
FINAL
Environmental Assessment
for
Construction of Security Forces Facility/
Demolition of Existing Building 528
MacDill AFB, Florida



Headquarters Air Mobility Command

MacDill AFB, FL

August 2005

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE AUG 2005		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2005 to 00-00-2005	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Final Environmental Assessment for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528 MacDill AFB, Florida				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) 6 Civil Engineer Squadron (6 CES/CEVN),2610 Pink Flamingo Avenue,MacDill AFB,FL,33621				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 138	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

FINAL
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
AND
FINDING OF NO PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE
CONSTRUCTION OF SECURITY FORCES FACILITY/DEMOLITION OF BUILDING 528
MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA

Agency: United States Air Force (USAF), Headquarters, Air Mobility Command

Background: Pursuant to the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations, Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Parts 1500-1508, as they implement the requirements of the National Environment Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, 42 U.S.C. § 4321, et seq., and the Air Force Environmental Impact Analysis Process, as promulgated in 32 CFR Part 989, the U.S. Air Force conducted an assessment of the potential environmental consequences associated with implementation of the following Proposed Action: to construct a new Security Forces (SF) Facility and demolish the existing Security Forces Facility (Building 528). The Environmental Assessment (EA) considered all potential impacts of the Proposed Action and alternatives, both as solitary actions and in conjunction with other proposed activities. The Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) summarizes the results of the evaluation of the Proposed Action and alternatives. The discussion focuses on activities that have the potential to change both the natural and human environments. The Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA) summarizes the options considered and why the proposed Security Forces Facility was designed and sited as proposed.

Proposed Action: The Proposed Action is to construct a new SF Facility to consolidate all security functions currently housed in Buildings 36 and 528. In addition, the Proposed Action includes the demolition of the existing SF Facility (Building 528). The purpose of the Proposed Action is to replace the existing substandard SF Facility with a modern, updated facility that meets current mission standards and improves efficiency and effectiveness of the SF operations by consolidating many of the security functions into one facility. Demolition of Building 528 would allow room for future development of the new Consolidated Base Support Facility.

Alternatives: Alternative actions considered include the renovation of existing facilities (including new construction of additional space to augment the operations of the existing SF Facility) and the No Action Alternative. The renovation alternative was determined not to be a reasonable alternative based on operational and environmental issues in that this alternative would not completely meet the objective of improved efficiency, would not correct the potential for flooding of the existing building, and would likely cost more than new construction. Therefore, the only alternative retained for further evaluation was the No Action Alternative.

The No Action Alternative would include no construction, or demolition activities, and no changes to the current operation of the SF Facility. The EA process identified the Proposed Action as the preferred course of action since it would best suit the needs of the base, and if implemented properly would not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

Summary of Findings: The environmental consequences associated with implementation of the Proposed Action are summarized below and are discussed in detail in Section 4.0 of the EA.

*Finding of No Significant Impact and Finding of No Practicable Alternative
Construction of Security Forces Facility /Demolition of Existing Building 528*

Air Quality: Fugitive dust and construction vehicle exhaust would be generated during construction and demolition activities; however, these emissions would not constitute a major source of air pollutants. The estimated values for carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, and particulate matter were determined to be less than USEPA *de minimis* values and less than 10% of the Hillsborough County emissions inventory.

Noise: Noise levels would increase temporarily during construction. However, the increased noise levels would not be continuous and the potential impacts on occupants of nearby buildings are considered minor.

Wastes, Hazardous Materials and Stored Fuels: Representative materials would be sampled for lead-based paint and asbestos, and, if present, abated prior to demolition of Building 528. Consequently, the Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse impacts from hazardous materials or wastes. There would be no impacts to stored fuels with implementation of the Proposed Action.

Water Resources: There would be no significant adverse impacts to surface or groundwater quality during construction and operation of the new Security Forces Facility, or as a result of demolition of the existing Building 528.

Floodplains: Currently, 80 percent of MacDill AFB is located within the coastal floodplain. The 20 percent of the installation that is not located within the floodplain is primarily being used for airfield operations and support. Construction of the new SF Facility would take place inside of the 100-year coastal floodplain, on the northern section of the base. The existing SF Facility (Building 528), slated for demolition under the Proposed Action, lies within the 100-year floodplain, along with the site selected for the construction of the new SF Facility. However, implementation of the Proposed Action would result in a minor decrease of impervious surfaces within the floodplain. Under the Proposed Action, the new SF Facility would be designed for construction within the floodplain, unlike the existing Building 528, and would include elevating the new building above the floodplain. Additionally, the Proposed Action would include constructing stormwater retention ponds and relocating a drainage swale in order to manage any increase in stormwater runoff as a result of the Proposed Action.

Land Use: The net changes to land use resulting from the Proposed Action would be the conversion of 3.0 acres from industrial and open land use to administrative land use (construction) and the conversion of 4.3 acres of administrative land use to open land use (demolition). These changes in land use are consistent with the future land use identified in the base General Plan (USAF, 2002). Therefore, the effect of the Proposed Action on land use at MacDill AFB would be beneficial, however the impact would not be significant.

Transportation Systems: An increase in traffic in the north-central portion of the base would result during implementation of the Proposed Action, due to the increase in construction-related activities. These impacts are considered to be minor and short-term.

Upon completion, the Proposed Action would likely result in a similar number, or a slight increase in the number of vehicles driving in the north-central area of the base. These potential impacts of additional vehicles would be accommodated with the modification of the Hangar Loop Drive and

*Finding of No Significant Impact and Finding of No Practicable Alternative
Construction of Security Forces Facility /Demolition of Existing Building 528*

Tampa Point Boulevard near the southern boundary of the site. As a result, implementation of the Proposed Action would have no significant adverse impact on base transportation facilities.

Safety and Occupational Health: Construction and operation of the new SF Facility, and the demolition of the existing Building 528, would not pose safety hazards beyond those typically experienced with a construction project or operation of an administrative building. Prior to demolition of the existing facility, a comprehensive asbestos and lead-based paint survey would be completed. Upon completion of the surveys, a qualified abatement subcontractor would be hired to remove and dispose of any identified asbestos containing material and lead-based paint. Implementing this approach would greatly reduce the potential for health and safety impacts to construction workers. If these precautions are implemented as described, the Proposed Action would not have a significant adverse impact on safety and occupational health.

Socioeconomic Resources: Implementation of the Proposed Action would have a minor short-term economic benefit for the MacDill AFB region.

Environmental Justice: No adverse effects on minority or low-income populations would occur as a result of the construction, demolition, or from the long-term operation of the new SF Facility or from demolition of the existing SF Facility (Building 528).

Biological Resources: Adverse impacts on wetlands (including wetland communities of Tampa Bay), wildlife, aquatic life, or protected species would not occur during the construction or the demolition activities of the Proposed Action. Consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service indicates that there would be no adverse impacts on threatened or endangered species during construction and operation of the new SF Facility. There would be no net loss of Jurisdictional wetlands associated with the project.

Cultural Resources: There would be no adverse impact to cultural resources with construction of the new SF Facility or the demolition of the existing SF Facility (Building 528). Consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office indicates that there would be no adverse impacts on cultural resources at MacDill AFB during construction and operation of the new SF Facility.

Infrastructure: Construction of a new facility, or demolition of the existing facility, would not adversely impact infrastructure systems and facilities of MacDill AFB.

Cumulative Impacts: There are no significant site-specific direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts associated with the construction and demolition activities, or from the long-term operation of the new SF Facility. The construction, demolition, and operational activities of the Proposed Action were considered in conjunction with other on-going or planned construction projects, and together they do not constitute significant cumulative adverse impacts.

Environmental Management: The operating SF Facility would participate in Base recycling programs to reduce solid waste disposal volumes. During construction and demolition activities, soil erosion in disturbed areas would be controlled by implementation of a sediment and erosion control plan as well as best management practices.

*Finding of No Significant Impact and Finding of No Practicable Alternative
Construction of Security Forces Facility /Demolition of Existing Building 528*

Florida Coastal Zone Management: In accordance with the federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) and the Florida CZMA, this Federal action must be consistent “to the maximum extent practicable” with the Florida Coastal Management Program (CMP). Appendix B to the EA contains the Air Force’s Consistency Statement and finds that the conceptual Proposed Action and alternative plans presented in the EA are consistent with Florida’s CMP. In accordance with Florida statutes, the Air Force has submitted a copy of the attached EA to the State of Florida so that they can perform a coastal zone consistency evaluation. The state of Florida has determined the Proposed Action to be consistent with the Florida CMP.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT: Based upon my review of the facts and analyses contained in the attached Environmental Assessment, which is hereby incorporated by reference, I conclude that implementation of the Proposed Action would not have a significant environmental impact, either by itself or cumulatively with other projects at MacDill AFB. Accordingly, the requirements of NEPA and the regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality and the Air Force are fulfilled and an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. The Tampa Tribune published a Notice of Availability on February 6, 2005. No comments were received during the public comment period ending March 11, 2005. Copies of agency coordination letters and comments received are included in Appendix E of the EA. The signing of this combined Finding of No Significant Impact and Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONSI/FONPA) completes the environmental impact analysis process under Air Force regulations.

FINDING OF NO PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE: Pursuant to Executive Order 11988, the authority delegated in Secretary of the Air Force Order (SAFO) 791.1, and taking into consideration the findings of the EA, which is incorporated herein by reference, I find that there is no practicable alternative to the Proposed Action occurring in the floodplain. The Proposed Action would reduce the total impervious surface in the floodplain by approximately 2.4 acres. The Proposed Action would result in relocation of a drainage canal (wetlands) but would not result in a net loss of wetlands or permanent impact to wetlands; consequently, pursuant to Executive Order 11990, I find that there is no practicable alternative to the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to the environment. Based upon the environmental and operational constraints that determined the location of the new SF Facility, there are no other available areas located on MacDill AFB that would be sufficiently sized and appropriately located in order to satisfy the objectives of the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action, as designed, includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to the coastal floodplain. The Air Force has sent all required notices to Federal agencies, single points of contact, the State of Florida, local government representatives, and the local news media.



JAMES S. BRACKETT, Colonel, USAF
Deputy Director, Installations & Mission Support

Attachment: Environmental Assessment

17 Nov 05

DATE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR PROPOSED ACTION	1
1.1 PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED ACTION	1
1.2 NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION.....	2
1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED ACTION	2
1.4 SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW	3
1.5 ENVIRONMENTAL PERMIT REQUIREMENTS.....	3
1.5.1 Environmental Resource Permit	3
1.5.2 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 404 Nationwide Permit	4
1.5.3 Floodplain	4
1.5.4 Stormwater Discharge Permit for Construction Activities	5
1.5.5 Stormwater Discharge Associated with Industrial Activity and Phase II Municipal Storm Sewer Systems	5
1.5.6 Asbestos Notification.....	6
2.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES	7
2.1 DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION	7
2.1.1 Background.....	7
2.1.2 Proposed Action.....	7
2.2 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS	9
2.2.1 Alternative Eliminated from Further Study	10
2.2.2 Description of the No Action Alternative	11
2.2.3 Comparison of Environmental Effects of the Proposed Action and Alternatives	11
3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	13
3.1 AIR QUALITY	13
3.2 NOISE	14
3.3 WASTES, HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, AND STORED FUEL	14
3.4 WATER RESOURCES	16
3.5 FLOODPLAINS.....	16
3.6 LAND USE	17
3.7 TRANSPORTATION.....	17
3.8 SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH.....	18
3.9 SOCIOECONOMICS	18
3.10 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	18
3.11 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE	21
3.12 CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	22
3.13 INFRASTRUCTURE	23
4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES.....	24
4.1 PROPOSED ACTION.....	24
4.1.1 Air Quality	24
4.1.2 Cumulative Air Quality Impacts	25
4.1.3 Noise	26
4.1.4 Wastes, Hazardous Material and Stored Fuel	26

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.1.5 Water Resources	27
4.1.6 Floodplains	28
4.1.7 Land Use	29
4.1.8 Transportation	29
4.1.9 Safety and Occupational Health.....	30
4.1.10 Socioeconomics	30
4.1.11 Environmental Justice.....	31
4.1.12 Biological Resources	31
4.1.13 Cultural Resources	32
4.1.14 Infrastructure.....	32
4.2 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS	32
4.3 NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE.....	33
5.0 CONCLUSIONS.....	34
6.0 MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS	35
6.1 AIR QUALITY	35
6.2 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/WASTES	35
6.3 WATER RESOURCES	35
6.4 SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH.....	36
6.5 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	36
7.0 PERSONS CONTACTED	37
8.0 LIST OF PREPARERS.....	38
9.0 REFERENCES	39

LIST FIGURES

Figure 1-1	Project Location and Vicinity Map
Figure 2-1	Proposed Demolition Areas
Figure 2-2	Proposed Construction Area
Figure 2-3	Proposed Security Forces Facility
Figure 3-1	Environmental Constraints in Vicinity of Proposed Security Forces Facility
Figure 3-2	100-Year Floodplain Map

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1	Summary of Potential Environmental Consequences
Table 3-1	Summary of Protected Species Identified at MacDill AFB
Table 4-1	Proposed Action Air Emissions at MacDill AFB

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	Air Force Form 813
Appendix B	Consistency Statement
Appendix C	ERP Site Summaries
Appendix D	Air Emission Calculations for Project
Appendix E	Agency Coordination Letters and Comments

LIST OF ACRONYMS

1,2-DCA	1,2-Dichloroethane
1,2-DCE	1,2-Dichloroethylene
ACM	asbestos containing material
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
AF	Air Force
AFB	Air Force Base
AICUZ	Air Installation Compatible Use Zone
AQCR	Air Quality Control Region
AST	aboveground storage tank
ATV	All-Terrain Vehicle
BMP	best management practice
CAA	Clean Air Act
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CES	Civil Engineering Squadron
CEV	Environmental Management
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CMP	Coastal Management Program
CO	carbon monoxide
COE	Corps of Engineers
CZMA	Coastal Zone Management Act
dB	decibel
DFSP	Defense Fuel Supply Point
DNL	Day-Night Average Sound Level
DoD	Department of Defense
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIAP	Environmental Impact Analysis Process
EIR	Economic Impact Region
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EO	Executive Order
EPC	Environmental Protection Commission
ERA	Environmental Restoration Account
ERP	Environmental Restoration Program
FAC	Florida Administrative Code
FDEP	Florida Department of Environmental Protection
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FONPA	Finding of No Practicable Alternative
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FY	Fiscal Year
GOV	government operated vehicle
HAZWOPER	Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response
HVAC	Heating, Ventilating, and Air-Conditioning
INRMP	Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan
LBP	lead-based paint
LTM	Long Term Monitoring
MDG	Medical Group

LIST OF ACRONYMS (continued)

mgd	million gallons per day
MILCON	Military Construction
MPS	Marine Patrol Squadron
msl	mean sea level
NCO	Non-Commissioned Officer
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NESHAP	National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NOI	Notice of Intent
NO ₂	nitrogen dioxide
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
O ₃	ozone
ORC	Oxygen Releasing Compound
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
OWS	Oil-Water Separator
Pb	lead
PM ₁₀	particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter
PM _{2.5}	particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter
RAVEN	Ranging and Velocity Navigation
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RV	recreational vehicle
SF	Security Forces
SO ₂	sulfur dioxide
SPCC	Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures
SWFWMD	Southwest Florida Water Management District
SWMU	Solid Waste Management Unit
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
TCE	Trichloroethylene
tpy	tons per year
TRACON	Tampa Terminal Radar Approach Control
TSP	total suspended particulates
US	United States
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USAF	United States Air Force
USC	United States Code
USCENTCOM	United States Central Command
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
USSOCOM	United States Special Operations Command
UST	underground storage tank
VOC	volatile organic compound

1.0 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR PROPOSED ACTION

This Environmental Assessment (EA) identifies, describes, and evaluates potential environmental impacts associated with the construction of a new Security Forces (SF) Facility and the associated demolition of the existing SF Facility (Building 528) at MacDill Air Force Base (AFB), Florida (Figure 1-1). This EA evaluates the impacts of the Proposed Action as well as alternatives to the Proposed Action.

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to replace the existing substandard SF Facility with a modern, updated facility that meets current mission standards and improves the efficiency and effectiveness of the SF operations by consolidating the training section, ranging and velocity navigation (RAVEN) section, mobility and vehicle section, quality control office, investigations office, unit scheduler, and the unit manager functions into one facility. The new facility would house all SF services with the exception of the K9 services, Marine Patrol Squadron (MPS, including boats) and Visitors Control services, which are currently housed at other locations around the base.

The SF squadron currently operates out of a 47-year-old vintage commissary (Building 528) that was renovated in 1995 to house the squadron, which at that time included 130 assigned personnel. More than 400 personnel are currently assigned to the SF squadron and it is anticipated that future staffing will be 426 persons. Building 528 is overcrowded and personnel are required to work in outlying buildings. The current facility is undersized and does not provide sufficient operational, administrative, and storage space to house and supply the personnel that have been permanently assigned to the SF squadron. Due to limited space, the old flight simulator building (Building 36) is used for training and storage purposes. Building 36 is located at a distance of 0.79 miles from Building 528. Construction of a new SF Facility would allow consolidation of all security functions currently housed in Buildings 36 and 528.

The new SF Facility would provide sufficient storage areas for war reserve materials, mobility equipment, weapons and ammunitions, and traffic control devices. The Proposed Action would

also allow adequate space for offices, holding cells, interview rooms, classrooms, workout areas, control centers, assembly areas, and storage space for the 426 personnel anticipated to be assigned to the SF squadron.

In addition, the Proposed Action includes the demolition of the existing SF Facility (Building 528).

1.2 NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

Construction of a new SF Facility is needed to provide a consolidated on-base state of the art facility to meet the manning and operational requirements of the Security Forces. Building 528 is a 47-year-old commissary building currently occupied by SF operations. Building 36 is a 52-year-old flight simulator building currently used for training and storage located 0.79 miles from Building 528. The two facilities do not provide adequate space for the more than 400 personnel currently assigned to the SF squadron or for future personnel levels. Building 528 lacks private interview rooms and adequate office space, weapons storage, training classrooms, supply storage, parking, and restroom facilities. The geographical separation of these buildings adversely impacts command and control, communication between flight elements, and the overall efficiency of the SF squadron.

The need for this EA was originally outlined on Air Force (AF) Form 813, Request for Environmental Impact Analysis, a copy of which is included in Appendix A.

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

An upgraded facility is necessary for consolidation of Security Forces operations and to provide administrative, training, and storage space for the SF squadron. A new SF facility is also needed to support personnel assigned to MacDill AFB who visit the SF Facility for various base operational needs, such as flight line badges, finger printing, police reports and police assistance that are currently in geographically separate locations.

Construction of a larger facility is also needed to consolidate the administrative, training, and equipment storage functions for the SF squadron into one facility which will significantly improve command and control and improve the efficiency, morale and productivity

of the squadron. The construction of the facility also is consistent with the MacDill AFB *General Plan* (USAF, 2002).

1.4 SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

This EA examines the potential for impacts to the environment resulting from the military construction (MILCON) of a new SF Facility at MacDill AFB, Florida (Figure 1-1) and the demolition of the existing structure. This environmental analysis has been conducted in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 [Title 42, United States Code, Sections 4321-4347 (42 USC 4321-4347)] and the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations for implementing NEPA [Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations Parts 1500-1508 (40 CFR 1500-1508)], as well as the Air Force directive for adherence to NEPA implemented in 32 CFR 989, *The Environmental Impact Analysis Process* (EIAP).

The Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) (16 USC 1451-1464), as amended, requires federal agencies carrying out activities subject to the Act to provide a "consistency determination" to the relevant state agency. The Air Force's consistency determination for the Proposed Action is contained in the Consistency Statement provided in Appendix B. This EA has been submitted to the Florida State Clearinghouse for a multi-agency review. The Florida Department of Community Affairs, with input from state and county agencies, has determined that the Proposed Action is consistent with the Florida Coastal Management Program. This EA has also been made available for public review.

