs' Circle. Each entry is followed by secondary reasons, in addition to the problems outlined above, why the functions could not use Chiefs' Circle.

1) Judge Advocate Claims (currently in building 708) – This office must be co-located with the other branches of JA.
2) JA Sexual Assault (Building 708) – Same reason as Judge Advocate Claims.
3) Area Defense Council (Building 368) – This organization needs a more secure building.
4) TMO (Building 914) – The USAF wants this organization to be located near other infrastructure functions.
5) GSA Rep (Building 255)
6) DLA Reps (3 each) (Building 300) – Will likely be moved to the new DLA warehouse.
7) CARE (Building 300)
8) Housing Office (Building 706) – Has been substantially reduced in size since housing was privatized, and requires much less space than that provided by just one of the houses.
9) ANG Rep (Basement Building 300)
10) CFC – This organization did not like the location.

In addition to potentially using Chiefs' Circle for administrative functions, the buildings were also evaluated (during late 2006 and early 2007) for use as a potential Temporary Living Facility (TLF). However, a TLF was built across from the base commissary just a few years ago, and it was determined that Robins fulfills its TLF space requirements. Even if the base was in need of additional TLF space, the use of Chiefs' Circle for such a function would have been problematic, as these facilities are typically co-located with stores and eating establishments.
Chiefs' Circle is not located within easy walking distance of these types of establishments on Robins AFB.

In addition to administrative functions, during the last half of 2007 we considered using the buildings for "soft functions," i.e., on-base organizations that do not have the typical office communication line requirements such as "drops" for computer hook-ups. For example, one of the buildings is currently being used as a meeting location for a local Boy Scouts troop. There were two problems with this option: 1) No other organization expressed an interest in using the buildings, even when we contacted the City of Warner Robins about this option; and 2) If an interested organization does turn up, they would have to provide for the maintenance requirements for the building they used—a significant problem. In short, soft uses were determined to be an impractical long-term option for these buildings.

Synopsis of Communications Regarding Moving Chiefs' Circle

In July 2008, several contacts were made regarding the possibility of moving the five structures that make up Chiefs' Circle Historic District to an off-base location. The following organizations were contacted: 1) Keep Warner Robins Beautiful (a City of Warner Robins department); 2) Carpenter Construction (a firm that is involved in a number of construction and demolition projects on Robins AFB); 3) NewTown Macon (an organization that works with the City of Macon to revitalize its downtown area); and 4) Lords of Macon (a firm specializing in recycling Middle Georgia building materials).

Debra Jones of Keep Warner Robins Beautiful said that she would forward photos of the buildings to others in her network and re-contact 78 CEG/CEV if she found anyone interested in removing them from Robins AFB. We have had no success with this lead to-date.

Jerry Carpenter, of Carpenter Construction, informed the 78 CEG/CEV that it was too expensive to move those buildings, though it is technically possible. He felt that the expense was not worth the potential gains. Mike Ford, CEO of NewTown Macon, echoed Carpenter's comments, but directed one of his contacts, Philip Lord of Lords of Macon, to contact CEG/CEV to arrange a site visit. While this visit fell through at the last moment, Mr. Lord did inform us that he looked at the photos we sent, and he thought it would be prohibitively expensive to move the buildings.

Synopsis of Communications Regarding Recycling Chiefs' Circle Material

In June 2008, several contacts were made regarding recycling building materials in the event of the demolition of Chiefs Circle. The following organizations were contacted: 1) Habitat for Humanity; 2) the Georgia Recycling Coalition; 3) the Georgia Department of Natural Resources; and 4) Lords of Macon.

John Sillers of Habitat for Humanity visited the site in June and said that his organization might be interested in recycling some of the material, but not the bricks. Both Gloria Hardegree, of the Georgia Recycling Coalition, and Stephanie Busch, of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, supplied lists of recycling brokers in Georgia, but we have not had any success.
pursuing those leads thus far. A site visit was also arranged for Philip Lord of Lords of Macon, but he had a last minute conflict and canceled. Mr. Lord did say he looked at the photos of the buildings, and that he did not think the bricks (his specialty) were historic enough to warrant his involvement.

Robins AFB has an official contract specification called “Construction and Demolition Waste Management,” which would be followed in the event of the demolition of Chiefs’ Circle. This specification exceeds State of Georgia requirements on construction and demolition (solid waste) recycling, and allows the base to specify exactly how much material must be recycled from a demolition site. Section 1.2 of this document states that contractors must “use all reasonable means to divert construction and demolition waste from landfills and incinerators and to facilitate their recycling or reuse. A minimum of \textit{50/75 percent} by weight of total project solid waste shall be diverted from the landfill.” This would mean that any contractor bidding on the demolition job would be contractually bound to recycle whatever percentage Robins AFB deems appropriate. For instance, during the ongoing demolition of Military Family Housing on base, it has been found that by recycling brick, asphalt, concrete, windows, doors, and appliances, at least $75\%$ of the solid waste was recyclable. It appears that a reasonable figure for recycling solid waste for Chiefs’ Circle would be $75-80\%$ by weight.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>To/From</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-Jan-07</td>
<td>To SHPO</td>
<td>Notified SHPO of Robins' intent to convert Chiefs' Circle to admin space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Feb-07</td>
<td>From SHPO</td>
<td>Response to letter dated 12 Jan 07 requesting additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Feb-07</td>
<td>To SHPO</td>
<td>Response to letter dated 14 Feb 07 providing additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Mar-07</td>
<td>From SHPO</td>
<td>SHPO concurs on a finding of no adverse effect on the Chiefs' Circle conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Aug-07</td>
<td>To SHPO</td>
<td>Proposed Demolition of Chiefs' Circle - USAF now wants to demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Aug-07</td>
<td>To ACHP</td>
<td>Notified ACHP at the same time as SHPO about the proposed demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Sep-07</td>
<td>From ACHP</td>
<td>Notified Robins' of their intent to participate in the consultation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Sep-07</td>
<td>From SHPO</td>
<td>Advised that next step in Section 106 process is considering alternatives to demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Jun-08</td>
<td>From SHPO</td>
<td>References their site visit (3/14/08) &amp; stresses importance of alternatives to demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Jun-08</td>
<td>To SHPO</td>
<td>Sent DRAFT Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for their review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Jun-08</td>
<td>To ACHP</td>
<td>Sent DRAFT MOA for their review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Jun-08</td>
<td>From ACHP</td>
<td>Will not comment on the MOA until all alternatives have been considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Jun-08</td>
<td>To SHPO</td>
<td>Sent DRAFT EA for their review that includes alternatives to demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Jun-08</td>
<td>To ACHP</td>
<td>Sent DRAFT EA for their review that includes alternatives to demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>From/To</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Jun-08</td>
<td>From SHPO</td>
<td>Will not comment on the MOA until all alternatives have been considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Jul-08</td>
<td>From ACHP</td>
<td>Does not feel the EA adequately addresses or considers alternatives to demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Jul-08</td>
<td>From SHPO</td>
<td>Does not feel the EA adequately addresses or considers alternatives to demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Sep-08</td>
<td>To ACHP</td>
<td>Response to EA review comments clarifying efforts to find alternatives to demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Sep-08</td>
<td>To SHPO</td>
<td>Response to EA review comments clarifying efforts to find alternatives to demo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 28, 2008

Fred Hursey
Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
Environmental Management Division
Department of the Air Force
78 CEG/CEVP
775 Macon Street, Building 1555
Robins Air Force Base, Georgia 31098

RE: Robins AFB: Demolition of Chiefs’ Circle Historic District
Houston County, Georgia
HP-070831-005

Dear Mr. Hursey:

The Historic Preservation Division (HPD) is in receipt of your letter dated September 17, 2008 that addresses the comments that our office provided on the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the above referenced undertaking. Our comments are offered to assist the US Department of the Air Force (USAF) and Robins Air Force Base (AFB) in complying with the provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA).

Thank you for providing additional information on consideration of alternatives to demolition for the National Register-eligible Chiefs’ Circle Historic District that included a synopsis of efforts to convert the property for other uses. However, this response and additional information do not meaningfully change previous comments, especially with regard to planning and analysis with a bias toward demolition. That this bias is apparently the result of USAF-wide policy and modifying the policy is beyond the scope of a base-level EA does not mitigate the situation for Chiefs’ Circle and the underlying issue of demolition of historic resources as a result of not taking their preservation and continued use as a preferred treatment, with demolition as a last resort, in base planning.

Regarding alternative uses that were considered, HPD would like to suggest consideration of partnering with other federal or with state agencies, such as those that provide housing for the homeless, in an attempt to match these resources with a need in the community. It seems to us that these duplexes would be a good fit for families without adequate housing and responsibility for maintenance of the buildings could be assumed by a partner agency.

We again offer our assistance to the USAF and Robins AFB to evaluate additional alternatives that may justify keeping these buildings. Please contact Elizabeth (Betsy) Shirk, Environmental Review Coordinator, at (404) 651-6624.

Sincerely,

W. Ray Luce
Division Director

WRL/ECS

cc: Nancy Brown, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Kristina Harpst, Middle Georgia RDC
November 10, 2008

Mr. Fred Hursey
Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
78th Civil Engineer Group
775 Macon St., Bldg 1555
Robins Air Force Base, GA 31098

Ref: Proposed Demolition of Chiefs’ Circle Historic District, Robins Air Force Base, Georgia

Dear Mr. Hursey:

The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) received your letter, dated September 17, 2008. Thank you for addressing our concerns about how the draft memorandum of agreement (MOA) for the referenced project was characterized in the draft Environmental Assessment for the Demolition of Chiefs’ Circle Residential Structures (EA) by removing any reference to the MOA.

While we appreciate the efforts to provide a more thorough description of the alternatives that were considered for reusing the space, we question how these efforts concluded that there is no possible reuse for the historic district. Your letter points out that some areas slated for demolition will be rebuilt as an extensive Air Force Reserve Command Campus, which indicates the need for additional space on the base in the foreseeable future. Reusing the existing structures within the historic district to meet this need would be a cost-effective way to address realignment and add square footage, at a fraction of the cost of new construction. The Synopsis of Efforts to Convert Chiefs’ Circle to Temporary Living Facilities, to Administrative Space, or for “Soft Uses” you provided with your September 17 letter lists three administrative functions that were considered, but gives no explanation of why they were not feasible: GSA Rep (Building 255), CARE (Building 300), and ANG Rep (Basement Building 300). We also question whether the CFC’s “dislike” of the location is sufficient reason to demolish a historic district determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. This seems contrary to both the letter and spirit of Section 110(a)(2)(B) of the National Historic Preservation Act, which requires federal agencies to “manage and maintain” their historic properties.

In determining whether the properties can be retained, we support the State Historic Preservation Officer’s (SHPO) suggestion that the Air Force explore partnering with other federal or state agencies to use these structures to provide low-income housing or housing for the homeless. We share the SHPO’s concerns that planning and analysis has been done with a bias toward demolition as the preferred treatment, without adequate exploration of alternatives that would preserve at least some of these historic properties.
3 March 2009

RE: Disposition of Chiefs’ Circle

Ms. Shirk

In accordance with our most recent email and phone communications, and in particular your letter dated 28 October 2008, we have expanded our analysis of previously described alternative uses for Chiefs’ Circle, and searched for other logistically and economically feasible options short of demolition (please see attached table of alternatives).

At this time, our commander has determined that two alternatives should be considered. One preferred alternative is to keep one of the buildings as a representative of the district and its history and to be maintained for soft uses, as is currently being done. The second alternative would keep one of the buildings but move it to another location on or off base, most likely in close proximity to other houses or an area where the public has access to it (see Alternatives 5 and 6 on the attached table). As for the four buildings that would be demolished, the local Habitat for Humanity office would reuse many of their materials, and we would insert language in the demolition contract requiring that up to 75 percent of the remaining materials be recycled.

Robins Air Force Base acknowledges a 30-day calendar day review period from the date we receive the return receipt. Should we not receive any comments within that time frame, we will assume you do not object to our request, and we shall proceed with incorporating this language into our environmental assessment and the project’s programmed request for funding. Please look over our alternatives analysis, and contact Dr. Robert Sargent at 478/327-3974 if you have any questions or need further information.

Fred Hursey
Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
Environmental Division
Attachment:
Synopsis of alternatives analysis
In accordance with the SHPO's letter dated 28 October 2008, as well as recent phone discussions with the ACHP and SHPO, we have expanded our analysis of previously described alternative uses for Chiefs' Circle, and searched for other logistically and economically feasible options short of demolition (please see attached table of alternatives).

At this time, our commander has determined that two alternatives should be considered. One preferred alternative is to keep one of the buildings as a representative of the district and its history and to be maintained for soft uses, as is currently being done. The second alternative would keep one of the buildings but move it to another location on or off base, most likely in close proximity to other houses or an area where the public has access to it (see Alternatives 5 and 6 on the attached table). As for the four buildings that would be demolished, the local Habitat for Humanity office would reuse many of their materials, and we would insert language in the demolition contract requiring that up to 75 percent of the remaining materials be recycled.

We apologize for the misunderstanding regarding this particular communication on this project. We had understood that you wanted our office to "work out" the analysis of these alternatives with the Georgia SHPO, and keep you informed concerning our progress. So we notified the SHPO first, and then followed-up with a phone call and email to them two weeks later before discussing this with you. In the future, we will send letters to both offices simultaneously, as we've generally done in the past. We realize that you are very busy and will be travelling next week, but would greatly appreciate it if you could possibly provide your thoughts concerning our analysis and proposal by 6 April. Please contact Dr. Robert Sargent at
April 3, 2009

Fred Hursey
Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
Environmental Management Division
Department of the Air Force
78 CEG/CEVP
775 Macon Street, Building 1555
Robins Air Force Base, Georgia 31098

RE: Robins AFB: Demolition of Chiefs’ Circle Historic District
Houston County, Georgia
HP-070831-005

Dear Mr. Hursey:

The Historic Preservation Division (HPD) is in receipt of your letter dated March 3, 2009 concerning the above referenced undertaking. Our comments are offered to assist the US Department of the Air Force (USAF) and Robins Air Force Base (AFB) in complying with the provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA).

Thank you for providing additional information consisting of a summarized expanded analysis of alternative uses for Chief’s Circle with preference focused on two alternatives: (1) Alternative 6 – retain one structure as representative of the Chief’s Circle Historic District (H.D.) and maintain it for “soft” uses and (2) Alternative 5 – relocate one or all structures that make up Chief’s Circle H.D. on or off base.

Based on the information submitted, we continue to question whether the consideration of alternatives was adequate since the summary does not provide details that would allow evaluation of the level of effort. HPD understands from informal discussion with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) that this is their position as well. In addition, we would offer another recommendation for consideration. We suggest that the USAF and Robins AFB check to see if the thrust to provide funding for housing of homeless veterans might offer an appropriate use for these buildings.

We look forward to working with you and the ACHP as this project continues. If you have any questions, please contact Elizabeth (Betsy) Shirk, Environmental Review Coordinator, at (404) 651-6624.

Sincerely,

W. Ray Luce
Division Director

cc: Nancy Brown, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Kristina Harpst, Middle Georgia RDC
April 3, 2009

Mr. Fred Hursey
Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
78th Civil Engineer Group
775 Macon St., Bldg 1555
Robins Air Force Base, GA 31098

Ref: Proposed Demolition of Chiefs’ Circle Historic District, Robins Air Force Base, Georgia

Dear Mr. Hursey:

The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) has reviewed your March 20, 2009 letter, and we regret any confusion regarding our interest in the completion of the Section 106 process for the referenced project. While we only get involved in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process when agencies coordinate it with their requirements under Section 106, the ACHP tends to remain in the Section 106 consultation until that process has been completed. While we are encouraged by the Air Force’s interest in preserving one of the four buildings in the Chiefs’ Circle Historic District, we share the State Historic Preservation Officer’s concerns about the level of effort the Air Force has put into determining that only one of these historic buildings can be retained. In order to determine whether a reasonable and good faith effort has been made to preserve all the buildings, we would appreciate a more detailed account of the Air Force’s efforts.

As you know, our regulations require the federal agency in charge of an undertaking to seek ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any adverse effects to historic properties. Before the agency can determine appropriate mitigation to resolve adverse effects, it first needs to fully examine alternatives to demolition. In our November 10, 2008 letter to you we questioned how efforts to find an alternative to demolition concluded that there is no possible reuse for the historic district. The table provided with your recent letter does not adequately address the issues that the Air Force considered in reaching its conclusion, because it does not provide a level of detail necessary to document that alternatives to demolition were fully examined. Additional information should illustrate, for example, how and when other interested parties and the public were notified that the buildings were available for reuse, what responses, if any, the Air Force received, and how it determined this was not a feasible outcome. Further, the Air Force should provide a breakdown of the estimated costs for each alternative, and the qualifications of those who prepared the analysis. The additional and very useful information included in your September 9, 2008 letter should be incorporated into the documentation.

The note on your table of alternatives considered indicates that if not demolished, “no funds would be available for the repair and maintenance of the structures resulting in eventual deterioration of the structures.” The statement appears contradictory to Section 110(a)(2)(B) of the National Historic
Preservation Act, calling for federal agencies to “manage and maintain" their historic properties “in a way that considers the preservation of their historic, archaeological, architectural, and cultural values.” Furthermore, Section 110(a)(1) states that federal agencies have a responsibility to “use, to the maximum extent feasible, historic properties available to the agency” prior to constructing buildings. Because the Air Force’s previous correspondence cites the Area Development Plan as one of the driving forces behind decisions to demolish most of the historic district, it would be helpful to know to what degree consideration was given to reuse of historic properties.