1.5 ENVIRONMENTAL PERMIT REQUIREMENTS

Based on a review of the relevant federal, state and local environmental regulations, several environmental permits may be required for the proposed project. The following provides a discussion of those permits.

1.5.1 Environmental Resource Permit

The construction of the new SF Facility would alter impervious surfaces and a stormwater drainage ditch classified as a wetland. Therefore, an individual Environmental Resources Permit issued by the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) will be required under

Chapter 40D-4 *Rules of the Southwest Florida Water Management District Individual Environmental Resource Permits*. The Environmental Resource Permit Program regulates the construction, alteration, maintenance, removal, modification, and operation of all activities in uplands, wetlands, and other surface waters that will alter, divert, impede, or otherwise change the flow of surface waters. The program is designed to ensure that such activities do not degrade water quality or cause flooding (SWFWMD, Chapter 40D-4). In conjunction with the SWFWMD Environmental Resources Permit application process, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) will be provided a copy of the permit application because the project would involve the filling of wetlands in order to relocate the ditch (SWFWMD, Chapter 40D-4.101(5)).

1.5.2 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 404 Nationwide Permit

In accordance with EO 11990, the base is required to avoid to the extent possible the long and short term adverse impacts associated with the destruction or modification of wetlands and to avoid direct or indirect support of new construction in wetlands wherever there is a practicable alternative. As discussed in Section 2.2, there is no practicable alternative to the Proposed Action. Under the Clean Water Act (CWA) of 1977 (33 USC 1344), the USACE is the agency authorized to grant permits for impacts to the nation's waters. The Proposed Action includes the relocation of a ditch, classified as a wetland, which traverses the site and drains stormwater to Hillsborough Bay. The ditch is considered to be a water of the United States (US). Therefore, a CWA Section 404 permit from the USACE will be required (Federal Register, January 2002). Generally, the USACE Jacksonville District considers a wetland located within 200 feet of open waters or a wetland connected to open waters by a tributary, canal, stream, etc., as an adjacent wetland; and it is therefore regulated under the CWA. The area proposed for construction of the SF Facility would be considered an adjacent wetland. Any filling within the wetland on the SF Facility site would likely require an individual 404 permit issued by the Jacksonville District COE (Jacksonville District COE, July 2003).

1.5.3 Floodplain

The proposed location of the new SF Facility is within the 100-year floodplain and classified as Zone A, special flood hazard area. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order (EO) 11988,

Floodplain Management, the Air Force must demonstrate that there is no practicable alternative to carrying out the Proposed Action within the floodplain, and coordination with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), State of Florida Emergency Management Agency, and the Hillsborough County Emergency Agency may be required (EO, May 1977). Additionally, the facility will need to be constructed in accordance with local building codes.

1.5.4 Stormwater Discharge Permit for Construction Activities

It is anticipated that the Proposed Action would disturb approximately 7.3 acres of land (including the proposed construction and demolition activities under the Proposed Action). Therefore, the Proposed Action is defined as a large construction activity under the State of Florida Generic Permit for Stormwater Discharge from Large and Small Construction Activities (FDEP, 2003). In order to obtain coverage under the Generic Stormwater Permit, a notice of intent (NOI) should be filed prior to commencement of construction activities. As part of the permit requirements, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) should be developed and implemented for the construction of the new facility and the demolition of the former facility (FDEP, 2003). Construction of the parking lots would require application for a project-specific stormwater management permit from the SWFWMD.

1.5.5 Stormwater Discharge Associated with Industrial Activity and Phase II Municipal Storm Sewer Systems

MacDill AFB is currently authorized to discharge stormwater to the waters of the state under the State of Florida Multi-Sector Generic Permit for Stormwater Discharge Associated with Industrial Activity and the State of Florida Generic Permit for Discharge of Stormwater from Phase II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (FDEP, 2003). As part of the permit requirements, MacDill AFB maintains a SWPPP as stated in Florida Administrative Code (FAC) Chapter 62-62 (FDEP, 2000). The Proposed Action would alter the impervious areas of the base, therefore, the SWPPP will need to be amended to show this alteration in impervious areas. Additionally, any alterations to the stormwater conveyance system or stormwater outfalls will need to be noted in the SWPPP as well.

1.5.6 Asbestos Notification

Building 528 proposed for demolition is a 47-year-old building that was renovated in 1995. Based on the age of the building, there is a high probability that it contains asbestos. In order to comply with the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP), a notification of asbestos demolition must be submitted to the Hillsborough County Environmental Protection Commission. In addition, a survey of the building for asbestos containing material should be conducted prior to submittal of the notification. A State of Florida asbestos licensed contractor must conduct the asbestos survey and asbestos removal. In the event that asbestos is not present, a notification of demolition is still required as stated in FAC Chapter 62-257 (February 1999).

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

This section provides a description of the Proposed Action and alternatives to the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action involves the construction of a new SF Facility for the SF squadron as well as demolition of the facility currently occupied by the squadron (Building 528). Two alternatives to the Proposed Action were considered as part of this EA, including the Renovate Existing Building 528 Alternative and the No Action Alternative.

2.1 DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

2.1.1 Background

Land on the southern tip of the Interbay Peninsula, south of Tampa, was selected for an Army airbase in 1939. The formal dedication of the airbase occurred in 1941, and became MacDill AFB in 1947. Building 528, which is currently used for SF squadron operations, was constructed in 1957 and renovated in 1995, when the personnel manning assigned to the SF squadron was 130 people. SF squadron training and storage occupies a 52-year-old flight simulator building (Building 36), which is located 0.79 miles away from Building 528.

As the services and functions of the SF squadron expanded, the assigned manning increased from 130 to more than 400. The age of the facility SF currently occupies and the increased mission has rendered the facility substandard for SF operations. Additional space is needed for offices, storage, and the unification of SF functions for future staffing of personnel. Sections and offices such as the training section, RAVEN section, mobility and vehicle sections, quality control office, investigations office, and the unit scheduler and unit manager positions are currently located at facilities that are physically separated which negatively impacts operational efficiencies of the SF squadron.

2.1.2 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would construct a new SF Facility, an associated parking area, install a stormwater management pond, relocate an existing drainage swale to the western boundary of the site, and demolish Building 528. The new facility would house all SF services with the exception

of K9 services, MPS, and Visitors Control services, which would remain housed at other locations around the base. The SF Facility would be located between South Boundary Boulevard and Tampa Boulevard, bordered to the north by CENTCOM Avenue and to the south by Hangar Loop Drive, and across from the existing Non-Commissioned Officer (NCO) club (Building 499), as shown in Figure 2-1. Building 528 is located east of South Boundary Boulevard, along Bayshore Boulevard.

The proposed facility would consolidate all security functions currently housed in Buildings 528 and 36. Building 528 is located approximately 1,200 feet north of the site proposed for construction of the new SF Facility. Building 528 would be demolished along with associated parking lots, curbing, sidewalks, etc. (Parking Area No. 1) and three additional parking areas located within the area proposed for construction of the new SF Facility (Parking Area Nos. 2, 3, and 4) as part of the Proposed Action to allow room for future development of the new Consolidated Base Support Facility. Buildings 526 and 527 have previously been demolished to allow room for development of the SF Facility (see Figure 2-1). The Proposed Action includes the construction of an approximately 32,000 square foot two-story building with reinforced concrete foundation and floor slab, masonry exterior walls, standing seam metal roof system, fire detection/suppression system, heating, ventilating, and air-conditioning system (HVAC), emergency power, associated site utilities, parking, grading, landscaping and other required support. The existing site is essentially flat with an elevation of approximately 6.0 feet above mean sea level (msl), which is below the 100-year floodplain elevation of 11.0 feet msl. In order to be in accordance with Florida State and Hillsborough County building codes, the new facility would be required to have a floor elevation of a minimum of 11.5 feet msl (MAFB, 2004). The layout of the proposed SF Facility is shown in Figure 2-3.

A total of 100,000 square feet of impervious surfaces would be paved under the Proposed Action for parking lots to be constructed on property contiguous to the proposed SF Facility. The new parking areas would be permanent asphalt lots and would provide approximately 300 parking spaces, including 260 for visitors and employees and 40 for police and security vehicles. The new parking areas would be designed to manage stormwater, and appropriately sized and permitted stormwater retention areas would be constructed adjacent to the parking lots. The employee parking area would be located to the south of the proposed SF Facility. The

government operated vehicle (GOV) parking area for police and security vehicles would be located in a designated area of this lot, near the proposed building. Visitor parking would be north of the proposed building. All parking would be a minimum of 82 feet away from the proposed building in accordance with current Department of Defense (DoD) Force Protection (antiterrorism) standards, found in *Unified Facilities Criteria, DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings* (NAVFAC, July 2002).

A mechanical equipment yard would be located adjacent to the proposed SF building and would be screened from view. An entry-controlled drop off/delivery area would also be provided. Service vehicles and trucks may use this area to access the supply room of the proposed building. In addition, this area may be used for drop-off of prisoners and/or as an investigations entrance. There would also be a covered area located outside the 82-foot setback to allow for storage of all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) and police and security vehicles. Appropriately sized emergency power generators and fuel storage tanks with capacities less than 500 gallons would be installed. Building standoff distances would meet current DoD antiterrorism construction requirements.

The stormwater drainage swale that traverses the middle of the proposed site is classified as a wetland and would be relocated to the western boundary of the site under the Proposed Action. During all construction and demolition activities under the Proposed Action, utilities, including sanitary sewer pipe, water lines, and storm sewer lines, would be abandoned or removed as necessary.

Currently, Hangar Loop Drive is undergoing modification as part of a separate project. Once complete, the intersection of Hangar Loop Drive and Tampa Point Boulevard will form the southern boundary of the proposed site (see Figure 2-2). The Proposed Action would occur after the modification of Hangar Loop Drive is complete. Under the separate ongoing project, the existing road connecting Hangar Loop Drive and Tampa Boulevard on the southern portion of the proposed site will be demolished.

2.2 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

The EIAP processes require the Air Force to analyze reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative. Reasonable alternatives are those that “meet the

underlying purpose and need for the Proposed Action and that would cause a reasonable person to inquire further before choosing a particular course of action” (32 CFR 989). Alternatives may be eliminated from detailed analysis based on operational, technical, or environmental standards that are applicable to the project.

Alternative locations for the Proposed Action were eliminated from further consideration due to existing land use constraints on base and the proposed location’s accessibility to the fiber optic system needed to support the electrical and alarming systems required for SF operations. The alternative actions analyzed in this EA are the renovation of existing facilities alternative (including new construction of additional space to augment operations at the existing SF Facility) and the No Action Alternative. The renovation alternative was determined not to be a reasonable alternative based on operational and environmental issues, as described below in Section 2.2.1. Therefore, the only alternative retained for further evaluation in this EA is the No Action Alternative.

2.2.1 Alternative Eliminated from Further Study

Complete renovation of Building 528, including new construction of additional space to augment operations at the existing SF Facility was initially considered as an alternative to the Proposed Action. Required renovations would include removing all of the existing walls and flooring and reconfiguring all existing spaces, removing the old roof and installing a new standing seam metal roof, installing new HVAC and electrical systems, installing additional restroom and locker room facilities, constructing additional building space for storage, training, and interviews, and modifying existing parking areas. Modifications to parking lots would be needed in order to meet the setback requirements of the DoD Force Protection standards (NAVFAC, July 2002).

This alternative would not meet the objective for a sufficiently sized facility for current and future SF squadron operations. Although it would allow the SF squadron to consolidate some of their functions and marginally improve operational efficiency, this alternative does not satisfy the need for improved efficiency, since some services provided by the SF squadron would still be in physically separate locations. This alternative is further limited by the requirement to comply with the DoD antiterrorism setback requirements for parking areas. This is due to the site layout of the existing facility and the orientation of the existing building to the road and parking areas.

The renovation alternative would also not correct the current potential for flooding of the existing SF Facility that was not originally constructed above the 100-year floodplain. Furthermore, construction of the needed additional space and the electrical, sewage, and interior upgrades, and the complete renovation of the existing SF Facility would likely be a more costly alternative than new construction.

2.2.2 Description of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no construction of a new SF Facility or renovation of the existing SF Facility, and operations would continue using existing facilities. If this alternative were implemented, SF command and control would continue to be fractured and the unity of command would continue to be endangered. Under the No Action Alternative, the efficiency and overall management requirements of the SF squadron would remain unmet. The No Action Alternative represents baseline conditions that can be compared to conditions that would exist under the Proposed Action.

2.2.3 Comparison of Environmental Effects of the Proposed Action and Alternatives

The purpose of this section is to summarize and compare the environmental impacts of each alternative, thereby defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice among the alternatives by the decision-maker. The environmental resources potentially affected by the alternatives are described in Chapter 3, Affected Environment. The consequences for each of these environmental resources from the implementation of each alternative are described in Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences. The present section discusses and provides a tabular matrix (Table 2-1) that summarizes the conclusions reached in Chapter 4.

In Chapter 4, impacts on each environmental component are evaluated to determine whether the impact would be beneficial or adverse. For adverse impacts, the level of impact on the resource is estimated (e.g., negligible, low, moderate, high) and considered in conjunction with the context (e.g., local versus regional, short-term versus long-term) and intensity (based on ten criteria provided in the CEQ Regulations) of the effect in determining whether the impact is significant. The conclusions of the evaluation are summarized in Table 2-1. As shown in the table, no potentially significant adverse impacts were identified for either the Proposed Action or the No-Action Alternative.

It is the conclusion of this EA that implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in a significant adverse effect on the environment. Therefore, preparation of a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)/Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA) is appropriate for this action, and preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required.

Table 2.1 Summary of Potential Environmental Consequences

<i>Resources</i>	<i>Proposed Action</i>	<i>No-Action Alternative</i>
Air Quality	○	○
Noise	○	○
Wastes, Hazardous Materials, and Stored Fuel	○	○
Water Resources	+	—
Floodplains	+	—
Land Use	+	—
Transportation	○	○
Safety and Occupational Health	○	○
Socioeconomics	+	○
Environmental Justice	○	○
Biological Resources	○	○
Cultural Resources	○	○
Infrastructure	○	○

Consequences:

- + = Beneficial.
- = No net change or not discernible.
- = Adverse but not significant.

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

This section describes the characteristics of the existing natural and man-made environment that could potentially be affected by the Proposed Action or the No Action Alternative. This section establishes the basis for assessing impacts of the alternatives on the affected environment provided in Section 4.0.

3.1 AIR QUALITY

The Clean Air Act (CAA), as amended in 1977 and 1990, provides the basis for regulating air pollution to the atmosphere. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) has set air quality standards for six “criteria” pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), ozone (O₃), sulfur oxides (SO_x), lead (Pb), and particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 10 micrometers (PM₁₀) and 2.5 micrometers (PM_{2.5}). These standards are the cornerstone of the CAA. Although not directly enforceable, they are the benchmark for the establishment of emission limitations by the states for the pollutants USEPA determines may endanger public health or welfare.

The Environmental Protection Commission of Hillsborough County (EPC) is responsible for issuing and enforcing the CAA Title V Air Operation Permit (Permit No. 0570141-001-AV issued October 21, 1999) (USAF, 1999). The 1998 air emission inventory at MacDill AFB found the installation is a major source of nitrogen oxides with potential emissions of 184 tons per year.

The USEPA tracks compliance with the air quality standards through designation of a particular region as “attainment” or “non-attainment.” MacDill AFB is located in Hillsborough County within the West Central Florida Intrastate Air Quality Control Region (AQCR). Hillsborough County currently meets the USEPA air quality standards for all criteria pollutants (60 CFR 62748, December 7, 1995). The county was formerly non-attainment for ozone, but currently maintains attainment.

3.2 NOISE

The meaning of noise for this analysis is undesirable sound that interferes with speech communication and hearing, or is otherwise annoying (unwanted sound). In June 1980, the Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise published guidelines (FICUN 1980) relating day-night average sound level (DNL) values to compatible land uses. Most federal agencies have identified 65 decibels (dB) DNL as a criterion that protects those most affected by noise and that can often be achieved on a practical basis. The primary source of noise at MacDill AFB is aircraft operations. The Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) Study for MacDill AFB (USAF, 1996) plotted the DNL from 65 to 80 dB for a typical busy day. The DNL contours reflect aircraft operations. The DNL 65 dB contour covers the main runway, and extends about one mile southwest over Tampa Bay and about 1.5 miles northeast over Hillsborough Bay. A second, smaller DNL 65 dB contour is centered near the southeastern end of the inactive runway (taxiway).

The Proposed Action is located approximately 700 feet east and outside of the 65 dB noise contour.

3.3 WASTES, HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, AND STORED FUEL

Hazardous wastes generated at MacDill AFB include solvents, fuels, lubricants, stripping materials, used oils, waste paint-related materials, and other miscellaneous wastes. The responsibility for managing hazardous waste lies with the generating organization and 6th Civil Engineering Squadron (CES)/Environmental Management (CEV). Wastes come from approximately 50 locations throughout the base and are managed at satellite accumulation points base-wide.

Approximately 105 operations base-wide use hazardous materials. Hazardous materials on-base include various organic solvents, chlorine, freon, paints, thinners, oils, lubricants, compressed gases, pesticides, herbicides, nitrates, and chromates. A detailed tracking and accounting system is in place to identify potentially hazardous materials and to ensure that base organizations are approved to use specific hazardous materials.

The base receives jet fuel (JP-8) at the Defense Fuel Supply Point (DFSP) by pipeline from Port Tampa. JP-8 storage capacity at DFSP and MacDill AFB is over 7.5 million gallons. Diesel, gasoline, and heating oil are stored throughout MacDill AFB in small to medium-sized underground storage tanks (USTs) and aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) ranging in size from 50 to 12,000 gallons.

The Proposed Action was evaluated to determine if it would impact or be impacted by Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) sites which include both Environmental Restoration Account (ERA) sites and non-ERA sites. The site proposed for construction of the new SF Facility is located within the boundaries of two inactive ERP sites (Site 32 and Site 55) and two active ERP sites (SWMU 35 and SWMU 61). The existing Building 528 is located within ERP site SWMU 61 which is a 30-acre chlorinated solvent plume. Figure 3-1 shows the locations of these ERP Sites. ERP Site Summaries are included in Appendix C of this assessment.

Site 32 was a service station consisting of a building, a pump station, and eight 1,000-gallon USTs, which operated from 1940 to 1964. Site 55 is a former fuel storage area constructed in the 1950's and removed in 1998. It consisted of two supply stations, four USTs containing gasoline and an oil water separator (OWS). The status of Sites 32 and 55 is No Further Action.

SWMU 35 is comprised of 21 OWSs and one hazardous waste accumulation point site located throughout the base. Two of the OWS sites are located on the proposed site for the new SF Facility, one at the former location of Building 527 and one near the former AAFES Service Station. Both of these OWS sites are undergoing remedial action investigations for contaminated soils and groundwater.

SWMU 61 is a chlorinated solvent groundwater plume approximately 30 acres in size that underlies much of the proposed SF Facility site. The status of SWMU 61 is Remedial Action – Construction.

ERP site classifications and potential contaminants of concern for SWMUs 35 and 61 are provided in Appendix C (Site Summaries) of this EA.

According to the ERP Site Program Manager, construction within ERP site boundaries is permissible, provided that the applicable health and safety procedures are followed and that a

site-specific health and safety plan has been approved prior to the beginning of construction activities (Maddy 2005).

3.4 WATER RESOURCES

Surface water flows at the base are primarily from stormwater runoff. Most of the base drains toward the southern tip of the Interbay Peninsula; however, the easternmost section of the base drains toward Hillsborough Bay.

The USEPA issued a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) multi-sector stormwater general permit to MacDill AFB in July 2003. This permit authorizes the discharge of stormwater associated with industrial activity. In accordance with 40 CFR 112, the base has developed a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan and a Facility Response Plan, given the location of the base adjacent to navigable waters and shorelines as well as the amount of fuel storage capacity existing on site.