We look forward to continuing our consultation with your agency and other consulting parties on the proposed undertaking, and hope that a better understanding of the Section 106 process at the base will lead to an improved consultation process in the future. Please contact Nancy J. Brown at 202.606.8582 or nbrown@achp.gov, should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlene Dwin Vaughn, AICP
Acting Assistant Director
Office of Federal Agency Programs
Federal Property Management Section
In accordance with the SHPO’s letter dated 3 April 2009, we have further expanded our analysis of the previously described alternative uses for Chiefs’ Circle (see attachments), as well as continued to search for other logistically and economically feasible options for the disposition of these buildings.

As previously explained, upgrading these buildings for administrative uses isn’t economically practical, and bringing them up to modern housing standards isn’t necessary since the U.S. Air Force (USAF) has actually reduced the number of houses needed on Robins Air Force Base. The problem with the housing upgrade option is compounded by the fact that the USAF has privatized all of its housing facilities, so money for upgrades isn’t available. Although we analyzed the costs and pros and cons of upgrades or adaptive reuse alternatives, we expended most of our effort to find potential users of these buildings, especially off base. Numerous emails and calls have been made to the City of Warner Robins, area developers, the city attorney, and the Twenty-first Century Partnership in an effort to find interested parties. Our efforts to give the buildings to a new owner are hindered by the fact that USAF rules only allow us to give them to another government entity. The City of Warner Robins has expressed interest in acquiring at least one of these buildings, and we have met with them on two occasions (21 October 2009 and 9 November 2009) to discuss this option. We have also asked the Robins Air Force Base Museum of Aviation if they were interested in acquiring any of these buildings. The Director of the Museum of Aviation and his staff decided these buildings were not suitable for exhibits, offices, or storage at the museum.

During our meetings with the City of Warner Robins, officials discussed the possibility of moving one of these buildings to a location off-base, approximately a mile from its current location. The officials thought that placing one of the Chiefs’ Circle houses in this location
would complement the other historic buildings that exist in that area. As a result of these meetings, the city officials plan to discuss the possibility of obtaining one of these buildings with the newly-elected mayor and city council in January 2010. City officials have expressed concerns about limitations the SHPO might place on the use of any relocated buildings, and our office is currently trying to determine how to pay for this potential relocation.

Per your request for us to expand our cost analysis of each alternative, it was found that some of the alternatives would be extremely costly. Continuing to use these buildings as military housing isn't practical because there are sufficient modern houses available on base, and it would cost an estimated $1,433,330 (see attachment 1) to renovate these houses to meet modern military housing standards. Using these houses as administrative space is also not economically feasible because this would require remodeling, renovation, adding communication lines, and updating for American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance, which would cost an estimated $2,482,545 (see attachment 2.) Using these buildings for soft uses would require most of the same upgrades as those necessary for administrative space conversion, and is estimated to cost $1,872,712 (see attachment 3.) We have sought out groups to use these buildings for soft uses “as is,” but none of these groups have expressed interest, largely because the buildings lack modern communication connections, and because of the before-mentioned required upgrades under this option. Relocating these buildings to another location on this installation is also not feasible because it would cost an estimated $2,299,404, including the same upgrade requirements listed above (see attachment 4.)

The most economically feasible and logistically practical alternatives at this time are to either relocate all of the buildings off-base, or to demolish four of them and relocate the remaining one on or off-base. In order to move all of these buildings off-base, which would cost an estimated $547,150 (see attachment 4), we would need to find parties that would like to acquire them and determine if USAF policy will allow us to donate these buildings to interested parties. Thus far the only interested party identified is the City of Warner Robins, and we are still researching whether or not we will be able to donate a building to them. To demolish four of the buildings and keep the remaining one on base for administrative or soft use would cost an estimated $595,771 (see attachment 5.) Demolishing four of the buildings and relocating the remaining one off-base would only cost an estimated $212,772 (see attachment 5), and as stated previously, we have located a potential user for this alternative.

Although no other parties have expressed interest in acquiring any of the Chiefs’ Circle buildings at this time, we will continue to search for viable options for the disposition of these buildings. Note that we have considered making the buildings available onsite to low-income citizens in the community per your previous suggestion, but have determined that this option is inappropriate from a security standpoint. We welcome any suggestions from the SHPO regarding potential owners for these buildings, and would greatly appreciate your thoughts concerning our analysis. We would also like to get your thoughts about any restrictions your office might impose with respect to building modifications should the City of Warner Robins acquire one or more of the buildings. We request your response and comments to this letter within 45 calendar days from the date we receive the return receipt. Should we not receive any comments within that time
frame, we will assume you agree with our findings and do not have any further suggestions or requests. Please contact Andrea Pyron at 478-926-9645 if you have any questions or need further information.

Fred Hursey
Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
Environmental Division

Attachments:
1. Alternative 1 Cost Analysis
2. Alternative 3 Cost Analysis
3. Alternative 4 Cost Analysis
4. Alternative 5 Cost Analysis
5. Alternative 6 Cost Analysis

cc:
78 CEG/CEA (Douglas Johnson)
HQ AFMC/A6/7 (Erwin Roemer)
778 CES/CL (Nancy Manley)
78 CES/CL (Paul Kelley)
CHIEFS' CIRCLE ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1: Renovating and continuing their use as residences

$1,433,330

Means Estimating Guide
Remodel 5 duplex units to 5 single units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per Bldg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Fee</td>
<td>$22,108</td>
<td>$110,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Demolition</td>
<td>$14,904</td>
<td>$74,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical, Structural and Roof Repairs for Car Ports (2 per bldg)</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Abatement with Containment</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Interior Wall Construction</td>
<td>$10,168</td>
<td>$50,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim and Paint</td>
<td>$32,292</td>
<td>$161,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Millwork</td>
<td>$10,996</td>
<td>$54,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>$22,190</td>
<td>$110,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>$13,579</td>
<td>$67,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural and Roof Repairs</td>
<td>$19,872</td>
<td>$99,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical (Main Building)</td>
<td>$17,057</td>
<td>$85,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions (Indirect Costs)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal
$178,666 $953,330

ADA Compliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Widen Interior Doors or Openings</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen Exterior Doorways</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramps with connecting decks</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Lifts</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal
$96,000 $480,000

Total Renovation Cost
$1,433,330

Attachment 1
This scope of work is remodel cost and interior re-work to convert two separate units into one home. The difference in cost estimates is driven by higher estimated costs in plumbing, electrical, roof and structural repairs as based on the cost average established by MEANS. The revised cost estimate is validated by the fact that without adding ADA costs the renovation cost is 52% of new home construction assuming $110 per SF which is typical for new home in the local market.
### CHIEFS’ CIRCLE ALTERNATIVES

**Alternative 3: Renovating the structures for future use as administrative space**

$2,482,545

**Means Estimating Guide**

**Remodel to Admin Space**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Per Bldg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Fee</td>
<td>$22,108</td>
<td>$110,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Demolition</td>
<td>$14,904</td>
<td>$74,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical, Structural and Roof Repairs for Car Ports (2 per bldg)</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Abatement with Containment</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim and Paint</td>
<td>$32,292</td>
<td>$161,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Millwork</td>
<td>$17,388</td>
<td>$86,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Fire Alarm and Sprinkler</td>
<td>$8,992</td>
<td>$44,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>$24,840</td>
<td>$124,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>$49,680</td>
<td>$248,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural and Roof Repairs, Increase Loading to 50lbs/sf 2nd floor</td>
<td>$26,496</td>
<td>$132,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical (Main Building)</td>
<td>$50,342</td>
<td>$251,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 parking spots</td>
<td>$13,584</td>
<td>$67,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions (Indirect Costs)</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$280,126</td>
<td>$1,460,632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Communications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Per Bldg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside Bldg Cabling</td>
<td>$25,840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Equipment</td>
<td>$52,355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Plant Fiber Optic</td>
<td>$204,404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Copper</td>
<td>$124,314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Plant Conduit System and manholes</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$541,913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal**

$2,002,545

Attachment 2
## ADA Compliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Per Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Widen Interior Doors or Openings</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen Exterior Doorways</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramps with Connecting Decks</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Lifts</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$248,2545</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This scope of work includes complete remodel and selective demolition to adjust walls and remove non administrative space functions (i.e. kitchens.) Work includes adding ADA bathrooms, lifts and fire safety for office occupancies. Current structural loading is insufficient on the 2nd Floor. Estimated costs have been added to address these issues. Outside plant cost have been added to accommodate the necessary communication systems. This estimate assumes 10 parking spots per bldg to be built.
CHIEFS’ CIRCLE ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 4: Reuse of the structures for “soft” uses