3.5 FLOODPLAINS

According to information provided by FEMA (Flood Insurance Rate Maps dated 1982 to 1991), 80 percent of the MacDill AFB is within the 100-year floodplain. The maps indicate that all the residential, industrial, and institutional (medical and education) land uses on the base are within the 100-year floodplain, along with most of the commercial and aviation support areas. The majority of the land that is above the floodplain is designated for airfield operations.

The extent of the floodplain is an important consideration for MacDill AFB because EO 11988, Floodplain Management, regulates the uses of these areas. The objective of this Presidential order is to avoid, to the extent possible, the long and short-term adverse impacts associated with occupancy and modification of floodplains.

The proposed new SF Facility and parking lot would be located inside of the 100-year floodplain (Figure 3-2). The existing Building 528, proposed for demolition, lies at an elevation of less than 10 feet msl, and is also within the 100-year floodplain.

3.6 LAND USE

Land use categories at MacDill AFB include runway/taxiways, aircraft operations/maintenance, industrial, community commercial, community service, administrative, medical, accompanied housing, unaccompanied housing, outdoor recreation, water, and open space. The proposed SF Facility site is currently designated as industrial and open land uses, while the existing Building 528 proposed for demolition is designated as administrative land use (USAF, 2002).

3.7 TRANSPORTATION

MacDill AFB is served by four operating gates at Dale Mabry Highway, Bayshore Boulevard, MacDill Avenue, and Manhattan Avenue. The Dale Mabry, Bayshore, and MacDill gates are used for government and personal vehicles (commuter traffic). The Manhattan gate is used as the large vehicle (contractor trucks, delivery vehicles, and recreational vehicles) entry point. Large vehicles are inspected, and their credentials and destinations are confirmed before entering the base.

The transportation system on-base consists of arterials, collectors, and local streets that connect with the off-base network through the four gates. On-base arterial facilities include North and South Boundary Boulevards, Bayshore Boulevard, Marina Bay Drive, and Tampa Point Boulevard. The 1998 traffic study determined that service levels for traffic on-base are generally acceptable.

Hangar Loop Drive currently bisects the site of the proposed SF Facility. Hillsborough Loop Drive borders the site of the proposed facility to the south and intersects Tampa Point Boulevard. An ongoing separate construction project includes the demolition of the eastern end of Hangar Loop Drive and the modification and extension of Hillsborough Loop Drive. This separate construction project also includes the construction of a traffic circle that would replace the intersection of Hillsborough Loop Drive and Tampa Point Boulevard. The traffic circle would complete the southeast corner of the site proposed for the new SF Facility. Tampa Point Boulevard would border the SF Facility site to the east, and Hillsborough Loop Drive would border the SF Facility site to the south.

3.8 SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

The MacDill AFB Asbestos Management Plan identifies procedures for management and abatement of asbestos. Prior to renovation or demolition activities, asbestos sampling is performed and, if present, the asbestos is removed in accordance with applicable Federal and State regulations.

At least three asbestos abatements have been performed at Building 528. Between November 1994 and December 1996, asbestos containing materials (ACMs), including floor tile, mastic, duct and pipe insulation, and an exhaust stack and expansion tank from a boiler room were removed from Building 528 and disposed of as hazardous waste.

A lead-based paint (LBP) survey was conducted at Building 528 in November 1994. Results indicated that LBP was present on the rear double door and casing and on an interior support column. It is likely that LBP abatement will be required to be accomplished in accordance with applicable federal and state regulations and base procedures, prior to demolition activities, to prevent any health hazards.

3.9 SOCIOECONOMICS

The Economic Impact Region (EIR) for MacDill AFB is the geographic area within a 50-mile radius of the base subject to significant base-related economic impacts. According to the 1998 Economic Resource Impact Statement for MacDill AFB, the total economic impact of MacDill AFB on the EIR was \$3.5 billion with over 105,000 jobs supported. Purchase of local labor, goods, and services to support base operations provides an annual economic impact of \$1.34 billion. Retiree income provides an economic impact of \$2.19 billion. The direct impact on local income produced by base expenditures is \$494 million.

3.10 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

A detailed description of the biological resources found at MacDill AFB is provided in the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) (USAF, 2000). MacDill's INRMP has been approved by State and Federal Fish and Wildlife agencies. The limited undeveloped areas

within the base boundaries have all experienced some type of disturbance, including ditching, clearing, or the encroachment of exotic vegetation.

The 1998 Wetland Delineation Study identified, delineated, and classified approximately 1,195 acres of wetlands on MacDill AFB (USAF, 1998a). In accordance with EO 11990, the base is required to avoid to the extent possible the long and short term adverse impacts associated with the destruction or modification of wetlands and to avoid direct or indirect support of new construction in wetlands wherever there is a practicable alternative. Mangrove wetlands are the principal scrub/shrub wetland community on the base. The mangrove community at MacDill AFB has been categorized as excellent wildlife habitat and is protected by state and local regulations. A shallow drainage ditch, classified as a wetland, traverses the proposed site for the new SF Facility.

Wildlife species listed by federal or state agencies as endangered, threatened, or of special concern and known to occur permanently or periodically, or to have the potential to occur on the base, are shown below in Table 3-1. In 1996, the Endangered Species Management Plan (USAF, 1996a) and the Biological Survey of MacDill AFB (USAF, 1996b) identified the general locations of protected species at MacDill AFB. These reports do not identify any protected species within the vicinity of the Proposed Action (Figure 3-1).

Table 3-1 – Summary of Protected Species Identified at MacDill AFB

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	
		Federal	State
Reptile/Amphibians			
American alligator	<i>Alligator mississippiensis</i>	T (SA)	SSC
Atlantic loggerhead turtle	<i>Caretta caretta caretta</i>	T	T

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	
		Federal	State
Reptile/Amphibians			
Atlantic green turtle	<i>Chelonia mydas mydas</i>	E	E
Gopher tortoise	<i>Gopherus polyphemus</i>	-	SSC

Gopher frog	<i>Rana capito</i>	C2	SSC
Florida pine snake	<i>Pituophis melanoleucus mugitus</i>	C2	SSC
Short-tailed snake	<i>Stilosoma extenuatum</i>	C2	T
Birds			
Roseate spoonbill	<i>Ajaia ajaja</i>	-	SSC
Limpkin	<i>Aramus guarauna</i>	-	SSC
Burrowing owl	<i>Athene cunicularia</i>	-	SSC
Piping plover	<i>Charadrius melodus</i>	T	T
Southeastern snowy plover	<i>Chardrius melodus</i>	T	T
Little blue heron	<i>Egretta caerulea</i>	C2	T
Reddish egret	<i>Egretta rufescens</i>	C2	SSC
Snowy egret	<i>Egretta thula</i>	-	SSC
Tricolored heron	<i>Egretta tricolor</i>	-	SSC
Peregrine falcon	<i>Falco peregrinus tundris</i>	T	E
Southease American kestrel	<i>Falco sparverius paulus</i>	C 2	E
Florida sandhill crane	<i>Grus Canadensis pratensis</i>	-	T
American oysercatcher	<i>Haematopus palliates</i>	-	SSC
Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	
		Federal	State
Birds			
Bald eagle	<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	T	T
Wood stork	<i>Mycteria americana</i>	E	E
Brown pelican	<i>Pelecanus occidentalis</i>	-	SSC

Least tern	<i>Sterna antillarum</i>	-	T
Roseate tern	<i>Sterna dougalii</i>	T	T
Bachman's warbler	<i>Vermivora bachmanii</i>	E	E
Black skimmer	<i>Rynchops niger</i>	-	SSC
White ibis	<i>Eudocimus albus</i>	-	SSC
Mammals			
Florida mouse	<i>Podomys floridanus</i>	C2	SSC
West Indian (FL) manatee	<i>Trichechus manatus</i>	E	E
Fish			
Common snook	<i>Centropomus undecimalis</i>	-	SSC
Plants			
No State or Federally listed plant species are known to exist on MacDill AFB			

T = Threatened, T(SA)=Threatened/Similarity of Appearance, E=Endangered, SSC=Species of Special Concern, C2=Candidate for listing

Source: Endangered Species Management Plan (USAF, 1996a)

3.11 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Environmental justice must be considered for federal actions under the NEPA review process and in accordance with the Air Force EIAP (32 CFR 989.33). Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations* (issued February 11, 1994) requires that each Federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high or adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations.

Environmental justice analysis focuses on residents living within the areas where there would be potentially adverse environmental impacts, which for the purposes of this EA are those areas bordering the site of the Proposed Action. No non-military residential communities are located adjacent to or in the vicinity of the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action would occur completely within the boundary of MacDill AFB and does not include any off-base construction. Therefore, no minority and low-income populations exist that might be affected by implementation of the Proposed Action or the No Action Alternative.

3.12 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Cultural resources include prehistoric and historic sites. These resources consist of districts, buildings, structures and objects that are significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. Historic properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are subject to protection or consideration by a federal agency in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

Five archaeological sites have been found on MacDill AFB, none of which are located in the vicinity of the Proposed Action. A total of 43 architectural properties on MacDill AFB, including two historic districts (Figure 3-1), have been determined to be eligible for NRHP listing (Universe Technologies and Gene Stout Associates, 2000). In addition, two properties, the United States Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) Headquarters (Building 501) and the United States Central Command (USCENTCOM) Headquarters (Building 540), may be eligible for listing as Cold War Era resources.

In addition to the buildings associated with the headquarters of USSOCOM and USCENTCOM, there are numerous other Cold War Era structures which may be eligible for listing either because of their association with the Cold War or because many of these structures are now turning 50 years old. The Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan provides an up-to-date listing of these potentially eligible structures (Universe Technologies and Gene Stout and Associates, 2000).

The site for the Proposed Action is located just north of the northern half of the MacDill Field Historic District. The district is comprised of some of the first buildings constructed at MacDill, including the hangars, fire station, and theater (Figure 3-1).

3.13 INFRASTRUCTURE

All generated wastewater is treated at the base wastewater treatment plant. The plant is permitted to treat a volume of 1.2 million gallons per day (mgd). Currently, the plant operates at an average of approximately 0.6 mgd. All treated wastewater is currently reused on-base by reclamation, principally through spray application at the golf course located in the southeast area of the base.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

This section discusses the potential impacts the Proposed Action and the No-Action Alternative may have on the affected environment. First the effects of the Proposed Action are evaluated, followed by the evaluation of the No Action Alternative.

4.1 PROPOSED ACTION

4.1.1 Air Quality

The Proposed Action would not substantially change existing operational emissions and, therefore, would not increase ambient concentrations of air pollutants in Hillsborough County. Functions performed at the SF Facility would replace functions currently being performed on the base at existing facilities.

Air quality impacts would occur during construction of the SF Facility and the demolition of Building 528; however, these air quality impacts would be temporary. Fugitive dust (suspended and PM₁₀ particulate matter) and construction vehicle exhaust emissions would be generated during construction. Dust generated by equipment and construction activities would fall rapidly within a short distance from the source. If required, areas of exposed soil could be sprayed with water daily to suppress dust.

The anticipated pollutant emissions for the Proposed Action have been calculated given the general size and scope of the project. These estimates are presented in Appendix D and are compared to Hillsborough County Emissions Inventory totals in Table 4.1 below.

Table 4-1 Proposed Action Air Emissions at MacDill AFB

Pollutant	Proposed Action Annual Emissions (tpy)^a	Hillsborough County Emissions Inventory^b (tpy)	Net Change (%)	<i>De minimis</i> Values^d (tpy)	Above/ Below <i>De minimis</i>
CO	11.85	19,272	0.061	100	Below
ROG	5.77	27,703	0.021	100	Below
NO _x	14.30	82,563	0.017	100	Below
SO ₂	0.72	NA	--	100	Below
PM ₁₀ ^c	1.26	NA	--	100	Below
Pb	--	53	--	25	--

^aIncludes sum of both construction of Security Forces Facility and demolition of existing Building 528.

^bBased on stationary permitted emissions presented in 1997 Ozone Emissions Inventory, EPC.

^cPM₁₀ estimated as 50 percent of the 1990 tpy reported for total suspended particulates (TSP).

^dSource: 40 CFR 93.153, November 30, 1993

NA Not available

NC Not calculated

tpy Tons per year

% Percent

The new SF Facility would be constructed over a groundwater plume of chlorinated solvents (SWMU 61). The Florida Department of Environmental Protection raised the issue of the potential for degradation of indoor air quality as a result of the location of the SF Facility on top of this ERP site. To insure that indoor air quality would not be degraded, the design for the SF Facility would incorporate sufficient ventilation to allow the regular exchange of air from outside.

4.1.2 Cumulative Air Quality Impacts

Other projects are proposed for construction on MacDill AFB during the 15-month period needed to complete the Proposed Action. None of these projects are immediately adjacent to the proposed project site; however, they have been included in the cumulative emissions analysis since they are located on MacDill AFB. Table 4A (Appendix D) summarizes the air emissions for each of these projects. Tables 4B through 4D provide the cumulative annual air emissions for each project for Fiscal Years (FY) 2005 through FY 2007, respectively. As Tables 4B through 4D demonstrate, the cumulative annual emission estimates fall below the *de minimus* level of 100 tons per year for all five pollutants evaluated.

4.1.3 Noise

The closest noise sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the proposed SF Facility construction site include the occupants of the NCO Club (Building 499) located approximately 200 feet to the east. For the demolition of Building 528, the nearest potential receptors are the occupants of the compound for the Marine Forces Central Command Headquarters located approximately 300 feet to the west.

The Proposed Action is not anticipated to create additional operational noise that would impact adjacent land uses. The adjacent receptors would probably experience noise impacts from construction and/or construction-related vehicles. The magnitude of these impacts would be directly related to the proximity of the occupied facility to the construction or demolition site. In addition, the impacts vary according to the activity occurring on any particular day, and impacts would cease when construction is completed. Based on a cumulative average construction noise level of approximately 85 dB at 50 feet from the center of the project site (depending upon the current stage of the project), occupants of these nearby buildings would be potentially negatively impacted. However, these impacts would be temporary and are considered minor.

In summary, operational and temporary construction/demolition noise associated with the Proposed Action would have no significant adverse impact on the noise environment at MacDill AFB.

4.1.4 Wastes, Hazardous Material and Stored Fuel

Hazardous wastes/materials, such as paint, adhesives, and solvents, may be on site during the construction work under the Proposed Action. All construction related hazardous wastes/materials, including petroleum products, would be removed and disposed of according to base procedures, as well as applicable state and federal regulations. Appreciable amounts of hazardous wastes are not anticipated to be generated by base personnel during the operation and maintenance of the proposed SF Facility.

In regard to stored fuels management, removal of the above ground emergency power generator tanks at the existing SF Facility would be off-set by the installation of replacement above ground emergency power generator tanks at the new SF Facility. Both the currently existing tanks and

the replacement tanks store fuel at a capacity of less than 550-gallons and are therefore, not required to be regulated.

Implementation of the Proposed Action creates the potential for encountering contaminated media known to be present in the location of the Proposed Action at ERP SWMUs 35 and 61. Consequently, the construction contractor would be required to prepare a site-specific health and safety plan that meets the requirements of 29 CFR 1910.120(b)(4), and this plan must be reviewed and approved by the Bioenvironmental Engineering Flight and the ERP Manager. In addition, during excavation or soil removal activities, the construction contractor must use workers that have received 40-hour Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response (HAZWOPER) training with an 8-hour annual refresher in accordance with 29 CFR 1910.120.

If contaminated media are encountered during construction work around the proposed SF Facility or at Building 528, the MacDill ERP Manager would be contacted to insure that the material is managed in accordance with ERP guidelines.

In summary, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in a significant adverse impact on the management and disposal of hazardous material and waste.

4.1.5 Water Resources

Some soil erosion would occur during construction and demolition activities; however, implementation of a sediment and erosion control plan, including use of best management practices (BMPs) such as silt fencing and hay bales, would dramatically reduce erosion and avoid potential stormwater violations.

The project would also involve demolition activities, including the removal of numerous stormwater drainage structures from the site of Building 528. Stormwater in this area is externally drained; stormwater from impervious surfaces is directed to drains and ditches that connect directly to the nearby Hillsborough Bay. Upon completion of the demolition activities, the area would be designated as vacant land without impervious cover. Therefore, a long-term, positive impact to surface waters would result.

Under the Proposed Action, there are no direct or indirect discharges to groundwater. A net decrease of 2.4 acres of impervious cover will result under the Proposed Action. Construction of the new parking lots and proposed roadways would result in the addition of 3.0 acres of impervious surfaces, while demolition activities under the Proposed Action would result in the removal of approximately 5.4 acres of impervious surfaces [including Building 528 and all of its associated parking, curbing, paved areas, as well as three additional parking areas located within the proposed site for the new SF Facility (see Figure 2-1)]. In addition, the new parking lots would include appropriately sized stormwater treatment/attenuation areas. The stormwater retention areas would collect surface water runoff from the parking lots and allow it to infiltrate into the ground, recharging the groundwater in the surficial aquifer.

In summary, the Proposed Action would not have significant adverse effects on water resources.

4.1.6 Floodplains

The proposed location of the SF Facility and associated parking areas are located within 3.0 acres of the 100-year floodplain. The finished floor elevation would be completed to at least 11 feet msl in order to withstand a 100-year flood event. The existing Building 528, slated for demolition following the completion of the new facility, lies at less than 10 feet msl, and is also within the 100-year floodplain. Approximately 5.4 acres of impervious surfaces within the floodplain would be demolished under the Proposed Action (see Figure 2-1). Following demolition, 2.7 acres of this area (Building 528 and Parking Area No. 1) would be graded, vegetated, and designated as open land.

Implementation of the Proposed Action would have a positive impact to the floodplain, due to a decrease in total impervious surface of 2.4 acres that lies within the 100-year contour. The Proposed Action would also have a positive impact with regard to human safety, health, and welfare, as required by Executive Order 11988, by removing a heavily-occupied sub-standard facility within the floodplain, and relocating personnel into a building constructed in accordance with FEMA guidelines. Additionally, stormwater retention ponds and other stormwater management upgrades are planned under the Proposed Action. Consequently, impacts to the floodplain are expected to be beneficial, but not significant. The floodplain-related permitting requirements for the Proposed Action are discussed in Section 1.5.3.

4.1.7 Land Use

The Proposed Action would involve construction of a new SF Facility on approximately 3.0 acres currently designated as industrial and open land use, resulting in a land use change from industrial and open land uses to administrative land use. Demolition of the Building 528 and parking area No. 1 would change approximately 2.7 acres of administrative land to open land use. Demolition of parking areas No. 2 and No. 3 located within the vicinity of the proposed construction would result in approximately 1.6 acres of administrative land use being converted into open land while demolition of parking area No. 4 would result in no net change to land use because the new SF Facility parking area would be located in the same area. Consequently, the net changes to land use resulting from the Proposed Action would be the conversion of 3.0 acres from industrial and open land use to administrative land use (construction) and the conversion of 4.3 acres of administrative land use to open land use (demolition). These changes in land use are consistent with the future land use identified in the base *General Plan* (USAF, 2002). Therefore, the effect of the Proposed Action on land use at MacDill AFB would be beneficial, however the impact would not be significant.

4.1.8 Transportation

An increase in traffic in the north-central portion of the base would result during implementation of the Proposed Action, due to the increase in construction-related activities. These negative impacts are considered to be minor and short-term.

Upon completion, the Proposed Action would result in a similar number or a slight increase in the number of vehicles driving in the northern-central area of the base, as a result of the increased number of SF personnel that would be supported out of the new SF Facility. These potential impacts of additional vehicles would be accommodated with the modification of Hangar Loop Drive and Tampa Point Boulevard near the southern boundary of the site, which will improve traffic flow in the area. As a result, implementation of the Proposed Action would have no significant adverse impact on base transportation facilities.

4.1.9 Safety and Occupational Health

The proposed construction activities for the project would pose safety hazards to the workers similar to those associated with typical industrial construction projects, such as falls, slips, heat stress, and machinery injuries. Construction would not involve any unique hazards and all construction methods would comply with Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requirements to ensure the protection of workers and the general public during construction. Diligent, but not controlling, governmental oversight of contractor activities would help assure OSHA compliance.