$1,872,712

Means Estimating Guide

Remodel to Admin Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Per Bldg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Fee</td>
<td>$22,108</td>
<td>$110,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Demolition</td>
<td>$14,904</td>
<td>$74,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical, Structural and Roof Repairs for Car Ports (2 per bldg)</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Abatement with Containment</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim and Paint</td>
<td>$32,292</td>
<td>$161,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Millwork</td>
<td>$17,388</td>
<td>$86,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Fire Alarm and Sprinkler</td>
<td>$8,992</td>
<td>$44,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>$24,840</td>
<td>$124,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>$49,680</td>
<td>$248,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural and Roof Repairs, Increase Loading to 50lbs/sf 2nd floor</td>
<td>$26,496</td>
<td>$132,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical (Main Building)</td>
<td>$50,342</td>
<td>$251,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions (Indirect Costs)</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal                                                                   $266,542  $1,392,712

ADA Compliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Per Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Widen Interior Doors or Openings</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen Exterior Doorways</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramps with connecting decks</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Lifts</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                                                                 $96,000  $480,000

$1,872,712
The definition of soft needs does not change the standards for life safety or NFPA or ADA requirements. Even if the use was effectively left as an office located in a house, there is no way to ensure the soft use was not exceeded. Additionally, fire alarm and ADA requirements differ based on residential and commercial use, not soft use. We are still required to meet ASHREA 90.1 which drives different requirements for residential and commercial operations. The communications cabling cost would be less within the bldg except that there is still a large base network cost that can't be avoided to bring service. Over the next 15 years all these systems will have to be repaired.
CHIEFS’ CIRCLE ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 5: Relocation of all of the structures to an on-base or off-base location

Option 1 $2,299,404  Option 2 $547,150

Means Estimating Guide

**Option 1:** Remodel 5 duplex units and move them to another location on-base.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Per Bldg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Fee</td>
<td>$22,108</td>
<td>$110,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Demolition</td>
<td>$14,904</td>
<td>$74,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical, Structural and Roof Repairs for Car Ports (2 per bldg)</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Abatement with Containment</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim and Paint</td>
<td>$32,292</td>
<td>$161,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Millwork</td>
<td>$10,996</td>
<td>$54,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>$22,190</td>
<td>$110,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>$13,579</td>
<td>$67,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural and Roof Repairs</td>
<td>$19,872</td>
<td>$99,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical (Main Building)</td>
<td>$17,057</td>
<td>$85,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions (Indirect Costs)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Subtotal                                                                   | $168,498 | $902,491 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relocation Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Move Buildings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Site Utilities</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Subtotal                                                                      | $ 75,000 | $ 375,000 |

| Subtotal                                                                      | $1,277,491 |

Attachment 4
### Communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside Bldg Cabling</td>
<td>$25,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Equipment</td>
<td>$52,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Plant Fiber Optic</td>
<td>$204,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Copper</td>
<td>$124,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Plant Conduit System and manholes</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$541,913</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADA Compliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Widen Interior Doors or Openings</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen Exterior Doorways</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramps with Connecting Decks</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Lifts</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$96,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                                   **$2,299,404**
Option 2: Relocate 5 duplex units to a location off-base

Partial Demolition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHIEF'S CIRCLE (5 duplex unit)</th>
<th>Per unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition Design Fee</td>
<td>$1,095</td>
<td>$10,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EROSION CONTROL FEE</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EROSION CONTROL MEASURES</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg Demolition</td>
<td>$9,680</td>
<td>$96,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Demolition</td>
<td>$1,740</td>
<td>$17,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Abatement</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td>$7,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Pavements and Drives</td>
<td>$1,870</td>
<td>$18,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Stabilization Seeding</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal $17,215 108.26% $172,150

Relocation Cost

| Move Buildings | 5 | $60,000 | $300,000 |
| New Site Utilities | 5 | $15,000 | $75,000 |

Total $375,000

$547,150

This scope of work is remodel cost and interior re-work to convert two separate units into one home. The revised cost estimate is validated by the fact that without adding ADA costs the renovation cost is 52% of new home construction assuming $110 per SF which is typical for new home in the local market. The relocation cost is broken out with the addition of the new site utilities and drive pavements.
CHIEFS' CIRCLE ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 6: Demolition of four, and administrative or soft reuse of the remaining structure on-site or off-site

Option 1 $ 595,771 Option 2 $212,772

Option 1: Demolish 4 buildings and move the remaining one to another site on-base

Demolition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHIEF'S CIRCLE (4 duplex unit)</th>
<th>Per unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition Design Fee</td>
<td>$ 1,095</td>
<td>$ 8,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EROSION CONTROL FEE</td>
<td>$ 25</td>
<td>0.17% $ 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EROSION CONTROL MEASURES</td>
<td>$ 800</td>
<td>5.37% $ 6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg Demolition</td>
<td>$ 9,680</td>
<td>65.01% $ 77,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Demolition</td>
<td>$ 1,740</td>
<td>11.69% $ 13,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Abatement</td>
<td>$ 725</td>
<td>4.87% $ 5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Pavements and Drives</td>
<td>$ 1,870</td>
<td>12.56% $ 14,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Stabilization Seeding</td>
<td>$ 800</td>
<td>5.37% $ 6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions (Indirect Costs)</td>
<td>$ 480</td>
<td>3.22% $ 3,840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal $ 17,215 108.26% $ 137,722

Renovate one unit

Design Fee $22,108
Selective Demolition $14,904
Electrical, Structural and Roof Repairs for Car Ports (2 per bldg) $12,000
Asbestos Abatement with Containment $1,500
New Interior Wall Construction $10,168
Trim and Paint $32,292
Equipment & Millwork $10,996
Plumbing $22,910
HVAC $13,579
Structural and Roof Repairs $19,872
Electrical (Main Building) $17,057
General Conditions (Indirect Costs) $ 2,000

$178,666
### Subtotal

$316,388

### Communications (for one unit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside Bldg Cabling</td>
<td>$5,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Equipment</td>
<td>$10,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Plant Fiber Optic</td>
<td>$40,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Copper</td>
<td>$24,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Plant Conduit System and manholes</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $108,383

### ADA Compliance (for one unit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Widen Interior Doors or Openings</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen Exterior Doorways</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramps with Connecting Decks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Lifts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $38,700

### Relocation Cost (for one unit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Move Building</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Site Utilities</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $75,000

### Total

$595,771
Option 2: Demolish 4 Units & Move the Remaining Building Off-Base

Demolition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Per unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHIEF'S CIRCLE (4 duplex unit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition Design Fee</td>
<td>$ 1,095</td>
<td>$ 8,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EROSION CONTROL FEE</td>
<td>$ 25</td>
<td>0.17% $ 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EROSION CONTROL MEASURES</td>
<td>$ 800</td>
<td>5.37% $ 6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg Demolition, Single Fam House</td>
<td>$ 9,680</td>
<td>65.01% $ 77,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Demolition</td>
<td>$ 1,740</td>
<td>11.69% $ 13,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Abatement</td>
<td>$ 725</td>
<td>4.87% $ 5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Pavements and Drives</td>
<td>$ 1,870</td>
<td>12.56% $ 14,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Stabilization Seeding</td>
<td>$ 800</td>
<td>5.37% $ 6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions (Indirect Costs)</td>
<td>$ 480</td>
<td>3.22% $ 3,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$17,215</td>
<td>108.26% $ 137,722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relocation Cost (for one unit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Move Building</td>
<td>$ 60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Site Utilities</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$212,772</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scope of work includes demolition for 4 units with utilities and site and relocation cost for one unit.
In accordance with the SHPO’s letter dated 3 April 2009, we have further expanded our analysis of the previously described alternative uses for Chiefs’ Circle (see attachments), as well as continued to search for other logistically and economically feasible options for the disposition of these buildings.

As previously explained, upgrading these buildings for administrative uses isn’t economically practical, and bringing them up to modern housing standards isn’t necessary since the U.S. Air Force (USAF) has actually reduced the number of houses needed on Robins Air Force Base. The problem with the housing upgrade option is compounded by the fact that the USAF has privatized all of its housing facilities, so money for upgrades isn’t available. Although we analyzed the costs and pros and cons of upgrades or adaptive reuse alternatives, we expended most of our effort to find potential users of these buildings, especially off base. Numerous emails and calls have been made to the City of Warner Robins, area developers, the city attorney, and the Twenty-first Century Partnership in an effort to find interested parties.

Our efforts to give the buildings to a new owner are hindered by the fact that USAF rules only allow us to give them to another government entity. The City of Warner Robins has expressed interest in acquiring at least one of these buildings, and we have met with them on two occasions (21 October 2009 and 9 November 2009) to discuss this option. We have also asked the Robins Air Force Base Museum of Aviation if they were interested in acquiring any of these buildings. The Director of the Museum of Aviation and his staff decided these buildings were not suitable for exhibits, offices, or storage at the museum.

During our meetings with the City of Warner Robins, officials discussed the possibility of moving one of these buildings to a location off-base, approximately a mile from its current location. The officials thought that placing one of the Chiefs’ Circle houses in this location would complement the other historic buildings that exist in that area. As a result of these meetings, the city officials plan to discuss the possibility of obtaining one of these buildings with the newly-elected mayor and city council in January 2010. City officials have expressed
concerns about limitations the SHPO might place on the use of any relocated buildings, and our office is currently trying to determine how to pay for this potential relocation.

Per your request for us to expand our cost analysis of each alternative, it was found that some of the alternatives would be extremely costly. Continuing to use these buildings as military housing isn’t practical because there are sufficient modern houses available on base, and it would cost an estimated $1,433,330 (see attachment 1) to renovate these houses to meet modern military housing standards. Using these houses as administrative space is also not economically feasible because this would require remodeling, renovation, adding communication lines, and updating for American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance, which would cost an estimated $2,482,545 (see attachment 2.) Using these buildings for soft uses would require most of the same upgrades as those necessary for administrative space conversion, and is estimated to cost $1,872,712 (see attachment 3.) We have sought out groups to use these buildings for soft uses “as is,” but none of these groups have expressed interest, largely because the buildings lack modern communication connections, and because of the before-mentioned required upgrades under this option. Relocating these buildings to another location on this installation is also not feasible because it would cost an estimated $2,299,404, including the same upgrade requirements listed above (see attachment 4.)

The most economically feasible and logistically practical alternatives at this time are to either relocate all of the buildings off-base, or to demolish four of them and relocate the remaining one on or off-base. In order to move all of these buildings off-base, which would cost an estimated $547,150 (see attachment 4), we would need to find parties that would like to acquire them and determine if USAF policy will allow us to donate these buildings to interested parties. Thus far the only interested party identified is the City of Warner Robins, and we are still researching whether or not we will be able to donate a building to them. To demolish four of the buildings and keep the remaining one on base for administrative or soft use would cost an estimated $595,771 (see attachment 5.) Demolishing four of the buildings and relocating the remaining one off-base would only cost an estimated $212,772 (see attachment 5), and as stated previously, we have located a potential user for this alternative.

Although no other parties have expressed interest in acquiring any of the Chiefs’ Circle buildings at this time, we will continue to search for viable options for the disposition of these buildings. Note that we have considered making the buildings available onsite to low-income citizens in the community per your previous suggestion, but have determined that this option is inappropriate from a security standpoint. We welcome any suggestions from the SHPO regarding potential owners for these buildings, and would greatly appreciate your thoughts concerning our analysis. We would also like to get your thoughts about any restrictions your office might impose with respect to building modifications should the City of Warner Robins acquire one or more of the buildings. We request your response and comments to this letter within 45 calendar days from the date we receive the return receipt. Should we not receive any comments within that time
frame, we will assume you agree with our findings and do not have any further suggestions or requests. Please contact Andrea Pyron at 478-926-9645 if you have any questions or need further information.

FRED HURSEY  
Chief, Environmental Programming Branch  
Environmental Division

Attachments:
1. Alternative 1 Cost Analysis  
2. Alternative 3 Cost Analysis  
3. Alternative 4 Cost Analysis  
4. Alternative 5 Cost Analysis  
5. Alternative 6 Cost Analysis  

cc:  
78 CEG/CEA (Douglas Johnson)  
HQ AFMC/A6/7 (Erwin Roemer)  
778 CES/CL (Nancy Manley)  
78 CES/CL (Paul Kelley)
CHIEFS' CIRCLE ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1: Renovating and continuing their use as residences

$1,433,330

Means Estimating Guide
Remodel 5 duplex units to 5 single units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Per Bldg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Fee</td>
<td>$22,108</td>
<td>$110,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Demolition</td>
<td>$14,904</td>
<td>$74,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical, Structural and Roof Repairs for Car Ports (2 per bldg)</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Abatement with Containment</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Interior Wall Construction</td>
<td>$10,168</td>
<td>$50,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim and Paint</td>
<td>$32,292</td>
<td>$161,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Millwork</td>
<td>$10,996</td>
<td>$54,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>$22,190</td>
<td>$110,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>$13,579</td>
<td>$67,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural and Roof Repairs</td>
<td>$19,872</td>
<td>$99,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical (Main Building)</td>
<td>$17,057</td>
<td>$85,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions (Indirect Costs)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal                                                                  $178,666 $ 953,330

ADA Compliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Per Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Widen Interior Doors or Openings</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen Exterior Doorways</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramps with connecting decks</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Lifts</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Renovation Cost                                                      $1,433,330
This scope of work is remodel cost and interior re-work to convert two separate units into one home. The difference in cost estimates is driven by higher estimated costs in plumbing, electrical, roof and structural repairs as based on the cost average established by MEANS. The revised cost estimate is validated by the fact that without adding ADA costs the renovation cost is 52% of new home construction assuming $110 per SF which is typical for new home in the local market.
### CHIEFS’ CIRCLE ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 3: Renovating the structures for future use as administrative space

$ 2,482,545

**Means Estimating Guide**

**Remodel to Admin Space**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per Bldg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Fee</td>
<td>$ 22,108</td>
<td>$ 110,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Demolition</td>
<td>$ 14,904</td>
<td>$ 74,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical, Structural and Roof Repairs for Car Ports (2 per bldg)</td>
<td>$ 12,000</td>
<td>$ 120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Abatement with Containment</td>
<td>$ 1,500</td>
<td>$ 7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim and Paint</td>
<td>$ 32,292</td>
<td>$ 161,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Millwork</td>
<td>$ 17,388</td>
<td>$ 86,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Fire Alarm and Sprinkler</td>
<td>$ 8,992</td>
<td>$ 44,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>$ 24,840</td>
<td>$ 124,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>$ 49,680</td>
<td>$ 248,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural and Roof Repairs, Increase Loading to 50lbs/sf 2nd floor</td>
<td>$ 26,496</td>
<td>$ 132,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical (Main Building)</td>
<td>$ 50,342</td>
<td>$ 251,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 parking spots</td>
<td>$ 13,584</td>
<td>$ 67,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions (Indirect Costs)</td>
<td>$ 6,000</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal**

$ 280,126 $ 1,460,632

**Communications**

| Inside Bldg Cabling       | $ 25,840 |
| Network Equipment         | $ 52,355 |
| Outside Plant Fiber Optic | $ 204,404|
| Outside Copper            | $ 124,314|
| Outside Plant Conduit System and manholes | $ 135,000|

**Subtotal**

$ 541,913

$ 2,002,545
### ADA Compliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Per Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Widen Interior Doors or Openings</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen Exterior Doorways</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramps with Connecting Decks</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Lifts</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,482,545</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This scope of work includes complete remodel and selective demolition to adjust walls and remove non-administrative space functions (i.e. kitchens.) Work includes adding ADA bathrooms, lifts and fire safety for office occupancies. Current structural loading is insufficient on the 2nd Floor. Estimated costs have been added to address these issues. Outside plant cost have been added to accommodate the necessary communication systems. This estimate assumes 10 parking spots per bldg to be built.
# CHIEFS' CIRCLE ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 4: Reuse of the structures for “soft” uses

$1,872,712

## Means Estimating Guide

### Remodel to Admin Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per Bldg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Fee</td>
<td>$22,108</td>
<td>$110,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Demolition</td>
<td>$14,904</td>
<td>$74,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical, Structural and Roof Repairs for Car Ports (2 per bldg)</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Abatement with Containment</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim and Paint</td>
<td>$32,292</td>
<td>$161,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Millwork</td>
<td>$17,388</td>
<td>$86,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Fire Alarm and Sprinkler</td>
<td>$8,992</td>
<td>$44,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>$24,840</td>
<td>$124,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>$49,680</td>
<td>$248,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural and Roof Repairs, Increase Loading to 50lbs/sf 2nd floor</td>
<td>$26,496</td>
<td>$132,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical (Main Building)</td>
<td>$50,342</td>
<td>$251,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions (Indirect Costs)</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal $266,542 $1,392,712

### ADA Compliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Widen Interior Doors or Openings</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen Exterior Doorways</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramps with connecting decks</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Lifts</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $96,000 $480,000

$1,872,712
The definition of soft needs does not change the standards for life safety or NFPA or ADA requirements. Even if the use was effectively left as an office located in a house, there is no way to ensure the soft use was not exceeded. Additionally, fire alarm and ADA requirements differ based on residential and commercial use, not soft use. We are still required to meet ASHREA 90.1 which drives different requirements for residential and commercial operations. The communications cabling cost would be less within the bldg except that there is still a large base network cost that can't be avoided to bring service. Over the next 15 years all these systems will have to be repaired.
CHIEFS’ CIRCLE ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 5: Relocation of all of the structures to an on-base or off-base location