The demolition portion of the project is anticipated to encounter ACM since these materials have been identified during completion of limited surveys. In addition, the demolition may encounter LBP. Prior to initiating demolition activities, the demolition contractor shall hire a qualified independent environmental consulting firm to perform a comprehensive asbestos and LBP survey for the existing facility. Once the surveys have been completed and the hazardous materials identified, the demolition contractor shall hire a qualified environmental abatement subcontractor to remove and dispose of the ACM and LBP. The same environmental firm shall perform environmental monitoring during the abatement work in accordance with Air Force, USEPA, and other applicable environmental regulations. All waste disposal manifests shall be turned over to the government upon completion of the demolition work.

The Proposed Action would involve demolition and construction activities within ERP site boundaries (SWMUs 35 and 61). However, appropriate measures have been included in the project to reduce the potential for contact with contaminated media and to protect workers from exposure. None of the constituents of concern at the site represent an immediate threat to life and health. Furthermore, according to the ERP Site Program Manager, construction activities associated with the Proposed Action are permissible within SWMUs 35 and 61 site boundaries (Maddy 2005). Consequently, no significant adverse impacts to safety and occupational health would occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

4.1.10 Socioeconomics

The Proposed Action would cost approximately \$11.2 million to complete, based on 2003 cost estimates. Economic activity associated with construction of the SF Facility would result in an

approximately 2.3 percent increase in the nearly \$494 million in annual expenditures MacDill AFB provides to the local economy, constituting a minor short-term beneficial effect. Operation of the SF Facility would provide a minor economic benefit to the MacDill AFB region. Therefore, the Proposed Action would have a minor beneficial impact on socioeconomic resources.

4.1.11 Environmental Justice

The Proposed Action would not disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations, given that there are no minority or low-income populations in the area of the proposed SF Facility site. Similarly, the SF Facility would have no adverse environmental effects on any off-base areas. Accordingly, there would be no environmental justice issues associated with the Proposed Action.

4.1.12 Biological Resources

No major wetland areas are located in or adjacent to the Proposed Action. A stormwater drainage ditch traverses the site proposed for construction of the SF Facility. The stormwater drainage ditch is classified as a wetland, and would be relocated to the western boundary of the site under the Proposed Action. The MacDill AFB construction program practices would ensure that silt fencing is installed around the perimeter of the construction area. Consequently, implementation of the Proposed Action would have no net effect on wetlands.

Section 3.11 identifies the federal and state-listed species that potentially occur at MacDill AFB. The proposed location of the new SF Facility has been surveyed by the MacDill AFB natural resources manager who determined that no threatened or endangered species or critical habitat would be impacted by construction activities at the site. Coordination with the USFWS has been completed to insure compliance with the Endangered Species Act and confirm that the project would have no adverse effect on listed species (Appendix E).

In summary, no significant adverse impact on biological resources is expected to occur from the Proposed Action.

4.1.13 Cultural Resources

Only one cultural resource, the MacDill Field Historic District, is located in the vicinity of the Proposed Action. Under the Proposed Action, construction and demolition activities would be performed such that there would be no impact on the MacDill Field Historic District. Also, construction and demolition activities would be performed in an area of the base that has already been developed. If unanticipated cultural resources were to be encountered during these activities, procedures for managing unidentified resources, as outlined in the Cultural Resources Management Plan, would be followed. Therefore, the Proposed Action would have no significant adverse impact to cultural resources.

4.1.14 Infrastructure

An increase in the generation of solid waste would occur during and subsequent to construction activities for the Proposed Action. The base has sufficient resources to manage the temporary increase in solid waste and the local landfills have sufficient capacity to accept the additional solid waste.

The construction of numerous restroom facilities, showers, baths, and/or other facilities would be included in the Proposed Action. Implementation of the Proposed Action may result in an increase in the total volume of wastewater to the base sanitary sewer system, as a number of shower facilities would be added. However, the increase in volume of wastewater is not expected to significantly impact the base sanitary sewer system. During project design, a determination would be made regarding the need to upgrade the capabilities of the sanitary sewer lift station servicing the area of the proposed SF Facility.

4.2 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Cumulative effects are impacts that result from the incremental consequences of an action when added to other past and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of the agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertaking such actions. Given the limited area that would be occupied by the SF Facility and its largely self-contained operations, the potential for significant cumulative impacts from the Proposed Action is small. As indicated in Table 2.1, the Proposed Action, when examined as a portion of the total proposed and/or ongoing construction projects on

MacDill AFB, would result in a minor beneficial cumulative impact to water resources, land use, and socioeconomics. Additionally, due to a decrease of 2.4 acres in total impervious surface that lies within the 100-year-flood contour, there would also be a minor beneficial cumulative impact to the floodplain. The Proposed Action would have minimal cumulative impacts to air quality, noise, waste and hazardous materials management, safety and occupational health, environmental justice, biological resources, cultural resources, or infrastructure, as outlined in Table 2.1 and Appendix D.

4.3 NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Under the No-Action Alternative, there would be no significant adverse impacts to the air quality; noise; wastes, hazardous material, and stored fuel; water resources; floodplains; land use; transportation; safety and occupational health; socioeconomics; environmental justice; biological resources; cultural resources; and infrastructure at MacDill AFB. However, the No-Action Alternative would be inconsistent with the MacDill AFB General Plan (MAFB, 2000); and would, therefore, cause an insignificant adverse effect on land use.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

Based upon the analyses presented in this EA, neither the Proposed Action nor the No-Action Alternative would have any potentially adverse impacts on environmental resources.

6.0 MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS

6.1 AIR QUALITY

Use reasonable precautions to control the emissions of unconfined particulate matter during construction activities in accordance with FAC Rule 62-296. Ensure that all hazardous materials used during construction comply with the MacDill AFB Hazardous Materials Management Program's requirements for low volatile organic compound content.

Prior to construction, contaminant concentrations in shallow groundwater flowing beneath the project area should be evaluated for potential risks to base workers occupying the new SF Facility.

6.2 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/WASTES

Ensure hazardous materials are approved and tracked through the MacDill AFB Hazardous Materials Management Program. Coordinate characterization and disposal of any hazardous or special waste with the base Environmental Compliance Program. Coordinate with the MacDill AFB Pollution Prevention Program to ensure recycling of demolition wastes, if possible. Ensure that any soil removed from SWMUs 61 and 35 is tested for contaminants of concern and, if found contaminated, it is properly disposed.

6.3 WATER RESOURCES

Submit appropriate applications to permit stormwater retention areas and NPDES construction for all of the proposed parking lots, and for the modification of the stormwater ditch (classified as a wetland) currently traversing the site. Ensure BMPs, such as silt screens and placement of hay bales, are employed during construction to prevent erosion and stormwater violations during all construction activities. Ensure that the new construction complies with all applicable water and energy conservation requirements in EO 13123, *Greening the Government Through Efficient Energy Management*.

6.4 SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

Ensure construction activities comply with OSHA standards or more stringent standards if applicable. Ensure that a site specific health and safety plan is prepared prior to initiating construction and demolition at SWMUs 61 and 35 and ensure that all workers completing excavation or dirt moving activities in this area have 40-hour HAZWOPER training and the annual 8-hour refresher course.

6.5 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Ensure that any ground surface areas disturbed during construction are re-seeded or revegetated with native flora.

7.0 PERSONS CONTACTED

Jason Kirkpatrick
6 CES/CEVN
2610 Pink Flamingo Avenue
MacDill AFB, FL 33621
Phone: (813) 828-0459
Fax: (813) 828-2212
e-mail: jason.kirkpatrick@macdill.af.mil

Chief Thomas Westermeyer
6 SFS/SFM
MacDill AFB, Florida 33621-5207
Phone: (813) 828-2598

Bob Fisher
Military Construction Project Manager
6 CES/CECE
MacDill AFB, Florida 33621-5207
Phone: (813) 828-8685

Andy Coe
6 CES/CECD, MacDill AFB
GIS Coordinator/Assistant CADD
Supervisor
Chugach Management Services, Inc.
PO Box 6349
Tampa, FL 33608-0349
Phone: (813) 828-2455

Candace Graham, M.C.S.E
CADD Supervisor
Chugach Management Services, Inc.
PO Box 6349
Tampa, FL 33608-0349
Phone: (813) 828-2455

Tony Rodriguez
6 CES/CEPP
MacDill AFB, Florida 33621-5207

Anthony Gennarro and Tish Maddy
MacDill Air Force Base
Environmental Restoration Program
7621 Hillsborough Loop Dr.
MacDill AFB, FL 33621-5207

Bryan Pridgeon
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
9500 Koger Boulevard, Suite 102
St. Petersburg, FL 33702
Phone: (727) 570-5398

Laura Kammerer
Division of Historical Resources
Compliance Review Section
500 S. Bronough St.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0250
Phone: (800) 847-7278

Jasmine Raffington
FL Coastal Management Program
Florida State Clearing House
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100
Phone: (850) 414-6568

Rob Ritch
6 CEV/CEVH
Environmental Flight
Hazardous-Waste & Toxic Substances
Phone: (813) 828-3393

Michael Harrison
Water Program Manager
6 CES/CEV
MacDill, AFB Florida 33621-5207
Phone: (813) 828-0458

8.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

Mr. Jason Kirkpatrick
6 CES/CEVN
2610 Pink Flamingo Avenue
MacDill AFB, FL 33621
Phone: (813) 828-0459

Mr. Steve Duda
Senior Biologist
Earth Tech, Inc.
10 Patewood Drive, Suite 500
Greenville, SC 29615
Phone: (864) 234-3595

Ms. Kathy Garvin
Environmental Scientist
Earth Tech, Inc.
10 Patewood Drive, Suite 500
Greenville, SC 29615
Phone: (864) 234-2285

Ms. Susan Provenzano, AICP
Senior Environmental Planner
Earth Tech, Inc.
10 Patewood Drive, Suite 500
Greenville, SC 29615
Phone: (864) 234-3591

Ms. Gretchen Jameson
Environmental Scientist
Earth Tech, Inc.
10 Patewood Drive, Suite 500
Greenville, SC 29615
Phone: (864) 234-3076

Mr. Nathan Craig
Environmental Scientist
Earth Tech, Inc.
10 Patewood Drive, Suite 500
Greenville, SC 29615
Phone: (864) 234-8966

9.0 REFERENCES

- | | |
|---|---|
| Advisory Council on
Historic Preservation, 1986. | 36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties. U.S.
Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. |
| American Weather Service
(AWS), 1993. | AWS Climatic Brief, Air Force Combat Climatology Center, Air
Weather Service, Scott AFB, October 1993. |
| E.O. 11988, May 1977. | Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management. |
| E.O. 11990, May 1977 | Executive Order 11990, Wetland Protection |
| Federal Interagency
Committee on Urban Noise
(FICUN), 1980. | Guidelines for Considering Noise in Land Use Planning and
Control. |
| Federal Register, January
2002. | Nationwide Permits, Conditions, Further Information, and
Definitions, Volume 67, Number 10. |
| FDEP, February 1999. | F.A.C. Chapter 62-257, Asbestos Program. |
| FDEP, March 1999. | F.A.C. Chapter 62-296, Stationary Sources – Emission Standards. |
| FDEP, February 2000. | F.A.C. Chapter 62-621, Generic Permits. |
| FDEP, May 2003. | State of Florida Department of Environmental Protection Generic
Permit for Stormwater Discharge from Large and Small
Construction Activities. |
| Florida Natural Areas
Inventory (FNAI), 1996. | Biological Survey of MacDill Air Force Base. |
| Jacksonville District COE,
July 2003. | Department of Army Jacksonville District Corps of Engineers
Approach on Identifying Adjacent Wetlands and Isolated Waters. |
| MacDill Air Force Base | Lead-based Paint and Asbestos Records, Building 528. |
| Maddy, Tish | Verbal correspondence, February 1, 2005. |
| Naval Facilities Engineering
Command (NAVFAC), July
2002. | Unified Facilities Criteria, DoD Minimum Antiterrorism
Standards for Buildings. |

Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD), March 1988.	Chapter 40D-4. Rules of the Southwest Florida Water Management District Individual Environmental Resource Permits.
Universe Technologies, Inc. and Gene Stout and Associates, 2000.	Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan, 2000-2004, Draft.
USAF, 1992.	From the 1940s to Now ... A Historical Synopsis of the 56 th Tactical Training Wing ... and MacDill Air Force Base, Florida. 56 FW Historian's Office, MacDill AFB.
USAF, 1995.	Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Volume I: Stationary Point and Area Sources, 5 th Edition (AP-42), United States Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, January 1995 (Supplement A, February 1996).
USAF, 1996a.	Endangered Species Management Plan MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
USAF, 1996b.	Biological Survey of MacDill Air Force Base – Final Report.
USAF, 1996c.	Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP) MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
USAF, 1996.	Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) Study, MacDill AFB, Tampa.
USAF, 1997.	Economic Resource Impact Statement MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
USAF, 1998a.	Delineation Study of the Waters of the United States Including the Landward Extent of Wetlands and Surface Waters MacDill Air Force Base Tampa, Hillsborough County, Florida.
USAF, 1998b.	Entry Gate Development Study MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
USAF, 1999.	DRAFT Title V Permit No. 0570141-001-AV MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
USAF, 2000.	Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan (INRMP) MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
USAF, 2002.	MacDill AFB General Plan MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
MAFB, 2004	Requirements Document FY 06 Security Forces Facility MacDill AFB, Tampa, Florida. Prepared by Pond.

- USEPA, 1971. Noise from Construction Equipment and Operation, Building Equipment and Home Appliances.
- USEPA, 1985. Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Volume II: Mobile Sources, 4th Edition (AP-42), USEPA, Ann Arbor, September 1985 (Supplement A, January 1991).
- USEPA, 1988. Gap Filling PM₁₀ Emission Factors for Selected Open Area Dust Sources (EPA-450/4-88-003), United States Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, February 1988.
- USEPA, 1995. Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Volume I: Stationary Point and Area Sources, 5th Edition (AP-42), USEPA, Research Triangle Park, January 1995 (Supplement A, February 1996).
- State of Florida, 1981. Florida Coastal Management Program.

FIGURES



Source: June 2002, MacDill Aerial Photo

0 1,500 3,000 6,000
Feet

CONSTRUCTION OF SECURITY
FORCES FACILITY/ DEMOLITION OF
EXISTING SECURITY FORCES FACILITY
MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA

FIGURE 1-1
PROJECT LOCATION AND VICINITY MAP

FIGURE 2-1
PROPOSED DEMOLITION AREAS




CONSTRUCTION OF SECURITY
FORCES FACILITY/ DEMOLITION OF
EXISTING SECURITY FORCES FACILITY
MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA

FIGURE 2-2
PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION AREA



CONSTRUCTION OF SECURITY
FORCES FACILITY/ DEMOLITION OF
EXISTING SECURITY FORCES FACILITY
MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA

FIGURE 2-3
PROPOSED SECURITY FORCES FACILITY




Legend

 Proposed Location for the New Security Forces Facility Site	 Wetlands	 Former Building Locations
 ERP Site Boundary	 Bay	 Existing Building Locations
 Paved Roads	 Inland Water Bodies	 Noise Contour
 Unpaved Roads	 Apron	 Recreation/Upland Restoration
 Parking Areas	 Taxiway	
 Driveways	 Historic District	

0 175 350 700
Feet

CONSTRUCTION OF SECURITY
FORCES FACILITY/ DEMOLITION OF
EXISTING SECURITY FORCES FACILITY
MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA

FIGURE 3-1
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS IN VICINITY
OF PROPOSED SECURITY FORCES FACILITY



CONSTRUCTION OF SECURITY
FORCES FACILITY/ DEMOLITION OF
EXISTING SECURITY FORCES FACILITY
MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA

FIGURE 3-2
100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN MAP

APPENDIX A

AIR FORCE FORM 813

REQUEST FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS		Report Control Symbol RCS	07604-07	
INSTRUCTIONS: Section I to be completed by Proponent. Sections II and III to be completed by Environmental Planning Function. Continue on separate sheets as necessary. Reference appropriate form number(s).				
SECTION I - PROPONENT INFORMATION				
1. TO (Environmental Planning Function)		2. FROM (Proponent Organization and functional address symbol)		24. TELEPHONE NO.
6 CES/CEVN		6 CES/CC 7621 Hillsborough Loop Drive MacDill AFB, FL 33621		(813) 828-3577 DSN 968-3577
3. TITLE OF PROPOSED ACTION				
CONSTRUCT SECURITY FORCES FACILITY				
4. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION (Identify decision to be made and need date)				
(See attached)				
5. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES (DOPAA) (Provide sufficient details for explanation of the total action)				
(See attached)				
6. PROPONENT APPROVAL (Name and Grade)		6a. SIGNATURE		6b. DATE
ANTHONY A. FOTI, Lt Col, USAF Base Civil Engineer				15 March 2004
SECTION II - PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL SURVEY (Check appropriate box and describe potential environmental effects including cumulative effects) (+ = positive effect; - = adverse effect; U = unknown effect)				
7. AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBLE USE ZONE/LAND USE (Noise, accident potential, encroachment, etc.)		+ 0 - U		
8. AIR QUALITY (Emissions, attainment status, state implementation plan, etc.)		X		
9. WATER RESOURCES (Quality, quantity, source, etc.)		X		
10. SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH (Asbestos/radiation/chemical hazards, explosives safety, quantity, distance, bird/wildlife aircraft hazards, etc.)		X		
11. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS WASTE (Toxicological, chemical, biological, etc.)		X		
12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (Wetlands/marshlands, threatened or endangered species, etc.)		X		
13. CULTURAL RESOURCES (Native American burial sites, archaeological, historical, etc.)		X		
14. GEOLOGY AND SOILS (Topography, minerals, geothermal, installation restoration program, seismicity, etc.)		X		
15. SOCIOECONOMIC (Employment/population projections, school and local fiscal impacts, etc.)		X		
16. OTHER (Potential impacts not addressed above)				
SECTION III - ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS DETERMINATION				
17. PROPOSED ACTION QUALIFIES FOR CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DATE: _____, YH				
X PROPOSED ACTION DOES NOT QUALIFY FOR A CATEX; FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS IS REQUIRED				
18. REMARKS				
MacDill AFB is located in a maintenance area for the following criteria pollutants: Ozone. Direct emissions from construction and indirect emissions from visiting traffic and/or follow-on operations, when totaled are less than the de minimus amounts in 40 CFR 93.153; therefore, a conformity determination is not required.				
19. ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING FUNCTION CERTIFICATION (Name and grade) (2-10-03)		19a. SIGNATURE		19b. DATE
Brian T. Kelly, Colonel, USAF Acting Vice Commander, 6th Air Mobility Wing				27 Apr 04
AF FORM 813, 19990901 (EF-V1)		THIS FORM CONSOLIDATES AF FORMS 813 AND 814		PAGE 1 OF 1 PAGE(S)

4.0 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION:

The Security Forces squadron currently operates out of a 1950's vintage commissary that was renovated in 1995 to house the unit. In 1995, only 130 personnel were assigned to the Security Forces squadron. Today, following the events of September 11th 2001, more than 400 personnel are permanently assigned to the squadron. The building is overcrowded and personnel are required to work in outlying buildings. The current facility is undersize and does not provide sufficient operational, administrative, and storage space to house and supply the 400+ personnel that have been permanently assigned to MacDill AFB. In addition, due to space limitations, the Security Forces squadron must use the old Flight Simulator building for training and storage. The old Flight Simulator building is located more than a ½-mile from the main Security Forces building (Bldg 528) and the geographical separation of these buildings adversely impact command and control and hinders communication between flight elements.

Construction of a new Security Forces facility would provide much need administrative, training, and storage space for the 6th Security Forces squadron which would in turn improve efficiency, moral and productivity. This action would consolidate the administrative, training, and equipment storage functions for the squadron into one facility which would significantly improve command and control for the 6 Security Forces squadron.