Option 1 $2,299,404  Option 2 $547,150

Means Estimating Guide
Option 1: Remodel 5 duplex units and move them to another location on-base.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Per Bldg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Fee</td>
<td>$22,108</td>
<td>$110,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Demolition</td>
<td>$14,904</td>
<td>$74,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical, Structural and Roof Repairs for Car Ports (2 per bldg)</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Abatement with Containment</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim and Paint</td>
<td>$32,292</td>
<td>$161,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Millwork</td>
<td>$10,996</td>
<td>$54,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>$22,190</td>
<td>$110,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>$13,579</td>
<td>$67,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural and Roof Repairs</td>
<td>$19,872</td>
<td>$99,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical (Main Building)</td>
<td>$17,057</td>
<td>$85,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions (Indirect Costs)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$168,498</td>
<td>$902,491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relocation Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Move Buildings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Site Utilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside Bldg Cabling</td>
<td>$25,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Equipment</td>
<td>$52,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Plant Fiber Optic</td>
<td>$204,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Copper</td>
<td>$124,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Plant Conduit System and manholes</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$541,913</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADA Compliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Widen Interior Doors or Openings</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen Exterior Doorways</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramps with Connecting Decks</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Lifts</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$96,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                                 **$1,819,404**
Option 2: Relocate 5 duplex units to a location off-base

Partial Demolition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHIEF'S CIRCLE (5 duplex unit)</th>
<th>Per unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition Design Fee</td>
<td>$ 1,095</td>
<td>$ 10,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EROSION CONTROL FEE</td>
<td>$ 25</td>
<td>0.17% $ 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EROSION CONTROL MEASURES</td>
<td>$ 800</td>
<td>5.37% $ 8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg Demolition</td>
<td>$ 9,680</td>
<td>65.01% $ 96,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Demolition</td>
<td>$ 1,740</td>
<td>11.69% $ 17,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Abatement</td>
<td>$ 725</td>
<td>4.87% $ 7,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Pavements and Drives</td>
<td>$ 1,870</td>
<td>12.56% $ 18,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Stabilization Seeding</td>
<td>$ 800</td>
<td>5.37% $ 8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions</td>
<td>$ 480</td>
<td>3.22% $ 4,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal                        | $ 17,215 | 108.26% $ 172,150 |

Relocation Cost

| Move Buildings | 5 | $ 60,000 | $ 300,000 |
| New Site Utilities | 5 | $ 15,000 | $ 75,000 |

$ 375,000

Total $547,150

This scope of work is remodel cost and interior re-work to convert two separate units into one home. The revised cost estimate is validated by the fact that without adding ADA costs the renovation cost is 52% of new home construction assuming $110 per SF which is typical for new home in the local market. The relocation cost is broken out with the addition of the new site utilities and drive pavements.
CHIEFS’ CIRCLE ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 6: Demolition of four, and administrative or soft reuse of the remaining structure on-site or off-site

Option 1 $ 595,771 Option 2 $212,772

Option 1: Demolish 4 buildings and move the remaining one to another site on-base

Demolition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHIEF’S CIRCLE (4 duplex unit)</th>
<th>Per unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition Design Fee</td>
<td>$ 1,095</td>
<td>$ 8,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EROSION CONTROL FEE</td>
<td>$ 25</td>
<td>0.17%  $ 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EROSION CONTROL MEASURES</td>
<td>$ 800</td>
<td>5.37%  $ 6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg Demolition</td>
<td>$ 9,680</td>
<td>65.01% $ 77,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Demolition</td>
<td>$ 1,740</td>
<td>11.69% $ 13,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Abatement</td>
<td>$ 725</td>
<td>4.87%  $ 5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Pavements and Drives</td>
<td>$ 1,870</td>
<td>12.56% $ 14,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Stabilization Seeding</td>
<td>$ 800</td>
<td>5.37%  $ 6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions (Indirect Costs)</td>
<td>$ 480</td>
<td>3.22% $ 3,840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal $ 17,215 108.26% $ 137,722

Renovate one unit

Design Fee $22,108
Selective Demolition $14,904
Electrical, Structural and Roof Repairs for Car Ports (2 per bldg) $12,000
Asbestos Abatement with Containment $1,500
New Interior Wall Construction $10,168
Trim and Paint $32,292
Equipment & Millwork $10,996
Plumbing $22,190
HVAC $13,579
Structural and Roof Repairs $19,872
Electrical (Main Building) $17,057
General Conditions (Indirect Costs) $ 2,000 $178,666
## Communications (for one unit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside Bldg Cabling</td>
<td>$5,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Equipment</td>
<td>$10,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Plant Fiber Optic</td>
<td>$40,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Copper</td>
<td>$24,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Plant Conduit System and manholes</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal** $108,383

## ADA Compliance (for one unit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Widen Interior Doors or Openings</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen Exterior Doorways</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramps with Connecting Decks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Lifts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal** $520,771

## Relocation Cost (for one unit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Move Building</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Site Utilities</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal** $75,000

**Total** $595,771

---

Subtotal $316,388

Subtotal $424,771

Attachment 5
Option 2: Demolish 4 Units & Move the Remaining Building Off-Base

Demolition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Per unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHIEF'S CIRCLE (4 duplex unit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition Design Fee</td>
<td>$1,095</td>
<td>$8,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EROSION CONTROL FEE</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EROSION CONTROL MEASURES</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>5.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg Demolition, Single Farm House</td>
<td>$9,680</td>
<td>65.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Demolition</td>
<td>$1,740</td>
<td>11.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Abatement</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td>4.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Pavements and Drives</td>
<td>$1,870</td>
<td>12.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Stabilization Seeding</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>5.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions (Indirect Costs)</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>3.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$17,215</td>
<td>108.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relocation Cost (for one unit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Move Building</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Site Utilities</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scope of work includes demolition for 4 units with utilities and site and relocation cost for one unit.
January 26, 2010

Fred Hursey
Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
Environmental Division
Department of the Air Force
78 CEG/CEVP
775 Macon Street, Building 1555
Robins Air Force Base, Georgia 31098

Att: Andrea Pyron

RE: Robins AFB: Demolition of Chiefs’ Circle Historic District
Houston County, Georgia
HP-070831-005

Dear Mr. Hursey:

The Historic Preservation Division (HPD) is in receipt of your letter dated December 11, 2009 for the above referenced undertaking. Our comments are offered to assist the US Department of the Air Force (USAF) and Robins Air Force Base (AFB) in complying with the provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA).

Thank you for the additional information on alternatives to demolition for the National Register-eligible Chiefs’ Circle Historic District. The cost analyses provided for the five previously described alternatives seem to realistically estimate the costs associated with the various alternatives, excepting that some savings appear achievable if not all of the structures were ADA compliant. We note that the extent of ADA compliance necessary can vary depending on the building use and implementing compliance alternatives available for historic buildings. However, based on the information provided to date and, as noted in previous comments, conceding that the current location of Chief’s Circle limits its sustainability, it is our opinion that Alternative 5, which entails relocating the buildings to another site, either on-or off-base, for residential or adaptive use should be the minimal target objective. If such relocation occurs and also involves transfer to another entity, the transfer should include agreement by the new owners to treat the buildings in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties of which the Standards for Rehabilitation would be most applicable.

HPD appreciates that Robins AFB has adequately evaluated alternatives to demolition of these buildings and we agree that the next step in the Section 106 process is consultation to resolve the Adverse Effects associated with this undertaking. If you have any questions, please contact Elizabeth (Betsy) Shirk, Environmental Review Coordinator, at (404) 651-6624.

Sincerely,

Karen Anderson-Cordova
Manager, Planning & Local Assistance Unit

KAC/ECS

cc: Katherine Kerr, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
    Kristina Harpst, Middle Georgia RC
RE: Current Status of Chiefs’ Circle, Robins AFB, Georgia

Ms. Brown

In accordance with the SHPO’s letter dated 26 January 2010, we have continued to search for potential users of the Chiefs’ Circle buildings with the intent to relocate the buildings. We have also continued to communicate and meet with the City of Warner Robins, anticipating that they would be able to acquire at least one of the buildings. The City applied for a grant to fund both the potential move and the remodeling that would be necessary to utilize a house, but was not awarded the money. As a result, Warner Robins is no longer interested in acquiring any of the houses. Unfortunately, our efforts to find another off base entity who would like to acquire the houses have been unsuccessful.

Our new space utilization manager is reassessing what are known as soft use needs with respect to all base organizations. We are also evaluating a new communications concept whereby wireless communications might be implemented in one or all of the structures, provided that we find users for them. This will reduce the substantial costs associated with converting one or more of the houses to administrative uses.

The ongoing war effort has led to reductions in funding for many Department of Defense programs, including housing maintenance. We continue to do everything that we can to ensure compliance with historic preservation requirements, but funding maintenance of buildings that are not being utilized or needed is obviously a lesser priority in difficult economic times such as these. If we should locate a potential user off base, we don’t have the funding to relocate the buildings. We request your assistance in obtaining grants or guidance to assist us in finding a
new owner for these buildings, as well as with relocating one or all of the buildings if a new user is located. We request your response and comments to this letter within 30 calendar days from the date we receive the return receipt. Please contact Andrea Pyron at 478-327-7438 if you have any questions or need any further information.