5.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES:

5.1 Proposed Action – Construct a 'state of the art' Security Forces facility to replace the existing undersized and inadequate building. The new facility would be approximately 32,125 square feet in size and constructed about 1,200 feet south of the current facility (Bldg 528). The new building would consist of a reinforced concrete foundation and floor slab, masonry exterior walls, and a standing seam metal roof system. Fire suppression system, emergency power, heating and air conditioning, parking, and landscaping are all included in the project. Physical security measures including stand-off distances would be include in compliance with Department of Defense standards. The new facility would be constructed with the base floor elevation above the 100-year floodplain elevation to comply with Federal Emergency Management Agency guidelines and Executive Order 11988. The existing Security Forces facility and any ancillary structures and parking would be demolished upon completion of the new facility. The site would be grassed over to create a site for future development.

5.2 Alternative #1: Renovation and Expansion. This alternative would extensively renovate the existing Security Forces building and construct an addition to create the needed additional training and storage space. This alternative would provide a sufficiently sized, updated facility for the Security Forces squadron which would allow the organization to consolidate their functions and improve operational efficiency. This alternative would not correct the current potential for flooding in the existing Security Forces building (Bldg 528) since this older building was not constructed above the 100-year flood elevation.

5.4 Alternative #3: No action alternative. This alternative would implement no substantial improvements to existing Security Forces buildings and this organization would continue to work in overcrowded, outdated facilities impacting moral and productivity.

6.0 CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION: This project is not applicable for a Categorical Exclusion and requires further environmental impact analysis.

7.0 EXECUTIVE ORDER 11988 – FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT: The location of the proposed project is in the 100-year coastal floodplain. Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, seeks to avoid construction of facilities or structures within floodplains “to reduce the risk of flood loss, to minimize the impact of floods on human safety, health and welfare, and to restore and preserve the natural and beneficial values served by floodplains”. As part of the environmental impact analysis process, this project shall be evaluated for compliance with Executive Order 11988 to ensure that the above referenced goals are met and to determine that there is no practicable alternative to locating the proposed action in the floodplain.

1. COMPONENT
AIR FORCE

FY 2006 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA

2. DATE


3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION
MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA

5. PROJECT TITLE
SECURITY FORCES FACILITY


7. PROJECT NUMBER
NVZR033703

- SITE PLAN -
not to scale


↑ NORTH



**MacDill AFB, FL
Security Forces Facility, \$11.2M
NVZR033703**



This 47-year old facility was originally constructed as a Commissary. Interior renovations to convert it to administrative office space were largely self-help and do not portray MacDill or AMC's standards of excellence.



Renovated when the squadron's manning was 130 personnel, this building is now grossly inadequate for the 400+ personnel assigned.

WHAT THIS PROJECT PROVIDES:

- An adequately sized and properly designed facility to house Security Forces operations

WHY THIS PROJECT IS REQUIRED:

- Security Forces support for the combatant command CINCs requires centralized management
- Fragmentation of security force functions causes an unnecessary strain on force protection management continuity

APPENDIX B

CONSISTENCY STATEMENT

APPENDIX B

CONSISTENCY STATEMENT

This consistency statement will examine the potential environmental consequences of the Proposed Action and ascertain the extent to which the consequences of the Proposed Action are consistent with the objectives of Florida Coastal Management Program (CMP).

Of the Florida Statutory Authorities included in the CMP, impacts in the following areas are addressed in the EA: beach and shore preservation (Chapter 161), historic preservation (Chapter 267), economic development and tourism (Chapter 288), public transportation (Chapters 334 and 339), saltwater living resources (Chapter 370), living land and freshwater resource (Chapter 372), water resources (Chapter 373), environmental control (Chapter 403), and soil and water conservation (Chapter 582). This consistency statement discusses how the proposed options may meet the CMP objectives.

CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION

Chapter 161: Beach and Shore Preservation

The proposed action will not have any long-term impacts on the beach and/or shoreline. Short term impacts due to the relocation of the drainage ditch will be minimized by the development of a SWPPP and implementation of best management practices (BMPs) for erosion and sedimentation control.

Chapter 267: Historic Preservation

The Air Force and the Florida State Historic Preservation Officer have determined that the Proposed Action will have no effect on historic properties associated with the Base.

Chapter 288: Economic Development and Tourism

The EA presents the new employment impact and net income impact of the Proposed Action and alternative. The options would not have significant adverse effects on any key Florida industries or economic diversification efforts.

Chapter 370: Saltwater Living Resources

The EA addresses potential impacts to local water bodies. Water quality impacts were surveyed for existing conditions at the Proposed Action and alternatives. Results indicate that no impacts would result from the Proposed Action or alternatives.

Chapter 372: Living Land and Freshwater Resources

Threatened and endangered species, major plant communities, conservation of native habitat, and mitigation of potential impacts to the resources are addressed in the EA. The Proposed Action and alternatives would not result in permanent disturbance to native habitat and should not significantly impact threatened or endangered species.

Chapter 373: Water Resources

There would be no impacts to surface water or groundwater quality under the Proposed Action or alternatives as discussed in the EA.

Chapter 403: Environmental Control

The EA addresses the issues of conservation and protection of environmentally sensitive living resources; protection of groundwater and surface water quality and quantity; potable water supply; protection of air quality; minimization of adverse hydrogeologic impacts; protection of endangered or threatened species; solid, sanitary, and hazardous waste disposal; and protection of floodplains and wetlands. Where impacts to these resources can be identified, possible mitigation measures are suggested. Implementation of mitigation will, for the most part, be the responsibility of MacDill AFB.

Chapter 582: Soil and Water Conservation

The EA addresses the potential of the Proposed Action and alternatives to disturb soil and presents possible measures to prevent or minimize soil erosion. Impacts to groundwater and surface water resources also are discussed in the EA.

CONCLUSION


The Air Force finds that the conceptual Proposed Action and alternatives plans presented in the EA are consistent with Florida's CMP.

APPENDIX C

ERP SITE SUMMARIES

Site Summary for Site32
Environmental Restoration Program, MacDill AFB, FL

Email or Print this Site Summary

Site ID:	Site32	
Site Name:	Old Base Exchange(BS) Service Statn	
Air Force ID:	SS032	
Regulatory Program:	Petroleum	
Air Force Program:	IRP	
Current Phase:	NFA	
Site Status:	No Further Action	
Relative Risk:	No Risk	
Site Closure:	4/11/2002	Site32

Primary Contaminants of Potential Concern

Groundwater:	Benzene, chrysene, cumene, naphthalene, toluene
Soils:	benzene, Pb, dibenzo(a,h)anthracene
Surface water:	DEHP, Pb
Sediments:	Barium, Pb
Buildings/structures:	None Identified

Physical Setting

Site 32, a former BX Service Station, is located in the northeast portion of the base along the north side of Hanger Loop Road, between Tampa Boulevard and Inner Bay Loop Road. The site is flat and contains paved areas and grassed areas. The old gas station building is still standing, but reportedly is scheduled for

demolition later in 2002.

Narrative

Site 32 was a AAFES service station consisting of a service station building, pump station, and eight 1,000-gallon USTs. The service station operated from 1940 to 1964. The building and pump station covered an area approximately 20,000 square feet in size. The pump station has been removed. The eight USTs, formerly located on the southeast portion of the site, and the associated distribution equipment were removed in November of 1992. The existing building was operated as a minor maintenance facility for vehicles for a period of time and is now vacant but still standing. A contamination assessment was conducted in 1993-95. The results indicated that soils in the vicinity of the former USTs were contaminated. An interim measure was conducted in 1997 to remove approximately 360 cubic yards of excessively contaminated soils. Soils were removed from a 1,955 square-foot area to the water table, at a depth of approximately 5 feet. Following soil removal, Oxygen Releasing Compound (ORC) was injected into groundwater in May 1998 to promote biological degradation of dissolved petroleum hydrocarbons. The site was placed on long term (groundwater) monitoring (LTM) from 1998 to July 2000. No exceedences of the State of Florida groundwater cleanup target levels occurred during the monitoring events of April and July 2000, and final soil sampling was performed in October 2001. The Revision 1 of the Site Rehabilitation was submitted to and approved by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) in 2002.

Summary of Activities to Date

Started	Completed	Category	Activity or Milestone
9/1/1990	9/30/1990	Field Work	Preliminary contamination assessment
3/1/1995	3/1/1995	Document Submittal	CAR
6/1/1997	6/30/1997	Regulatory Correspondence	CAR approved
9/1/1997	9/1/1997	Field Work	Soils removal
2/1/1998	2/1/1998	Document Submittal	RAP
5/1/1998	5/1/1998	Field Work	RAP in place
7/1/1998	4/1/2000	Field Work	Groundwater monitoring
1/1/1999	1/1/1999	Field Work	Groundwater monitoring
7/1/2000	7/1/2000	Field Work	Groundwater monitoring
9/20/2001	10/4/2001	Document Submittal	Soil sampling plan and sampling
2/22/2002	2/22/2002	Document Submittal	Site Rehabilitation Completion Report
4/11/2002	4/11/2002	Regulatory Correspondence	NFA
5/28/2002	5/28/2002	Document Submittal	Well abandonment plan
6/3/2002	6/3/2002	Field Work	Monitoring well abandonment

Government Contact


MacDill AFB
6 CES/CEVR
7621 Hillsborough Loop Drive (Bldg.30)

Contractor on Site

Earth Tech
10 Patewood Drive
Building VI, Suite 500


MacDill AFB, FL 33621
POC: Anthony Gennaro
Phone: (813)828-0764
Fax: (813)828-0731
Email: anthony.gennaro@macdill.af.mil

Greenville, SC 29615
POC: Dave Oliphant
Phone: (864)234-3560
Fax: (864)234-3069
Email: dave_oliphant@earthtech.com



Site Summary for Site55
Environmental Restoration Program, MacDill AFB, FL

Email or Print this Site Summary

Site ID:	Site55	
Site Name:	Fac 1155 UST Fuels Storage	
Air Force ID:	ST055	
Regulatory Program:	Petroleum	
Air Force Program:	IRP	
Current Phase:	NFA	
Site Status:	No Further Action	
Relative Risk:	No Risk	
Site Closure:	9/30/1996	

Site55

Primary Contaminants of Potential Concern

Groundwater:	BTEX, naphthalene, PAHs
Soils:	TRPH,BTEX, naphthalene, PAHs
Surface water:	None Identified
Sediments:	None Identified
Buildings/structures:	None Identified

Physical Setting

Site 55, Building 527 and former Building 1155, are located at the intersection of Tampa Point Boulevard and "A" Street. This site is adjacent to Site 32 and north of Site 56. The area is mostly grassy with paved parking south of Building 527. A drainage ditch is located northwest of the site.

Narrative

Site 55 is the former fuel storage area. This facility was constructed in the 1950s and consisted of two supply stations, four USTs containing gasoline and an OWS. The OWS formerly discharged to a leach field until 1970 when it was rerouted to discharge to the sanitary sewer system. In 1996, the OWS was removed. The four USTs containing gasoline and the two supply stations were removed in 1998. At that time contamination of the soil and groundwater was evident. A Tank Closure Assessment Report was written detailing the removal of the USTs and any findings. The report was submitted in March 1998 recommending that further investigation be completed. In November 1999, Site 55 was combined with SWMU 35 and placed under Site Assessment status.

Summary of Activities to Date

Started	Completed	Category	Activity or Milestone
1/1/1994	1/1/1995	Field Work	Reconnaissance assessment
1/1/1995	2/1/1996	Document Submittal	CAR
2/1/1996	2/1/1996	Field Work	Oil/water separator removal
2/1/1996	2/1/1996	Regulatory Correspondence	Discharge report form
2/1/1998	2/1/1998	Field Work	Tank removal
2/1/1998	3/1/1998	Field Work	Investigation
3/1/1998	3/1/1998	Document Submittal	Tank Closure
11/1/1999	11/1/1999	Regulatory Correspondence	Site55 combined with SWMU35


Government Contact

MacDill AFB
6 CES/CEVR
7621 Hillsborough Loop Drive (Bldg.30)
MacDill AFB, FL 33621
POC: Anthony Gennaro
Phone: (813)828-0764
Fax: (813)828-0731
Email: anthony.gennaro@macdill.af.mil

Contractor on Site

Earth Tech
7102 W. Boundary Road

MacDill AFB, FL 33621
POC: Ellen Eveland
Phone: (813)840-2700
Fax: (813)840-9113
Email: ellen_eveland@earthtech.com




Site Summary for SWMU35

Environmental Restoration Program, MacDill AFB, FL

Email or Print this Site Summary

Site ID:	SWMU35
Site Name:	Oil/Water Separators
Air Force ID:	SS035
Regulatory Program:	RCRA
Air Force Program:	IRP
Current Phase:	RI
Site Status:	Remedial Investigation
Relative Risk:	High
Site Closure:	12/31/2023 est.



SWMU35

Primary Contaminants of Potential Concern

Groundwater:	Al, antimony, arsenic, Fe, vynil chloride, Trichloroethylene
Soils:	arsenic, benzo(a)pyrenne, dibenzo(a,h)anthracene, ethyl benzene, Pb, Naphthalene
Surface water:	None Identified
Sediments:	None Identified
Buildings/structures:	None Identified

Physical Setting

SWMU 35 is comprised of 21 oil water separator sites (OWS) and one hazardous waste accumulation point site. These sites are located at various facilities around the base.

Narrative

The United States Geological Survey (USGS) performed a reconnaissance assessment of 23 OWS sites and 5 hazardous waste accumulation points. The reconnaissance assessment recommended further investigation of 20 OWS sites and one of the hazardous waste accumulation points. There are currently 13 OWS sites that have Confirmation Sampling status, 6 OWS sites and the Hazardous Waste Accumulation Point have Site Assessment Status and 2 of the OWS sites have RCRA Facility Investigation Status. A Work Plan detailing the investigation of 20 OWS sites was submitted and approved in March 2001. Initial investigation activities are currently underway. In March of 2002, 10 of the 13 confirmatory sampling reports were submitted. The remaining 3 require additional investigation prior to submitting to the state. A CAMP extension was requested and received for September 2002. In June of 2002, 2 of the 6 site assessment reports were submitted. The remaining 4 site assessments need additional investigation to define the nature and extent of contamination. A request to extend the PSMP date was submitted.

Summary of Activities to Date

Started	Completed	Category	Activity or Milestone
8/15/1991	8/15/1991	Regulatory Correspondence	RCRA/HSWA Permit
1/1/1994	12/1/1995	Field Work	Reconnaissance Assessment
12/1/1995	9/17/1997	Document Submittal	Reconnaissance Assessment
7/1/1997	11/1/1999	Consensus Decisions	USAF and USCOE Review Recommendations
11/4/1997	11/4/1997	Regulatory Correspondence	EPA letter
2/1/1999	2/1/1999	Document Submittal	OWS and Hazardous Waste Acc. Point report
11/1/1999	11/1/1999	Comments	EPA
11/1/1999	3/1/2001	Document Submittal	SWMU35 Work Plan
7/15/2000	7/15/2000	Document Submittal	CS/RFI Work Plan
3/1/2001	6/7/2002	Document Submittal	Site Assessment Report
3/1/2001		Field Work	Site Assessment
3/1/2002	3/15/2002	Document Submittal	Confirmatory Sampling Report
1/10/2003	1/10/2003	Document Submittal	Workplan Addendum

Government Contact

MacDill AFB
 Remedial Project Manager
 Installation Restoration Program
 MacDill AFB, FL 33621
 POC: Kenneth Domako
 Phone: (813)828-0764
 Fax: (813)828-0731
 Email: kenneth.domako@macdill.af.mil


MacDill AFB
 6 CES/CEVR

Contractor on Site

Earth Tech
 7102 W. Boundary Road

 MacDill AFB, FL 33621
 POC: Ellen Eveland
 Phone: (813)840-2700
 Fax: (813)840-9113
 Email: ellen_eveland@earthtech.com


7621 Hillsborough Loop Drive (Bldg.30)
MacDill AFB, FL 33621
POC: Anthony Gennaro
Phone: (813)828-0764
Fax: (813)828-0731
Email: anthony.gennaro@macdill.af.mil



Site Summary for SWMU61
Environmental Restoration Program, MacDill AFB, FL

Email or Print this Site Summary

Site ID:	SWMU61
Site Name:	Chlorinated Solvent Plume
Air Force ID:	SS061
Regulatory Program:	RCRA
Air Force Program:	IRP
Current Phase:	RA-C
Site Status:	Remedial Action - Construction
Relative Risk:	High
Site Closure:	12/31/2021 est.



SWMU61

Primary Contaminants of Potential Concern

Groundwater:	Chlorinated VOCs, arsenic, and petroleum
Soils:	None Identified
Surface water:	None Identified
Sediments:	None Identified
Buildings/structures:	None Identified

Physical Setting

SWMU 61 is located in the northeast portion of the Base along the north apron of the flightline. The site is about 30 acres in size. SWMU 61 is bounded on the west by Kingfisher Avenue, and on the east by the Hillsborough Bay. To the north, the site is bounded by North Boundary Boulevard, while the southern

extent is Florida Keys Avenue. The site includes an area which is approximately 14.25 million square feet.

Narrative

The initial presence of chlorinated solvents was mainly confirmed through previous investigations at Site 57 (Pumphouse 77) in 1993-1994, and at the AGE Building Vinyl Chloride area (SWMU 29) in 1993-1994. In January 1998, SWMU 29 was formally incorporated in SWMU 61 investigations. Chlorinated VOCs were also detected in groundwater at Site 57, North Apron, which is located south of PH 77. The primary site contaminants at SWMU 61 include trichloroethylene (TCE), 1,2-dichloroethene (1,2-DCE), vinyl chloride, and 1,2-dichloroethane (1,2-DCA). The source of the VOCs, including TCE and two of its degradation products, 1,2-DCE and vinyl chloride, has not yet been determined. A RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) Report was finalized in 1999. A groundwater monitoring program was initiated to evaluate MNA as a potential remedy for groundwater. Groundwater flow and transport modeling is currently being conducted. A Corrective Measures Study (CMS) for SWMU 61 will be performed following completion of the groundwater modeling efforts in 2002.

Summary of Activities to Date

Started	Completed	Category	Activity or Milestone
10/1/1994	10/1/1994	Document Submittal	Draft Vinyl Chloride Investigation Report
6/1/1998	6/1/1998	Document Submittal	Draft RFI
12/1/1998	12/1/1998	Document Submittal	Groundwater monitoring plan
1/1/1999	1/1/2000	Document Submittal	Annual Monitoring Report
10/1/1999	10/1/1999	Document Submittal	RFI Report
10/1/1999	10/1/1999	Field Work	Risk Assessment
11/16/1999	11/16/1999	Regulatory Correspondence	EPA letter
4/28/2000	4/28/2000	Document Submittal	Annual Monitoring Report
4/28/2001	4/28/2001	Document Submittal	Annual Monitoring Report
2/7/2003	2/7/2003	Document Submittal	Treatability Study Work Plan Revision 1
2/26/2003	2/26/2003	Document Submittal	Final Comprehensive Groundwater Sampling Work Plan Revision 2
3/4/2003	3/4/2003	Document Submittal	Groundwater Flow Modeling Report
3/21/2003	3/24/2003	Document Submittal	Basewide Water Level Measurement Effort: Rev. 0
4/18/2003	4/18/2003	Regulatory Correspondence	EPA letter
4/18/2003	4/18/2003	Regulatory Correspondence	DEP Letter.
2/25/2004	2/25/2004	Document Submittal	Treatability Study Report Rev. 1

Government Contact

MacDill AFB
6 CES/CEQ
7621 Hillsborough Loop Drive (Bldg.30)
MacDill AFB, FL 33621

Contractor on Site


Earth Tech
7102 W. Boundary Road
MacDill AFB, FL 33621

POC: Richard Burnette
Phone: (813)828-4554
Fax: (813)828-0731
Email: richard.burnette@macdill.af.mil

MacDill AFB
Remedial Project Manager
Installation Restoration Program
MacDill AFB, FL 33621
POC: Kenneth Domako
Phone: (813)828-0764
Fax: (813)828-0731
Email: kenneth.domako@macdill.af.mil

POC: Ellen Eveland
Phone: (813)840-2700
Fax: (813)840-9113
Email: ellen_eveland@earthtech.com

Earth Tech
10 Patewood Drive
Building VI, Suite 500
Greenville , SC 29615
POC: Gregg Branham
Phone: (864)234-3583
Fax: (864)234-3069
Email: gregg_branham@earthtech.com



APPENDIX D

AIR EMISSION CALCULATIONS FOR PROJECT

TABLE 4A
Total Air Emissions for Projects at MacDill AFB
Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Security Forces Facility

	Security Forces Facility (construction)	Security Forces Facility (demolition)	Primary Care Clinic (construction)	USCENTCOM	Apron Pavements	COMSEC Addition	SF Boathouse	AGE Renovation	Base Support	Housing Maintenance Building	PharmaCare Addition	Trans/Supply Complex	USSOCOM	Military Family Housing - Phase VI	Military Family Housing - Phase VII	Military Family Housing - Phase VIII	Project Totals	Hills Cty Emissions 1997	Net Change	De minimis	Above/Below De minimis
Pollutants																					
CO	5.53	6.32	23.72	19.52	9.28	0.27	0.96	1.72	2.58	0.86	2.13	4.28	17.03	20.28	20.28	20.28	155.04	19,272	0.80%	100	Below
VOC	2.93	2.84	8.88	7.4	4.1	0.34	0.85	1.27	1.7	0.79	1.4	2.39	6.58	7.75	7.75	7.75	64.72	27,703	0.23%	100	Below
NO _x	6.31	7.99	28.07	21.71	10.1	0.32	1.07	1.93	2.88	0.96	2.37	4.72	19.44	24.13	24.13	24.13	180.26	82,563	0.22%	100	Below
SO _x	0.31	0.41	1.41	1.06	0.49	0.02	0.05	0.09	0.14	0.05	0.12	0.23	0.96	1.22	1.22	1.22	9	NA	NA	100	Below
PM ₁₀	0.51	0.75	2.41	1.7	0.76	0.03	0.08	0.15	0.23	0.08	0.18	0.36	1.58	2.09	2.09	2.09	15.09	NA	NA	100	Below
Pb	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	53	NA	25	NA
Estimated Start/End Date	03/2006 to 06/2007	06/2007 to 10/2007	12/2006 to 12/2007	7/2005 to 6/2007	06/2005 to 06/2006	08/2005 to 04/2006	12/2005 to 10/2006	02/2006 to 01/2007	01/2007 to 01/2008	01/2006 to 11/2006	05/2006 to 03/2007	06/2006 to 12/2007	07/2005 to 12/2006	04/2005 to 10/2006	04/2006 to 10/2007	04/2007 to 10/2008					

**Note: All values in tons per year unless otherwise noted.
Net change = Project totals / Hillsborough County emissions
NC - Not Calculated
NA - Not Available
YEAR 2005 THROUGH 2007 EMISSIONS WERE ESTIMATED BY TAKING AN APPROPRIATE PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL EMISSIONS DETERMINED ABOVE.
SEE TABLES 4B through 4D BELOW

TABLE 4B
Total Air Emissions for Projects at MacDill AFB - 2005
Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Security Forces Facility

	Security Forces Facility (construction)	Security Forces Facility (demolition)	Primary Care Clinic (construction)	USCENTCOM	Apron Pavements	COMSEC Addition	SF Boathouse	AGE Renovation	Base Support	Housing Maintenance Building	PharmaCare Addition	Trans/Supply Complex	USSOCOM	Military Family Housing - Phase VI	Military Family Housing - Phase VII	Military Family Housing - Phase VIII	Project Totals	Hills Cty Emissions 1997	Net Change	De minimis	Above/Below De minimis
Estimated % of Time During 2005 That Project Would Be Active	0%	0%	0%	50%	58%	42%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	75%	0%	0%					
Pollutants																					
CO	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.76	5.38	0.11	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.52	15.21	0.00	0.00	39.06	19,272	0.20%	100	Below
VOC	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.70	2.38	0.14	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.29	5.81	0.00	0.00	15.39	27,703	0.06%	100	Below
NO _x	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.86	5.86	0.13	0.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.72	18.10	0.00	0.00	44.75	82,563	0.05%	100	Below
SO _x	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.53	0.28	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.48	0.92	0.00	0.00	2.22	NA	NA	100	Below
PM ₁₀	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.85	0.44	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.79	1.57	0.00	0.00	3.67	NA	NA	100	Below
Pb	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	53	NA	25	NA

TABLE 4C
Total Air Emissions for Projects at MacDill AFB - 2006
Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Security Forces Facility

	Security Forces Facility (construction)	Security Forces Facility (demolition)	Primary Care Clinic (construction)	USCENTCOM	Apron Pavements	COMSEC Addition	SF Boathouse	AGE Renovation	Base Support	Housing Maintenance Building	PharmaCare Addition	Trans/Supply Complex	USSOCOM	Military Family Housing - Phase VI	Military Family Housing - Phase VII	Military Family Housing - Phase VIII	Project Totals	Hills Cty Emissions 1997	Net Change	De minimis	Above/Below De minimis
Estimated % of Time During 2006 That Project Would Be Active	66%	0%	8%	100%	42%	25%	75%	92%	0%	83%	67%	58%	100%	83%	75%	0%					
Pollutants																					
CO	3.65	0.00	1.90	19.52	3.90	0.07	0.72	1.58	0.00	0.71	1.43	2.48	17.03	16.83	15.21	0.00	85.03	19,272	0.44%	100	Below
VOC	1.93	0.00	0.71	7.40	1.72	0.09	0.64	1.17	0.00	0.66	0.94	1.39	6.58	6.43	5.81	0.00	35.46	27,703	0.13%	100	Below
NO _x	4.16	0.00	2.25	21.71	4.24	0.08	0.80	1.78	0.00	0.80	1.59	2.74	19.44	20.03	18.10	0.00	97.71	82,563	0.12%	100	Below
SO _x	0.20	0.00	0.11	1.06	0.21	0.01	0.04	0.08	0.00	0.04	0.08	0.13	0.96	1.01	0.92	0.00	4.85	NA	NA	100	Below
PM ₁₀	0.34	0.00	0.19	1.70	0.32	0.01	0.06	0.14	0.00	0.07	0.12	0.21	1.58	1.73	1.57	0.00	8.03	NA	NA	100	Below
Pb	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	53	NA	25	NA

TABLE 4D
Total Air Emissions for Projects at MacDill AFB - 2007
Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Security Forces Facility

	Security Forces Facility (construction)	Security Forces Facility (demolition)	Primary Care Clinic (construction)	USCENTCOM	Apron Pavements	COMSEC Addition	SF Boathouse	AGE Renovation	Base Support	Housing Maintenance Building	PharmaCare Addition	Trans/Supply Complex	USSOCOM	Military Family Housing - Phase VI	Military Family Housing - Phase VII	Military Family Housing - Phase VIII	Project Totals	Hills Cty Emissions 1997	Net Change	De minimis	Above/Below De minimis
Estimated % of Time During 2007 That Project Would Be Active	50%	100%	92%	42%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	4%	16%	92%	0%	0%	83%	75%					
Pollutants																					
CO	2.77	6.32	21.82	8.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.58	0.00	0.34	3.94	0.00	0.00	16.83	15.21	78.01	19,272	0.40%	100	Below
VOC	1.47	2.84	8.17	3.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.70	0.00	0.22	2.20	0.00	0.00	6.43	5.81	31.95	27,703	0.12%	100	Below
NO _x	3.16	7.99	25.82	9.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.88	0.00	0.38	4.34	0.00	0.00	20.03	18.10	91.81	82,563	0.11%	100	Below
SO _x	0.16	0.41	1.30	0.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.00	0.02	0.21	0.00	0.00	1.01	0.92	4.61	NA	NA	100	Below
PM ₁₀	0.26	0.75	2.22	0.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.23	0.00	0.03	0.33	0.00	0.00	1.73	1.57	7.83	NA	NA	100	Below
Pb	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	53	NA	25	NA

APPENDIX E

AGENCY COORDINATION LETTERS AND COMMENTS

**CONSTRUCTION OF SECURITY FORCES FACILITY
MAC DILL AFB, FLORIDA
TABLE 4E - CONSTRUCTION SITE AIR EMISSIONS ESTIMATES
(Combustive Emissions of ROG, NOx, SO2, CO and PM10 Due to Construction)**

Input:

Total Building Area: 32,000 ft²
 Total Paved Area: 100,000 ft²
 Total Disturbed Area: 3.0 acres
 Construction Duration: 1.3 years
 Annual Construction Activity: 260 days/yr

Estimation:

Security Forces Facility @ 132,000 sq.ft.
 Estimated 24,615 sq. ft. in Plan
 (portions assumed to be multi-storied)
 Building Total = 24,615 sq. ft x 1.3 (margins
 of area) = **32,000** sq. ft.
 Pavement Area Estimated at **100,000** sq. ft.
Duration: 1.3 years

Results:[Average per Year Over the Construction Period]

	ROG	NOx	SO2	CO	PM10
Emissions, lb/day	22.52	48.56	2.40	42.58	3.95
Emissions, tons/yr	2.93	6.31	0.31	5.53	0.51

Calculation of Unmitigated Emissions

Summary of Input Parameters

	ROG	NOx	SO2	CO	PM10
Total new acres disturbed:	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Total new acres paved:	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30
Total new building space, ft ² :	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000
Total years:	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25
Area graded, acres in 1 yr:	2.40	2.40	2.40	2.40	2.40
Area paved, acres in 1 yr:	1.84	1.84	1.84	1.84	1.84
Building space, ft ² in 1 yr:	25,600	25,600	25,600	25,600	25,600

Annual Emissions by Source (lbs/day)

	ROG	NOx	SO2	CO	PM10
Grading Equipment	0.6	3.8	0.3	0.8	0.7
Asphalt Paving	0.48	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Stationary Equipment	4.3	3.5	0.2	0.8	0.2
Mobile Equipment	4.1	41.2	1.9	41.0	3.1
Architectural Coatings (Non-Res)	13.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Emissions (lbs/day):	22.52	48.56	2.40	42.58	3.95

Emission Factors

Reference: Air Quality Thresholds of Significance, SMAQMD, 1994.

Source	SMAQMD Emission Factor				
	ROG	NOx	SO2 *	CO *	PM10
Grading Equipment	2.50E-01 lb/acre/day	1.60E+00 lb/acre/day	0.11 lb/acre/day	0.35 lb/acre/day	2.80E-01 lb/acre/day
Asphalt Paving	2.62E-01 lb/acre/day	NA	NA	NA	NA
Stationary Equipment	1.68E-04 lb/day/ft ²	1.37E-04 lb/day/ft ²	9.11E-06 lb/day/ft ²	2.97E-05 lb/day/ft ²	8.00E-06 lb/day/ft ²
Mobile Equipment	1.60E-04 lb/day/ft ²	1.61E-03 lb/day/ft ²	7.48E-05 lb/day/ft ²	0.0016 lb/day/ft ²	1.20E-04 lb/day/ft ²
Architectural Coatings (Non-Res)	8.15E-02 lb/day/ft	NA	NA	NA	NA

* Factors for grading equipment and stationary equipment are calculated from AP-42 for diesel engines using ratios with the NOx factors.
 Factors for mobile equipment are calculated from ratios with Mobile5a 2001 NOx emission factors for heavy duty trucks for each site.

CONSTRUCTION OF SECURITY FORCES FACILITY
TABLE 4E - CONSTRUCTION SITE AIR EMISSIONS ESTIMATES
MACDILL AFB, FLORIDA
TABLE - CONSTRUCTION EMISSION FACTOR

Calculation of PM10 Emissions Due to Site Preparation (Uncontrolled).
Revised 16 June 1997.

User Input Parameters / Assumptions

Acres graded per year:	2.4 acres/yr	
Grading days/yr:	8 days/yr	(From "grading")
Exposed days/yr:	180 days/yr	graded area is exposed
Grading Hours/day:	8 hr/day	
Soil piles area fraction:	0.01	(Fraction of site area covered by soil piles)
Soil percent silt, s:	15 %	
Soil percent moisture, M:	8 %	
Annual rainfall days, H:	107 days/yr	that rainfall exceeds 0.01 inch/day (Tampa, FL)
Wind speed > 12 mph %, I:	12 %	
Fraction of TSP, J:	0.45	(SCAQMD recommendation)
Mean vehicle speed, S:	5 mi/hr	(On-site)
Dozer path width:	5 ft	
Qty construction vehicles:	0 vehicles	
On-site VMT/vehicle/day:	5 mi/veh/day	(Excluding bulldozer VMT during grading)

Emissions Due to Soil Disturbance Activities

Operation Parameters (Calculated from User Inputs)

Grading duration per acre	26.7 hr/acre	
Bulldozer mileage per acre	1.7 VMT/acre	(Miles traveled by bulldozer during grading)
Construction VMT per day	1 VMT/day	
Construction VMT per acre	4.8 VMT/acre	(Travel on unpaved surfaces within site)

Equations Used (Corrected for PM10)

Operation	Empirical Equation	Units	AP-42 Section (4th Edition)
Bulldozing	$0.75(s^{1.5})/(M^{1.4})$	lbs/hr	8.24, Overburden
Grading	$(0.60)(0.051)S^{2.0}$	lbs/VMT	8.24, Overburden
Vehicle Traffic	$(3.72/(M^{4.3}))^{*6}$	lbs/VMT	8.24, Overburden

Source: Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Vol. I, USEPA AP-42.
Section 8.24, Western Surface Coal Mining (4th Edition)

Calculation of PM10 Emission Factors for Each Operation

Operation	Emission Factor (mass/ unit)	Operation Parameter	Emission Factor (lbs/ acre)
Bulldozing	2.37 lbs/hr	26.7 hr/acre	63.3 lbs/acre
Grading	0.77 lbs/VMT	1.7 VMT/acre	1.3 lbs/acre
Vehicle Traffic	0.00 lbs/VMT	4.8 VMT/acre	0 lbs/acre

Emissions Due to Wind Erosion of Soil Piles and Exposed Graded Surface

Reference: CEQA Air Quality Handbook, SCAQMD, April 1993.

Soil Piles EF = $1.7(s/1.5)[(365 - H)/235][(I/15)(J) = (s)(365 - H)(I)(J)/(3110.2941)]$, p. A9-99.

Soil Piles EF = 6.7 lbs/day/acres covered by soil piles

Consider soil piles area fraction so that EF applies to graded area

Soil piles area fraction: 0.01 (Fraction of site area covered by soil piles)

Soil Piles EF = 0.067 lbs/day/acres graded

Graded Surface EF = 26.4 lbs/day/acre (recommended in CEQA Manual, p. A9-93).

Calculation of Annual PM10 Emissions

Source	Emission Factor	Graded Acres/yr	Exposed days/yr	Emissions lbs/yr	Emissions tons/yr
Bulldozing	63.3 lbs/acre	2.40	NA	152	0
Grading	1.3 lbs/acre	2.40	NA	3	0
Vehicle Traffic	0.0 lbs/acre	2.40	NA	0	0
Erosion of Soil Piles	0.1 lbs/acre/day	2.40	180	29	0
Erosion of Graded Surface	26.4 lbs/acre/day	2.40	180	11,405	6
TOTAL				11,589	6

CONSTRUCTION OF SECURITY FORCES FACILITY
TABLE 4E - CONSTRUCTION SITE AIR EMISSIONS ESTIMATES
MACDILL AFB, FLORIDA
TABLE - CONSTRUCTION (GRADING) EMISSIONS

Updated 17 June 1997.

Input Parameters

Construction area: 2 acres/yr
 Qty Equipment: 0

Assumptions.

Terrain is mostly flat.
 Terrain is populated with medium brush; trees are negligible.
 An average of 6" soil is removed during stripping.
 An average of 6" soil is excavated from one half of the site and backfilled to the other half of the site; no soil is hauled off-site or borrowed.
 200 hp bulldozers are used for site clearing.
 300 hp bulldozers are used for stripping, excavation, and backfill.
 Vibratory drum rollers are used for compacting.

Stripping, Excavation, Backfill and Compaction require an average of two passes each.
 Excavation and Backfill are assumed to involve only half of the site.

Calculation of days required for one piece of equipment to grade the specified area.

Reference: Means Heavy Construction Cost Data, 6th Ed., R. S. Means, 1992.

Means Line No.	Operation	Description	Output	Units	Acre/(equip)(day)	(Equip)(day)/acre	Acres/yr	(Equip)(days)/yr
021 108 0550	Site Clearing	Dozer & rake, medium brush	0.6	acre/day	0.6	1.67	2.40	4.00
021 144 0300	Stripping	Topsoil & stockpiling, adverse soil	1,650	cu. yd/day	2.05	0.49	2.40	1.17
022 242 5220	Excavation	Bulk, open site, common earth, 150' haul	800	cu. yd/day	0.99	1.01	1.20	1.21
022 208 5220	Backfill	Structural, common earth, 150' haul	1,950	cu. yd/day	2.42	0.41	1.20	0.50
022 226 5020	Compaction	Vibrating roller, 6 " lifts, 3 passes	1,950	cu. yd/day	2.42	0.41	2.40	0.99
TOTAL								7.87

Calculation of days required for the indicated pieces of equipment to grade the designated acreage.

(Equip)(day)/yr: 7.87
 Qty Equipment: 0
 Grading days/yr: 7.87

Round to	8 grading days/yr
----------	-------------------

DEMOLITION OF BUILDING 528

MAC DILL AFB, FLORIDA

**TABLE 4E - DEMOLITION SITE AIR EMISSIONS ESTIMATES (BUILDING 528 AND PARKING AREAS NO. 1 THROUGH NO. 4)
(Combustive Emissions of ROG, NOx, SO2, CO and PM10 Due to Demolition)**

Input:

Total Building Area: 20,000 ft²
 Total Paved Area: 215,000 ft²
 Total Disturbed Area: 5.4 acres
 Construction Duration: 0.3 years
 Annual Construction Activity: 110 days/yr

Estimation:

Total area to be demolished @235,000 sq.ft.
 Estimated 15,385 sq. ft. in Plan
 (portions assumed to be multi-storied)
 Building Total = + / - 15,385 sq. ft.
 x 1.3 (margins of area) = 20,000 sq. ft.
 Pavement Area Estimated at 215,000 sq. ft.
 Duration: 0.3 years

Results:[Average per Year Over the Construction Period]

	ROG	NOx	SO2	CO	PM10
Emissions, lb/day	51.72	145.27	7.51	114.94	13.57
Emissions, tons/yr	2.84	7.99	0.41	6.32	0.75

Calculation of Unmitigated Emissions

Summary of Input Parameters

	ROG	NOx	SO2	CO	PM10
Total new acres disturbed:	5.40	5.40	5.40	5.40	5.40
Total new acres paved:	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94
Total new building space, ft ² :	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Total years:	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30
Area graded, acres in 1 yr:	18.00	18.00	18.00	18.00	18.00
Area paved, acres in 1 yr:	16.45	16.45	16.45	16.45	16.45
Building space, ft ² in 1 yr:	66,667	66,667	66,667	66,667	66,667

Annual Emissions by Source (lbs/day)

	ROG	NOx	SO2	CO	PM10
Grading Equipment	4.5	28.8	1.9	6.2	5.0
Asphalt Paving	4.31	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Stationary Equipment	11.2	9.1	0.6	2.0	0.5
Mobile Equipment	10.7	107.3	5.0	106.7	8.0
Architectural Coatings (Non-Res)	21.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Emissions (lbs/day):	51.72	145.27	7.51	114.94	13.57

Emission Factors

Reference: Air Quality Thresholds of Significance, SMAQMD, 1994.