FRED HURSEY
Chief, Environmental Restoration & Conservation Section
Environmental Branch
78th Civil Engineer Group
RE: Current Status of Chiefs’ Circle, Robins AFB, Georgia

Ms. Shirk

In accordance with the SHPO’s letter dated 26 January 2010, we have continued to search for potential users of the Chiefs’ Circle buildings with the intent to relocate the buildings. We have also continued to communicate and meet with the City of Warner Robins, anticipating that they would be able to acquire at least one of the buildings. The City applied for a grant to fund both the potential move and the remodeling that would be necessary to utilize a house, but was not awarded the money. As a result, Warner Robins is no longer interested in acquiring any of the houses. Unfortunately, our efforts to find another off base entity who would like to acquire the houses have been unsuccessful.

Our new space utilization manager is reassessing what are known as soft use needs with respect to all base organizations. We are also evaluating a new communications concept whereby wireless communications might be implemented in one or all of the structures, provided that we find users for them. This will reduce the substantial costs associated with converting one or more of the houses to administrative uses.

The ongoing war effort has led to reductions in funding for many Department of Defense programs, including housing maintenance. We continue to do everything that we can to ensure compliance with historic preservation requirements, but funding maintenance of buildings that are not being utilized or needed is obviously a lesser priority in difficult economic times such as these. If we should locate a potential user off base, we don’t have the funding to relocate the buildings. We request your assistance in obtaining grants or guidance to assist us in finding a
new owner for these buildings, as well as with relocating one or all of the buildings if a new user is located. We request your response and comments to this letter within 30 calendar days from the date we receive the return receipt. Please contact Andrea Pyron at 478-327-7438 if you have any questions or need any further information.

FRED HURSEY
Chief, Environmental Restoration & Conservation Section
Environmental Branch
78th Civil Engineer Group
March 4, 2011

Fred Hursey
Chief, Environmental Programming Branch
Environmental Division
Department of the Air Force
78 CEG/CEVP
775 Macon Street, Building 1555
Robins Air Force Base, Georgia 31098
Attn: Andrea Pyron, Andrea.Pyron@robins.af.mil

RE: Robins AFB: Demolition of Chiefs’ Circle Historic District
Houston County, Georgia
HP-070831-005

Dear Mr. Hursey:

The Historic Preservation Division (HPD) is in receipt of your letter dated January 26, 2011 concerning the above referenced undertaking. Our comments are offered to assist the US Department of the Air Force (USAF) and Robins Air Force Base (AFB) in complying with the provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA).

Thank you for providing HPD with an update on the status of efforts by Robins AFB to find alternatives to demolition for the National Register-eligible Chiefs’ Circle Historic District. We regret that these have not been successful. As previously stated, HPD concedes that the current location of Chief’s Circle limits its sustainability, but had hoped that an alternative that entailed relocating the buildings to another site, either on- or off-base, for residential or adaptive use would be feasible. Unfortunately, we are unable to provide assistance in locating potential off base entities that might be interested in acquisition of these buildings or funding to relocate the buildings.

HPD appreciates that Robins AFB is reassessing soft use needs with respect to all base organizations as well as evaluating a new communications concept whereby wireless communications might be implemented in one or all of the structures, provided users are found for them.

We look forward to further consultation on this undertaking during the conference call scheduled for March 28, 2011 between the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), Robins AFB and our office. As previously stated in our letter dated January 26, 2010, HPD appreciates that Robins AFB has continued to evaluate alternatives to demolition of these buildings and we agree that the next step in the Section 106 process is consultation to resolve the Adverse Effects associated with this undertaking. If you have any questions, please contact Elizabeth (Betsy) Shirk, Environmental Review Coordinator, at (404) 651-6624.

Sincerely,  

Karen Anderson-Cofiova, Program Manager  
Environmental Review & Preservation Planning

KAC/ECS

cc: Katry Harris, ACHP, kharris@achp.gov  
Kristina Harpst, Middle Georgia RC
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PUBLIC NOTICE
FOR THE DRAFT FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) AND DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI) FOR THE DISPOSITION OF CHIEFS’ CIRCLE RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES
ROBINS AFB GEORGIA

Robins AFB announces the availability for public review and comment the proposed draft final EA, and draft FONSI for the disposition of Chiefs’ Circle Residential Structures at Robins AFB, Georgia.

Robins AFB has entered into a Memorandum of Agreement [MOA] Between Robins Air Force Base, The Georgia Historic Preservation Office [SHPO], and The Advisory Council On Historic Preservation [ACHP] Regarding Chiefs’ Circle Historic District, which sets forth actions consistent with governing historic preservation regulations for the disposition of Chiefs’ Circle residential structures. The Proposed Action would be carried out in accordance with the MOA.

The structures at the Chiefs’ Circle site are not currently suitable for use as residences and cannot reasonably be converted into office or other administrative space. As a result, the structures are susceptible to deterioration. The Proposed Action, in consonance with the MOA, would maintain one two-story duplex (Building 500) for a period of two years to pursue an alternative use. If a suitable alternative use for Building 500 does not arise within the two year period, its disposition would be the same as the other buildings. The other four two-story duplexes and associated open carports (Buildings 501, 502, 504 and 505) would be removed and their historic aspects would be documented, pursuant to the historic preservation provisions of the MOA, for preservation in a lasting record of the Historic District and attendant residential structures.

A copy of the proposed EA and FONSI are available for public viewing and comment for the next 30 days in the Nola Brantley Memorial Library (also known as the Houston County Library), 721 Watson Blvd, Warner Robins, Georgia, 478-923-0128. For questions or comments, please contact the 78th Air Base Wing Office of Public Affairs at 478-926-2137 or at the address below:
78 ABW/PA,  620 9th Street, Bldg 905, Rm 215, Robins AFB Georgia 31098.  DSN 472-1024
Commercial: 478-222-1024, 478-926-2137 FAX: 478-926-5997
This page intentionally left blank.
Material related to the above project was received by the Georgia State Clearinghouse on 3/19/2012. The review has been initiated and every effort is being made to ensure prompt action. The project will be reviewed for its consistency with goals, policies, plans, objectives, programs, environmental impact, criteria for Developments of Regional Impact (DRI) or inconsistencies with federal executive orders, acts and/or rules and regulations, and if applicable, with budgetary restraints.

The initial review process should be completed by 4/16/2012 (approximately). If the Clearinghouse has not contacted you by that date, please call 404-656-3855, and we will check into the delay. We appreciate your cooperation on this matter.

When emailing or calling about this project, please reference the State Application Identifier number shown above. If you have any questions regarding this project, please contact us at the above number.
GEORGIA STATE CLEARINGHOUSE MEMORANDUM
EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 REVIEW PROCESS

TO: Rebecca Crader
78 CEG/CEAO
Dept. of the Air Force

FROM: Barbara Jackson
Georgia State Clearinghouse

DATE: 4/13/2012

APPLICANT: Dept. of the Air Force - Robins AFB, GA

PROJECT: Draft Final EA: Disposition of Chiefs' Circle Residential Structures at Robins AFB, GA

STATE ID: GA120319002

The applicant/sponsor coordinated directly with DNR's Historic Preservation Division, one of our state reviewers for this type project.

Provided that there are no impending concerns or issues, the State level review of the above-referenced proposal has been completed, and the proposal found to be consistent with those state or regional goals, policies, plans, fiscal resources, criteria for Developments of Regional Impact (DRI), environmental impacts, federal executive orders, acts and/or rules and regulations with which the state is concerned.

/bj

Enc.: GA DCA, Apr. 11, 2012
GA EPD, Apr. 11, 2012

Form NCC
Oct. 2008
GEORGIA STATE CLEARINGHOUSE MEMORANDUM
EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 REVIEW PROCESS

TO: Barbara Jackson
Georgia State Clearinghouse
270 Washington Street, SW, Eighth Floor
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

FROM: MS. ROBIN CHATMON
GA DEPT. OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

APPLICANT: Dept. of the Air Force - Robins AFB, GA

PROJECT: Draft Final EA: Disposition of Chiefs’ Circle Residential Structures at Robins AFB, GA

STATE ID: GA120319002

FEDERAL ID:

DATE: 4/17/2012

☑ This project is considered to be consistent with those state or regional goals, policies, plans, fiscal resources, criteria for developments of regional impact, environmental impacts, federal executive orders, acts and/or rules and regulations with which this organization is concerned.

This project is not consistent with:

☑ The goals, plans, policies, or fiscal resources with which this organization is concerned. (Line through inappropriate word(s) and prepare a statement that explains the rationale for the inconsistency. (Additional pages may be used for outlining the inconsistencies. Be sure to put the GA State ID no. and any Federal ID no. on all pages).