Source	SMAQMD Emission Factor				
	ROG	NOx	SO2 *	CO *	PM10
Grading Equipment	2.50E-01 lb/acre/day	1.60E+00 lb/acre/day	0.11 lb/acre/day	0.35 lb/acre/day	2.80E-01 lb/acre/day
Asphalt Paving	2.62E-01 lb/acre/day	NA	NA	NA	NA
Stationary Equipment	1.68E-04 lb/day/ft ²	1.37E-04 lb/day/ft ²	9.11E-06 lb/day/ft ²	2.97E-05 lb/day/ft ²	8.00E-06 lb/day/ft ²
Mobile Equipment	1.60E-04 lb/day/ft ²	1.61E-03 lb/day/ft ²	7.48E-05 lb/day/ft ²	0.0016 lb/day/ft ²	1.20E-04 lb/day/ft ²
Architectural Coatings (Non-Res)	8.15E-02 lb/day/ft	NA	NA	NA	NA

* Factors for grading equipment and stationary equipment are calculated from AP-42 for diesel engines using ratios with the NOx factors.
Factors for mobile equipment are calculated from ratios with Mobile5a 2001 NOx emission factors for heavy duty trucks for each site.

DEMOLITION OF BUILDING 528
TABLE 4E - DEMOLITION SITE AIR EMISSIONS ESTIMATES (BUILDING 528 AND PARKING AREAS NO. 1 THROUGH NO. 4)
MACDILL AFB, FLORIDA
TABLE - CONSTRUCTION EMISSION FACTOR

Calculation of PM10 Emissions Due to Site Preparation (Uncontrolled).
Revised 16 June 1997.

User Input Parameters / Assumptions

Acres graded per year:	18.0	acres/yr	
Grading days/yr:	59	days/yr	(From "grading")
Exposed days/yr:	180	days/yr	graded area is exposed
Grading Hours/day:	8	hr/day	
Soil piles area fraction:	0.01		(Fraction of site area covered by soil piles)
Soil percent silt, s:	15	%	
Soil percent moisture, M:	8	%	
Annual rainfall days, H:	107	days/yr	that rainfall exceeds 0.01 inch/day (Tampa, FL)
Wind speed > 12 mph %, I:	12	%	
Fraction of TSP, J:	0.45		(SCAQMD recommendation)
Mean vehicle speed, S:	5	mi/hr	(On-site)
Dozer path width:	5	ft	
Qty construction vehicles:	2	vehicles	
On-site VMT/vehicle/day:	5	mi/veh/day	(Excluding bulldozer VMT during grading)

Emissions Due to Soil Disturbance Activities

Operation Parameters (Calculated from User Inputs)

Grading duration per acre	26.2	hr/acre	
Bulldozer mileage per acre	1.7	VMT/acre	(Miles traveled by bulldozer during grading)
Construction VMT per day	11	VMT/day	
Construction VMT per acre	35.4	VMT/acre	(Travel on unpaved surfaces within site)

Equations Used (Corrected for PM10)

Operation	Empirical Equation	Units	AP-42 Section (4th Edition)
Bulldozing	$0.75(s^{1.5})/(M^{1.4})$	lbs/hr	8.24, Overburden
Grading	$(0.60)(0.051)S^{2.0}$	lbs/VMT	8.24, Overburden
Vehicle Traffic	$(3.72/(M^{4.3}))^{*}.6$	lbs/VMT	8.24, Overburden

Source: Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Vol. I, USEPA AP-42.
Section 8.24, Western Surface Coal Mining (4th Edition)

Calculation of PM10 Emission Factors for Each Operation

Operation	Emission Factor (mass/ unit)	Operation Parameter	Emission Factor (lbs/ acre)
Bulldozing	2.37 lbs/hr	26.2 hr/acre	62.1 lbs/acre
Grading	0.77 lbs/VMT	1.7 VMT/acre	1.3 lbs/acre
Vehicle Traffic	0.00 lbs/VMT	35.4 VMT/acre	0 lbs/acre

Emissions Due to Wind Erosion of Soil Piles and Exposed Graded Surface

Reference: CEQA Air Quality Handbook, SCAQMD, April 1993.

Soil Piles EF = $1.7(s/1.5)[(365 - H)/235](I/15)(J) = (s)(365 - H)(I)(J)/(3110.2941)$, p. A9-99.

Soil Piles EF = 6.7 lbs/day/acres covered by soil piles

Consider soil piles area fraction so that EF applies to graded area

Soil piles area fraction: 0.01 (Fraction of site area covered by soil piles)

Soil Piles EF = 0.067 lbs/day/acres graded

Graded Surface EF = 26.4 lbs/day/acre (recommended in CEQA Manual, p. A9-93).

Calculation of Annual PM10 Emissions

Source	Emission Factor	Graded Acres/yr	Exposed days/yr	Emissions lbs/yr	Emissions tons/yr
Bulldozing	62.1 lbs/acre	18.00	NA	1,118	1
Grading	1.3 lbs/acre	18.00	NA	23	0
Vehicle Traffic	0.0 lbs/acre	18.00	NA	0	0
Erosion of Soil Piles	0.1 lbs/acre/day	18.00	180	217	0
Erosion of Graded Surface	26.4 lbs/acre/day	18.00	180	85,536	43
TOTAL				86,894	43

DEMOLITION OF BUILDING 528

**TABLE 4E - DEMOLITION SITE AIR EMISSIONS ESTIMATES (BUILDING 528 AND PARKING AREAS NO. 1 THROUGH NO. 4)
MACDILL AFB, FLORIDA**

TABLE - CONSTRUCTION (GRADING) EMISSIONS

Estimate of time required to grade a specified area.
Updated 17 June 1997.

Input Parameters

Construction area: 18 acres/yr
Qty Equipment: 2

Assumptions.

Terrain is mostly flat.
Terrain is populated with medium brush; trees are negligible.
An average of 6" soil is removed during stripping.
An average of 6" soil is excavated from one half of the site and backfilled to the other half of the site; no soil is hauled off-site or borrowed.
200 hp bulldozers are used for site clearing.
300 hp bulldozers are used for stripping, excavation, and backfill.
Vibratory drum rollers are used for compacting.

Stripping, Excavation, Backfill and Compaction require
an average of two passes each.
Excavation and Backfill are assumed to involve only half of the site.

Calculation of days required for one piece of equipment to grade the specified area.

Reference: Means Heavy Construction Cost Data, 6th Ed., R. S. Means, 1992.

Means Line No.	Operation	Description	Output	Units	Acre/(equip)(day)	(Equip)(day)/acre	Acres/yr	(Equip)(days)/yr
021 108 0550	Site Clearing	Dozer & rake, medium brush	0.6	acre/day	0.6	1.67	18.00	30.00
021 144 0300	Stripping	Topsoil & stockpiling, adverse soil	1,650	cu. yd/day	2.05	0.49	18.00	8.80
022 242 5220	Excavation	Bulk, open site, common earth, 150' haul	800	cu. yd/day	0.99	1.01	9.00	9.08
022 208 5220	Backfill	Structural, common earth, 150' haul	1,950	cu. yd/day	2.42	0.41	9.00	3.72
022 226 5020	Compaction	Vibrating roller, 6 " lifts, 3 passes	1,950	cu. yd/day	2.42	0.41	18.00	7.45
TOTAL								59.04

Calculation of days required for the indicated pieces of equipment to grade the designated acreage.

(Equip)(day)/yr: 59.04
Qty Equipment: 2
Grading days/yr: 59.04

Round to	59 grading days/yr
----------	--------------------

THE TAMPA TRIBUNE

Published Daily

Tampa, Hillsborough County, Florida

State of Florida }
County of Hillsborough } ss.

Before the undersigned authority personally appeared C. Pugh, who on oath says that she is the Advertising Billing Supervisor of The Tampa Tribune, a daily newspaper published at Tampa in Hillsborough County, Florida; that the attached copy of advertisement being a

LEGAL NOTICE

in the matter of **PUBLIC NOTICE**
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE


was published in said newspaper in the issues of
FEBRUARY 6, 2005

Affiant further says that the said The Tampa Tribune is a newspaper published at Tampa in said Hillsborough County, Florida, and that the said newspaper has heretofore been continuously published in said Hillsborough County, Florida, each day and has been entered as second class mail matter at the post office in Tampa, in said Hillsborough County, Florida for a period of one year next preceding the first publication of the attached copy of advertisement; and affiant further says that she has neither paid nor promised any person, this advertisement for publication in the said newspaper.

Sworn to and subscribed by me, this 08 day
of FEBRUARY, A.D. 20 05

Personally Known ☒ or Produced Identification _____
Type of Identification Produced _____

Susie Lee Slaton



**PUBLIC NOTICE
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE**

MacDill Air Force Base is inviting public review and comment on the Draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)/Finding of No Practical Alternative (FONPA) and the supporting Environmental Assessment (EA). The project is entitled Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528. The proposed action calls for construction of a new Security Forces (SF) Facility that would consolidate SF services. As their operation has expanded in recent years, the SF organization has outgrown their existing makeshift facility forcing some operational units to relocated to other available facilities throughout the base. The scattered operational units have an adverse effect on command and control for the SF organization. Construction of a new SF Facility would provide a state of the art facility and allow the consolidation of the operational units to improve command and control and meet the manning and operational needs of the SF organization. The proposed action also includes the demolition of the existing SF Facility (Building 528) and all of its associated parking, pavement, and curbed areas.

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY

The document is part of the Air Force environmental impact analysis process to satisfy requirements under the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA). The FONSI/FONPA and supporting EA draft is available for public review and comment beginning February 10, 2005 at the John F. Germany Library, located at 900 N. Ashley Drive, Tampa, FL 33606. The documents may be found in the Humanities Section of the Main Library. The comment period will close on March 11, 2005. Address written comments to the 6 AMW Public Affairs, 8209 Hangar Loop Drive, Suite 14, MacDill AFB, FL 33621-5502. The telephone number is (813) 828-2215.



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Glenda E. Hood

Secretary of State

DIVISION OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

Mr. Jason Kirkpatrick
Department of the Air Force
6 CES/CEVN
7621 Hillsborough Loop Drive
MacDill AFB, Florida 33621-5207

February 25, 2005

RE: DHR Project File Number: 2005-1108
Received by DHR February 7, 2005
Draft Environmental Assessment for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528 and Finding of No Significant Impact and Finding of No Practicable Alternative – Project No. 79524
MacDill Air Force Base, Hillsborough County

Dear Mr. Kirkpatrick:

Our office received and reviewed the above referenced project in accordance with Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act of 1966*, as amended and *36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties* and the *National Environmental Policy Act of 1969*, as amended. The State Historic Preservation Officer is to advise Federal agencies as they identify historic properties (listed or eligible for listing in the *National Register of Historic Places*), assess effects upon them, and consider alternatives to avoid or minimize adverse effects.

We have reviewed sections 3.12 and 4.1.13, both dealing with Cultural Resources. Based on the information provided, this office concurs with the finding that the proposed undertaking will have no adverse effect on the MacDill Field Historic District.

If you have any questions concerning our comments, please contact Scott Edwards, Historic Preservationist, by electronic mail sedwards@dos.state.fl.us, or at 850-245-6333 or 800-847-7278.

Sincerely,

Laura A. Kanner, Deputy SHPO

Frederick Gaske, Director, and
State Historic Preservation Officer

XC: Kathy Garvin, Earth Tech

500 S. Bronough Street • Tallahassee, FL 32399-0250 • <http://www.flheritage.com>

☐ Director's Office
(850) 245-6300 • FAX: 245-6436

☐ Archaeological Research
(850) 245-6444 • FAX: 245-6436

☒ Historic Preservation
(850) 245-6333 • FAX: 245-6437

☐ Historical Museums
(850) 245-6400 • FAX: 245-6433

☐ Southeast Regional Office
(954) 467-4990 • FAX: 467-4991

☐ Northeast Regional Office
(904) 825-5045 • FAX: 825-5044

☐ Central Florida Regional Office
(813) 272-3843 • FAX: 272-2340



PWS Log No. 01-2063

The proposed action is not likely to adversely affect resources protected by the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) This finding fulfills the requirements of the Act.

February 1, 2005

Stephen L. Hinkle
David L. Hinkle
Field Supervisor

7/20/05
Date

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Attn: Brian Pridgen
9549 Koger Blvd. Suite 111
St. Petersburg, FL 33702

Subject: Draft *Environmental Assessment for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida and Finding of No Significant Impact and Finding of No Practicable Alternative* Project No. 79524

Dear Mr. Pridgen:

MacDill Air Force Base is pleased to submit this Draft *Environmental Assessment (EA) for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and the associated *Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA)* documents. This Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA are being submitted to you for your review.

We request that you provide us with any comments, edits, or changes to this Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA by March 11, 2005, at which time we will modify the EA and FONSI/FONPA based on any comments received to produce the Final. Please send any comments, edits, or changes you may have, along with a letter stating that you have reviewed the enclosed documents to:

Mr. Jason Kirkpatrick
6 CES/CEVN
7621 Hillsborough Loop Dr.
MacDill AFB, FL 33621-5207

If you have any questions or concerns about this submittal, please call Jason Kirkpatrick at (813) 828-0459.

Best Regards,

Kathy Garvin

Enclosures

c: Jason Kirkpatrick, 6 CES/CEVN; Master File 79524



Jeb Bush
Governor

Department of Environmental Protection

Marjory Stoneman Douglas Building
3900 Commonwealth Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3000

Colleen M. Castille
Secretary

March 22, 2005

Mr. Jason W. Kirkpatrick
Conservation Program Manager
6 CES/CEVN
2610 Pink Flamingo Ave.
MacDill AFB, FL 33621

RE: Department of the Air Force – Draft Environmental Assessment for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base – Hillsborough County, Florida.
SAI # FL200502210485C

Dear Mr. Kirkpatrick:

The Florida State Clearinghouse, pursuant to Presidential Executive Order 12372, Gubernatorial Executive Order 95-359, the Coastal Zone Management Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1451-1464, as amended, and the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321, 4331-4335, 4341-4347, as amended, has coordinated a review of the referenced draft environmental assessment (EA).

The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), Division of Waste Management notes that the proposed work area includes several Oil/Water Separator sites, Site 32 (closed), Site 56 (undergoing remediation) and SWMU 61, a groundwater solvent plume site. DEP staff offers the following comments:

1. Please ensure that the locations of Sites 32, 56 and former Site 55 are surveyed in to known benchmarks or that high precision GPS coordinates are obtained. Location data should be preserved and made available as needed for our records or for assessment/remediation, as appropriate.
2. Since the construction area(s) are located on contaminated or closed contaminated sites, please be advised that access and soil and/or groundwater sampling activities may be required in the future.
3. Buildings constructed over groundwater areas with volatile organic compound (VOC) contamination risk possible indoor air quality degradation as a result of contaminant volatilization and upward migration through foundation materials. This is especially true

Mr. Jason W. Kirkpatrick
March 22, 2005
Page 2 of 2

with the SWMU 61 groundwater plume (page 90). Measures to prevent air quality degradation should be considered when designing new or renovated facilities in this area.

4. When construction over the subject contaminated sites occurs, please continue to coordinate with Mr. Richard Burnette in the MacDill Air Force Base Environmental Office.

For further information, please contact Mr. James Cason, Professional Geologist, DEP Bureau of Waste Cleanup at (850) 245-8999.

Based on the information contained in the draft EA and comments provided by our reviewing agencies, the state has determined that, at this stage, the proposed activity is consistent with the Florida Coastal Management Program (FCMP). The applicant must, however, address the concerns identified by DEP staff prior to project implementation. The state's continued concurrence with the project will be based, in part, on the adequate resolution of issues identified during this and subsequent reviews. The state's final concurrence of the project's consistency with the FCMP will be determined during the environmental permitting stage.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Ms. Lauren P. Milligan at (850) 245-2163.

Sincerely,



Sally B. Mann, Director
Office of Intergovernmental Programs

SBM/lm

Enclosures


cc: James Cason, DEP, DWM



Florida

Department of Environmental Protection

"More Protection, Less Process"




Categories

[DEP Home](#) | [OIP Home](#) | [Contact DEP](#) | [Search](#) | [DEP Site Map](#)

Project Information	
Project:	FL200502210485C
Comments Due:	March 20, 2005
Letter Due:	April 04, 2005
Description:	DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SECURITY FORCES FACILITY/DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDING 528, MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE - HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA.
Keywords:	USAF - CONSTRUCTION OF SECURITY FORCES FACILITY - MACDILL AFB, HILLSBOROUGH CO.
CFDA #:	12.200
Agency Comments:	
COMMUNITY AFFAIRS - FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS	
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION - FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	
<p>The DEP Division of Waste Management notes that the proposed work area includes several Oil/Water Separator sites, Site 32 (closed), Site 56 (undergoing remediation) and SWMU 61, a groundwater solvent plume site. DEP staff offers the following comments: 1. Please ensure that the locations of Sites 32, 56 and former Site 55 are surveyed in to known benchmarks or that high precision GPS coordinates are obtained. Location data should be preserved and made available as needed for our records or for assessment/remediation, as appropriate. 2. Since the construction area(s) are on contaminated or closed contaminated sites, please be advised that access and soil and/or groundwater sampling activities may be required in the future. 3. Buildings constructed over groundwater areas with volatile organic compound (VOC) contamination risk possible indoor air quality degradation as a result of contaminant volatilization and upward migration through foundation materials. This is especially true with the SWMU 61 groundwater plume (page 90). Measures to prevent air quality degradation should be considered when designing new or renovated facilities in this area. 4. When construction over the subject contaminated sites occurs, please continue to coordinate with Mr. Richard Burnette in the MacDill Air Force Base Environmental Office. For further information, please contact Mr. James Cason, Professional Geologist, DEP Bureau of Waste Cleanup at (850) 245-8999.</p>	
STATE - FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE	
No comment/Consistent	
SOUTHWEST FLORIDA WMD - SOUTHWEST FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT	
No Comment	
ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY UNIT - OFFICE OF POLICY AND BUDGET, ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY UNIT	
No Comment	
TAMPA BAY RPC - TAMPA BAY REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL	
<p>The TBRPC does not find the proposal to be regionally significant. The project is considered to have met the local requirements of the Intergovernmental Coordination and Review process and no further review by the TBRPC will be required.</p>	
HILLSBOROUGH - HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY	

For more information please contact the Clearinghouse Office at:

3900 COMMONWEALTH BOULEVARD MS-47
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-3000
TELEPHONE: (850) 245-2161
FAX: (850) 245-2190



Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council

Chair
Commissioner Jane von Halpmann

Vice-Chair
Robert Kersteen

Secretary/Treasurer
Jill Collins

Executive Director
Manny Pumariega

March 2, 2005

MacDill Air Force Base
6 CES/CEQ
7621 Hillsborough Loop Drive (Bldg. 30)
MacDill Air Force Base, FL 33621
POC: Richard Burnette

RECEIVED

MAR 04 2005

OIP / OLGA

*Subject: IC&R #076-05, MacDill Air Force Base Renovation Environmental Assessment,
FSC SAI #FL200502210485C, City of Tampa*

Dear Mr. Burnette:

The Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council recently received a copy of your environmental assessment request from the Florida State Clearinghouse for processing under provisions of the Intergovernmental Coordination and Review program.

The renovation involves the construction of a new Security Forces (SF) Facility and associated demolition of the existing SF Facility (building 528) at MacDill AFB.

While our agency **does not** find the proposal to be regionally significant, all member local governments of the TBRPC's Clearinghouse Review Committee and/or full policy board will be notified of the application. You will be contacted if any local concerns are identified.

In accordance with the State's delegated IC&R review requirements, this project is considered to have met the local requirements of the IC&R process and no further review will be required by our Agency. This letter constitutes compliance with IC&R only and does not preclude the applicant from complying with *other* applicable requirements or regulations.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me (ext. 29).

Sincerely,

John M. Meyer
IC&R Coordinator

cc: Ms. Lauren Millgan, FSC

4000 Gateway Centre Boulevard, Suite 100 • Pinellas Park, FL 33782

Phone: 727-570-5151 • Fax: 727-570-5118 • State Number: 513-5066 • www.tbrpc.org

2004 Government Organization of the Year — Tampa Bay Business Journal

COUNTY: HILLSBOROUGH

SCH - USAF - MD
2005 - 1721

DATE: 2/18/2005

COMMENTS DUE DATE: 3/20/2005

CLEARANCE DUE DATE: 4/4/2005

SAI#: FL200502210485C

MESSAGE:

STATE AGENCIES	WATER MNGMNT. DISTRICTS	OPB POLICY UNIT	RPCS & LOC GOVS
COMMUNITY AFFAIRS	SOUTHWEST FLORIDA WMD	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY UNIT	
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION			
X STATE			

The attached document requires a Coastal Zone Management Act/Florida Coastal Management Program consistency evaluation and is categorized as one of the following:

Federal Assistance to State or Local Government (15 CFR 930, Subpart F). Agencies are required to evaluate the consistency of the activity.