☑ The criteria for developments of regional impact, federal executive orders, acts and/or rules and regulations administered by your agency. Negative environmental impacts or provision for protection of the environment should be pointed out. (Additional pages may be used for outlining the inconsistencies. Be sure to put the GA State ID no. and any Federal ID no. on all pages).

☑ This project does not impact upon the activities of the organization.

NOTE: Should you decide to FAX this form (and any attached pages), it is not necessary to mail the originals to us. [770-344-3568]

RECEIVED APR 11 2012
Form SC-3
Aug. 2011
GEORGIA
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE
TO: Barbara Jackson  
Georgia State Clearinghouse  
270 Washington Street, SW, Eighth Floor  
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

FROM: MR. JUDSON H. TURNER  
GA DNR-EPD DIRECTOR'S OFFICE

APPLICANT: Dept. of the Air Force - Robins AFB, GA

PROJECT: Draft Final EA: Disposition of Chiefs' Cireole Residential Structures at Robins AFB, GA

STATE ID: GA120319002

FEDERAL ID:  

DATE:

This project is considered to be consistent with those state or regional goals, policies, plans, fiscal resources, criteria for developments of regional impact, environmental impacts, federal executive orders, acts and/or rules and regulations with which this organization is concerned.

This project is not consistent with:

☐ The goals, plans, policies, or fiscal resources with which this organization is concerned. (Line through inappropriate word(s) and prepare a statement that explains the rationale for the inconsistency. (Additional pages may be used for outlining the inconsistencies. Be sure to put the GA State ID no. and any Federal ID no. on all pages).

☐ The criteria for developments of regional impact, federal executive orders, acts and/or rules and regulations administered by your agency. Negative environmental impacts or provision for protection of the environment should be pointed out. (Additional pages may be used for outlining the inconsistencies. Be sure to put the GA State ID no. and any Federal ID no. on all pages).

☐ This project does not impact upon the activities of the organization.

NOTE: Should you decide to FAX this form (and any attached pages), it is not necessary to mail the original to us. (770-344-3568)
APPENDIX F

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
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MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
BETWEEN ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE (AFB),
THE GEORGIA HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE,
AND THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING CHIEF'S CIRCLE HISTORIC DISTRICT

WHEREAS pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f) (NHPA) and its implementing regulations, “Protection of Historic Properties” (36 C.F.R. 800), Robins Air Force Base has determined that its proposal to demolish four of the five individual structures associated with Chief’s Circle Historic District (“the District”) and to maintain the fifth structure until an as yet unidentified user can be identified, will have an adverse effect on this National Register of Historic Places eligible district; and

WHEREAS Robins AFB plans to carry out an undertaking consisting of the demolition of Buildings 501, 502, 504, and 505, and preserving Building 500 until either a permanent user has been identified or two years have passed wherein Building 500 would be demolished, whichever comes first; and

WHEREAS Robins AFB has defined the undertaking Area of Potential Effect (APE) as shown on the map included at Attachment 1; and

WHEREAS Robins AFB has repeatedly attempted to locate new on-base tenants for the structures making up the District since approximately 2007; and

WHEREAS Robins AFB has consulted with companies that move buildings, numerous potential new tenants, regional and local development entities, including the City of Warner Robins, in an attempt to find new owners in consideration of moving some or all of the buildings comprising the District to new sites either in the City of Warner Robins or elsewhere on Robins AFB; and

WHEREAS Robins AFB has been unable to locate an appropriate, available, and willing new site, new tenants, or new owner(s); and

WHEREAS Robins AFB has previously conducted an archaeological survey within the APE and this survey located no archaeological sites; and

WHEREAS, the Georgia State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has concurred with the archaeological survey report in which no sites were located within or adjacent to the APE; and

WHEREAS Robins AFB has consulted with the Georgia SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) regarding the effects of this undertaking on historic properties, and both have concurred that this undertaking will have an adverse effect on the District; and
WHEREAS both SHPO and ACHP have agreed to consult on this undertaking; and

WHEREAS Robins AFB has invited the Georgia SHPO and the ACHP to sign this Agreement as signatories; and

NOW, THEREFORE, Robins AFB, GA SHPO, and the ACHP agree that the undertaking shall be implemented in accordance with the following stipulations in order to take into account the effect of the undertaking on historic properties, and with the understanding that the execution and implementation of this Agreement satisfies Robins AFB responsibilities under Section 106 of the NHPA.

STIPULATIONS

Robins AFB shall ensure that the following measures are carried out:

I. Level II Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) documentation is completed, reviewed and approved by the National Park Service, and is provided to the SHPO, the HABS at the Library of Congress, and the Robins AFB History Office; and

II. The final HABS documentation is kept permanently on file within the Robins AFB Environmental Management Branch; and

III. If two years pass from the date this Agreement is signed into effect, during which time Robins AFB has diligently sought to identify a permanent user for Building 500 but has not been able to identify one, then Robins AFB may also demolish Building 500;

IV. If a permanent user is identified, Robins AFB will continue to maintain Building 500 for as long as it remains fully occupied by that or any subsequent permanent user. If a permanent user notifies Robins AFB that it will vacate Building 500, Robins AFB will, for a period of two years from the date of such notification, diligently seek to identify another permanent user. If a permanent user cannot be identified, Robins AFB may demolish Building 500.

V. DURATION

This MOA will be terminated if stipulations I-III are not completed within five years from the date of its execution. Prior to such time, Robins AFB may consult with the other signatories to reconsider the terms of the MOA and amend it in accordance with Stipulation VII below.

VI. MONITORING AND REPORTING

Each year, on or before 31 March, following the execution of this MOA until it expires or is terminated, Robins AFB shall provide all parties to this MOA a summary report
detailing work undertaken pursuant to its terms. This report shall include any scheduling changes proposed, any problems encountered, and any disputes and objections received in Robins AFB efforts to carry out the terms of this MOA. The report may be submitted electronically.

VII. DISPUTE RESOLUTION

Should any signatory to this MOA object at any time to any actions proposed or the manner in which the terms of this MOA are implemented, Robins AFB shall consult with such party to resolve the objection. If Robins AFB determines that such objection cannot be resolved, it will:

A. Forward all documentation relevant to the dispute, including its proposed resolution to the ACHP. The ACHP shall provide Robins AFB with its advice on the resolution of the objection within thirty days of receiving adequate documentation. Prior to reaching a final decision on the dispute, Robins AFB shall prepare a written response that takes into account any timely advice or comments regarding the dispute from all three signatories, and provide them with a copy of this written response. Robins AFB will then proceed according to its final decision.

B. If the ACHP does not provide its advice regarding the dispute within the thirty (30) day time period, Robins AFB may make a final decision on the dispute and proceed accordingly. Prior to reaching such a final decision, Robins AFB shall prepare a written response that takes into account any timely comments regarding the dispute from the signatories to the MOA, and provide them and the ACHP with a copy of such written response.

C. Robins AFB has the responsibility to carry out all other actions subject to the terms of this MOA that are not the subjects of the dispute remain unchanged.

VIII. AMENDMENTS

This MOA may be amended when such an amendment is agreed to in writing by all signatories. The amendment will be effective on the date a copy signed by all of the signatories is filed with the ACHP.

IX. TERMINATION

If any signatory to this MOA determines that its terms will not or cannot be carried out, that party shall immediately consult with the other parties to attempt to develop an amendment per Stipulation VII, above. If within thirty days an amendment cannot be reached, any signatory may terminate the MOA upon written notification to the other signatories.

Once the MOA is terminated, and prior to work continuing on the undertaking, Robins
AFB must either (a) execute a new MOA pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.6 or (b) request, take into account, and respond to the comments of the ACHP under 36 CFR § 800.7. Robins AFB shall notify the signatories as to the course of action it will pursue.

X. COMPLIANCE WITH THE ANTI-DEFICIENCY ACT

Any requirement for the expenditure of Department of Air Force funds established by terms of this agreement shall be subject to the availability of appropriated funds, and no provision herein shall be interpreted to require obligation or payment of funds in violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 USC 1341). In the event that Robins AFB is unable to carry out one or more terms of this agreement due to the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act, Robins AFB shall advise the SHPO and the ACHP, and shall otherwise comply with other requirements remaining funded for this MOA and, as appropriate, provisions of 36 CFR Part 800.

Execution of this MOA by Robins AFB, the SHPO, and the ACHP, and implementation of its terms show that Robins AFB has taken into account the effects of this undertaking on the District and afforded the ACHP and the SHPO an opportunity to comment.
SIGNATORIES:

Robins Air Force Base

MITCHEL H BUTIKOFER, Colonel, USAF
Installation Commander
Date: 3 Jan 12

Georgia State Historic Preservation Office

DR. DAVID CRASS
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
Date: 1/23/12

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

JOHN M. FOWLER
Executive Director
Date: 2/6/12
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