X Direct Federal Activity (15 CFR 930, Subpart C). Federal Agencies are required to furnish a consistency determination for the State's concurrence or objection.

Outer Continental Shelf Exploration, Development or Production Activities (15 CFR 930, Subpart E). Operators are required to provide a consistency certification for state concurrence/objection.

Federal Licensing or Permitting Activity (15 CFR 930, Subpart D). Such projects will only be evaluated for consistency when there is not an analogous state license or permit.

Project Description:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SECURITY FORCES FACILITY/DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDING 528, MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE - HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA.

To: Florida State Clearinghouse

AGENCY CONTACT AND COORDINATOR (SCH)
3900 COMMONWEALTH BOULEVARD MS-47
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-3000
TELEPHONE: (850) 245-2161
FAX: (850) 245-2190

EO. 12372/NEPA Federal Consistency

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Comment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Comment/Consistent
<input type="checkbox"/> Comment Attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistent/Comments Attached
<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Inconsistent/Comments Attached
	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable

From:

Division of Historical Resources
Division/Bureau: Bureau of Historic Preservation

Reviewer: S. Edwards

Date: 2-24-05

NAB / X: 5-151

Laura L. Kammerer, Deputy SHPO
2.25.2005

RECEIVED
BUREAU OF
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
FEB 27 2 3:56 PM '05

Garvin, Kathleen

From: Kirkpatrick Jason W Contr 6 CES/CEVH [Jason.Kirkpatrick@macdill.af.mil]
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2005 3:19 PM
To: Burnette Richard G GS-12 6 CES/CEQ; Garvin, Kathleen
Subject: RE: Demolition/Construction of Security Forces Facility at Building 528, MacDill AFB

Richard;

Thanks. Do you have any problem with construction on the site(s)? Do you think there is a chance that yall will have to do work under the building some day?

Kathy;

Please make sure a copy of these comments is included in the 'correspondence' section of the Final EA. We should also mention the DEP's concerns regarding indoor air quality for buildings constructed on gw plumes. Discuss it briefly in the air section.

JasonK

-----Original Message-----

From: Burnette Richard G GS-12 6 CES/CEQ
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2005 11:12 AM
To: Kirkpatrick Jason W Contr 6 CES/CEVH
Subject: FW: Demolition/Construction of Security Forces Facility at Building 528, MacDill AFB

These are Jim Cason's comments on the EA.
Richard

-----Original Message-----

From: Cason, James [mailto:James.Cason@dep.state.fl.us]
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2005 11:19 AM
To: Milligan, Lauren
Cc: Crane, Jim; Nuzie, Eric; Burnette Richard G GS-12 6 CES/CEQ
Subject: Demolition/Construction of Security Forces Facility at Building 528, MacDill AFB

Ms. Milligan:

I have reviewed the above document (CD ROM) per your request of March 16, 2005. The proposed work area includes Several Oil/Water Separator sites, Site 32 (closed), Site 56 undergoing remediation) and SWMU 61, a groundwater solvent plume site. I offer the following comments:

1. Please ensure that the locations of Sites 32, 56 and former Site 55 are surveyed in to known benchmarks or that high precision GPS coordinates are obtained since the locations need to be preserved and be available as needed for our records or for assessment/remediation, as appropriate.
2. Since the area(s) of construction are on contaminated or closed contaminated sites, the Air Force should know that access and possibly sampling activities for the soil and/or groundwater may be required in the future.
3. The Air Force should is reminded that buildings constructed over groundwater areas with volatile organic compound (VOC) contamination risk possible indoor air quality degradation as a result of contaminant volatilization and upward migration through foundation materials. This

is especially true with the SWMU 61 groundwater plume (page 90). This possibility should be considered.

4. When construction over the above contaminated sites occurs, please stay in contact with the MacDill Environmental Office/Richard Burnette.

Other than these comments, I have no other substantial comment. If you need anything further, please contact me at 245-8999.

Do you want the CD ROM back?

Garvin, Kathleen

From: NMFS HCDPC [NMFS.HCDPC@noaa.gov]
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2005 12:04 PM
To: Kirkpatrick Jason W Contr 6 CES/CEVH
Cc: Sramek Mark
Subject: MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE SECURITY FORCES FACILITY 79524

NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Habitat Conservation Division, has reviewed your office's Draft Environmental Assessment (EA), Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), and Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA) document, dated February 1, 2005, for the Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528 located on MacDill Air Force Base (AFB) in Hillsborough County, Florida. The proposed action would replace existing substandard security facilities with a consolidated, modern facility on MacDill AFB.

Based upon our review of the information provided, NOAA trust resources which occur within the project area have been adequately identified in the Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA. Owing to the locations of the demolition and proposed construction activities, and subsequent operation of the security facilities, adverse impacts to NOAA trust resources would not occur through completion of the project. NMFS concurs with the findings which are outlined by MacDill AFB in the Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA.

If you have questions with regard to our evaluation of the Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA, please contact Mark Sramek in our St. Petersburg, Florida office. Mr. Sramek may be reached at the letterhead address or by calling (727) 570-5311.

Garvin, Kathleen

From: Kirkpatrick Jason W Contr 6 CES/CEVH
Sent: Tuesday, January 04, 2005 8:43 AM
To: Garvin, Kathleen
Subject: FW: Security Forces Complex EA - PreDraft Review

Kathy; Please insert this e-mail in the 'correspondence' section of the DRAFT EA. Thanks.

Jason K

From: Jackson Jason R GS-12 6 AMW/SE
Sent: Monday, January 03, 2005 11:00 AM
To: Kirkpatrick Jason W Contr 6 CES/CEVH
Subject: RE: Security Forces Complex EA - PreDraft Review

Jason,

I have reviewed the EA for the new SFS complex and I do not have any changes or comments.

//SIGNED//

JASON R. JACKSON
Ground/Weapons Safety Manager
6 AMW/SEG
DSN 968-3385

From: Kirkpatrick Jason W Contr 6 CES/CEVH
Sent: Monday, December 20, 2004 1:23 PM
To: Green Diane M GS-09 6 AMW/PA; Klein Wendy E Maj 6 AMDS/SGPB; Jackson Jason R GS-12 6 AMW/SE; Jones Robert A Civ 6 AMW/JA
Subject: Security Forces Complex EA - PreDraft Review

Dear EIAP participants;

Please find attached a copy of the Preliminary Draft of the Construct Security Forces Complex EA. Your organizations are instrumental in implementing an effective Environmental Impact Analysis Process and, as such your review of the attached document is very important. I would like to incorporate any base comments on this document prior to going public.

Please review the attached document paying particular attention to Section 2 and Section 4 and provide any comments you might have by January 7th, 2004. If you have no comments, please shoot me an e-mail stating that so my records show your organization has participated. Sorry for the short timeline during the holidays but it is necessary. If you can't get comments back by the 7th, please send them along when you can, I'll incorporate them in the Draft.

If you would like a hard copy of the report (with all the appendices, etc), please let me know, I'll deliver. (Bob, I'll bring you a hard copy)

Jason K

<< File: SF Facility PreDraft EA.doc >> << File: total_SF_PreDraft.xls >> << File: ENV_CON_FIG2-3.pdf >> << File: ENV_CON_FIG3-1.pdf >>

6/29/2005

Jason Kirkpatrick, 6 CES/CEVN
Conservation Program Manager
2610 Pink Flamingo Avenue
MacDill AFB, FL 33621

(813) 828-0459
(813) 828-2212 FAX

Garvin, Kathleen

From: Kirkpatrick Jason W Contr 6 CES/CEVH
Sent: Thursday, December 23, 2004 11:06 AM
To: Garvin, Kathleen
Subject: FW: Security Forces Complex EA - PreDraft Review2

Kathleen, please include this e-mail in the correspondence section in the Draft EA. Thanks.

Jason K

From: Hale Alan C Capt 6 AMDS/SGPB
Sent: Tuesday, December 21, 2004 11:33 AM
To: Kirkpatrick Jason W Contr 6 CES/CEVH
Subject: FW: Security Forces Complex EA - PreDraft Review

Jason,

Looks good from the bio viewpoint—no comments,

Alan

//SIGNED//

ALAN C. HALE, Capt, USAF, BSC
Bioenvironmental Engineer, MacDill AFB
telephone 813.827.9575 (DSN 651.9575)
facsimile 813.828.6889 (DSN 968.6889)

-----Original Message-----

From: Klein Wendy E Maj 6 AMDS/SGPB
Sent: Monday, December 20, 2004 2:15 PM
To: Hale Alan C Capt 6 AMDS/SGPB
Subject: FW: Security Forces Complex EA - PreDraft Review

Alan- Please review/provide comments. I'll get with you today to provide guidance.

Very Respectfully,
WENDY E. KLEIN, Maj, USAF, BSC, CIH
Bioenvironmental Engineering Flight Commander
6 AMDS/SGPB, 2123 Emergency Drive, MacDill AFB, FL 33621
E-mail: wendy.klein2@macdill.af.mil
PHONE (813)827-9581/9570 (DSN 651)
FAX (813)828-6889 (DSN 968)

-----Original Message-----

From: Kirkpatrick Jason W Contr 6 CES/CEVH
Sent: Monday, December 20, 2004 1:23 PM
To: Green Diane M GS-09 6 AMW/PA; Klein Wendy E Maj 6 AMDS/SGPB; Jackson Jason R GS-12 6 AMW/SE; Jones Robert A Civ 6 AMW/JA
Subject: Security Forces Complex EA - PreDraft Review

Dear EIAP participants;

6/29/2005

Please find attached a copy of the Preliminary Draft of the Construct Security Forces Complex EA. Your organizations are instrumental in implementing an effective Environmental Impact Analysis Process and, as such your review of the attached document is very important. I would like to incorporate any base comments on this document prior to going public.

Please review the attached document paying particular attention to Section 2 and Section 4 and provide any comments you might have by January 7th, 2004. If you have no comments, please shoot me an e-mail stating that so my records show your organization has participated. Sorry for the short timeline during the holidays but it is necessary. If you can't get comments back by the 7th, please send them along when you can, I'll incorporate them in the Draft.

If you would like a hard copy of the report (with all the appendices, etc), please let me know, I'll deliver. (Bob, I'll bring you a hard copy)

Jason K

<<ENV_CON_FIG2-3.pdf>> <<ENV_CON_FIG3-1.pdf>> <<SF Facility PreDraft EA.doc>> <<total_SF_PreDraft.xls>>

Jason Kirkpatrick, 6 CES/CEVN

Conservation Program Manager

2610 Pink Flamingo Avenue

MacDill AFB, FL 33621

(813) 828-0459

(813) 828-2212 FAX



**DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
6TH AIR MOBILITY WING (AMC)
MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA**

MEMORANDUM FOR U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

FROM: 6 CES/CD
7621 Hillsborough Loop Drive
MacDill AFB Florida 33621-5207

SUBJECT: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Coordination on Construction/Demolition of
Security Forces Facility at MacDill Air Force Base (AFB)

1. The U.S. Air Force intends to construct a new Security Forces (SF) Facility. The Proposed Action includes the construction of an approximately 31,753 square foot (in plan) two-story building with associated site utilities, parking, grading, landscaping and other required support. This project is currently scheduled to begin in March 2006 within a developed area of the base that is designated as industrial land use. The proposed construction/demolition site is located east of South Boundary Boulevard, along Bayshore Boulevard on MacDill AFB. An aerial map of the area (Figure 1) and a facility layout drawing (Figure 2) are attached for your reference.
2. The Proposed Action also includes the demolition of the existing SF Facility (Building 528) located approximately 1,200 feet north of the area proposed for construction. Building 528 is a 47-year old commissary building that was renovated in 1995 to accommodate an increase in personnel assigned to the SF squadron. In addition to Building 528, associated parking lots, curbing, and sidewalks currently used at the site would be demolished as part of the Proposed Action. A photograph of Building 528 (Photograph 1) is attached.
3. Any trees and shrubbery in the area of the new SF Facility would be removed as well. Utilities, including sanitary sewer pipe, water lines, and storm sewer lines, would be abandoned or removed as necessary. The storm water drainage swale that transverses the middle of the site which is currently being improved as part of another project (Photograph 2), is classified as a wetland and would be relocated to the western boundary of the site under the Proposed Action.
4. A representative from the MacDill AFB Natural Resources staff surveyed the construction/demolition site to determine if any threatened or endangered species would be affected. The site has not been identified as critical habitat for any threatened or endangered species. Consequently, MacDill AFB believes that the Proposed Action would not adversely impact threatened or endangered species. If the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service agrees with this assessment, please document your concurrence by signing where indicated below. If you would like to inspect the proposed construction/demolition site, please contact the MacDill AFB Natural Resources staff.

5. If you have any questions or require additional information on the Proposed Action, please contact Mr. Jason Kirkpatrick at (813) 828-0459.

KENNETH E. DOMAKO, GS-13
Deputy Base Civil Engineer

Attachment:

Figure 1: Aerial Map showing Proposed Construction/Demolition of Security Forces Facility at MacDill AFB

Figure 2: Security Forces Facility Layout

Photograph 1: Main Entrance to SF Facility (Building 528), MacDill Air Force Base, Florida

Photograph 2: Proposed Area of Construction

MEMORANDUM FOR 6 CES/CD

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service concurs with MacDill Air Force Base's finding that the Proposed Action, construction of a new Security Forces facility and demolition of the existing Security Forces facility (Building 528), would not adversely impact threatened or endangered species on MacDill Air Force Base.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Representative

Date



Photograph 1

Main Entrance to SF Facility (Building 528), MacDill Air Force Base, Florida



Photograph 2

Proposed Area of Construction

(Note – Ditch construction shown in photo is not part of the SF Complex project)



**DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
6TH AIR MOBILITY WING (AMC)
MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA**

MEMORANDUM FOR DIVISION OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

FROM: 6 CES/CD

7621 Hillsborough Loop Drive
MacDill AFB 33621-5207

SUBJECT: State Historic Preservation Officer Coordination on Construction/Demolition of
Security Forces Facility at MacDill Air Force Base (AFB)

1. The U.S. Air Force intends to construct a new Security Forces (SF) Facility. The Proposed Action includes the construction of an approximately 31,753 square foot (in plan) two-story building with site utilities, parking, grading, landscaping and other required support. This project is currently scheduled to begin in March 2006 within a developed area of the base that is designated as industrial land use. The proposed construction/demolition site is located east of South Boundary Boulevard, along Bayshore Boulevard on MacDill AFB. A site map of the area (Figure 1) and a facility layout drawing (Figure 2) are attached for your reference.
2. The Proposed Action also includes the demolition of the existing SF Facility (Building 528) located approximately 1200 feet north of the area proposed for construction. Building 528 is a 47-year old commissary building that was renovated in 1995 to accommodate an increase in personnel assigned to the SF squadron. In addition to Building 528, associated parking lots, curbing, and sidewalks currently used at the site would be demolished as part of the Proposed Action. A photograph of Building 528 (Photograph 1) is attached.
3. Any trees and shrubbery in the area of the new SF Facility would be removed as well. Utilities, including sanitary sewer pipe, water lines, and storm sewer lines, would be abandoned or removed as necessary. The storm water drainage swale that transverses the middle of the site which is currently being improved as part of another project (Photograph 2), is classified as a wetland and would be relocated to the western boundary of the site under the Proposed Action.
4. A representative from the MacDill AFB Conservation Program surveyed the site to determine if any cultural resources would be affected. No cultural resources were observed on the site and it is not located within one of the MacDill's AFB Historic Districts. Consequently, MacDill AFB believes that the Proposed Action would not adversely impact cultural resources. If the State Historical Preservation Office agrees with this assessment, please document your concurrence by signing where indicated below. If you would like to inspect the proposed construction site, please contact the MacDill AFB Conservation Program manager.

5. If you have any question or require additional information on the Proposed Action, please contact Mr. Jason Kirkpatrick at (813) 828-0459.

KENNETH E. DOMAKO, GS-13
Deputy Base Civil Engineer

Attachments:

Figure 1: Aerial Map showing Proposed Construction/Demolition of Security Forces Facility at MacDill AFB

Figure 2: Security Forces Facility Layout

Photograph 1: Main Entrance to SF Facility (Building 528), MacDill Air Force Base, Florida

Photograph 2: Proposed Area of Construction

MEMORANDUM FOR 6 CES/CD

The State Historic Preservation Office concurs with MacDill Air Force Base's finding that the Proposed Action, construction of a new Security Forces facility and demolition of the existing Security Forces facility (Building 528), would have no adverse impact on historic resources at MacDill Air Force Base.

State Historic Preservation Officer

Date



Photograph 1

Main Entrance to SF Facility (Building 528), MacDill Air Force Base, Florida



Photograph 2

Proposed Area of Construction

(Note – Ditch construction shown in photo is not part of the SF Complex project)

February 1, 2005

National Marine Fisheries Service
Attn: Mr. David Dale
9721 Executive Center Drive North
St. Petersburg, FL 33702

Subject: Draft *Environmental Assessment for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and *Finding of No Significant Impact* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative* Project No. 79524

Dear Mr. Dale:

Earth Tech is pleased to submit this Draft *Environmental Assessment (EA) for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and the associated *Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA)* documents. This Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA are being submitted to you for your review.

We request that you provide us with any comments, edits, or changes to this Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA by March 11, 2005, at which time we will modify the EA and FONSI/FONPA based on any comments received to produce the Final. Please send any comments, edits, or changes you may have, along with a letter stating that you have reviewed the enclosed documents to:

Mr. Jason Kirkpatrick
6 CES/CEVN
7621 Hillsborough Loop Dr.
MacDill AFB, FL 33621-5207

If you have any questions or concerns about this submittal, please call Jason Kirkpatrick at (813) 828-0459.

Best Regards,

Kathy Garvin

Enclosures

c: Jason Kirkpatrick, 6 CES/CEVN; Master File 79524

February 1, 2005

Florida State Clearing House
Attn: Ms. Cheri Trainor
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100

Subject: Draft *Environmental Assessment for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and *Finding of No Significant Impact* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative* Project No. 79524

Dear Ms. Trainor:

Earth Tech is pleased to submit this Draft *Environmental Assessment (EA) for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and the associated *Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA)* documents. This Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA are being submitted to you for you to distribute and review.

We respectfully request that you provide us with any comments, edits, or changes to this Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA by March 11, 2005, at which time we will modify the EA and FONSI/FONPA based on any comments received to produce the Final. Please send any comments, edits, or changes you may have, along with confirmation of the review to:

Mr. Jason Kirkpatrick
6 CES/CEVN
7621 Hillsborough Loop Dr.
MacDill AFB, FL 33621-5207

If you have any questions or concerns about this submittal, please call Jason Kirkpatrick at (813) 828-0459.

Best Regards,

Kathy Garvin

Enclosures

c: Jason Kirkpatrick, 6 CES/CEVN; Master File 79524

February 1, 2005

Florida Coastal Management Program
Attn: Ms. Jasmine Ruffington
2555 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100

Subject: Draft *Environmental Assessment for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and *Finding of No Significant Impact* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative* Project No. 79524

Dear Ms. Ruffington:

Earth Tech is pleased to submit this Draft *Environmental Assessment (EA) for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and the associated *Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA)* documents. This Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA are being submitted to you for your coordinated review.

We respectfully request that you provide us with any comments, edits, or changes to this Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA by March 11, 2005, at which time we will modify the EA and FONSI/FONPA based on any comments received to produce the Final. Please send any comments, edits, or changes you may have, along with a letter stating your consistency determination to:

Mr. Jason Kirkpatrick
6 CES/CEVN
7621 Hillsborough Loop Dr.
MacDill AFB, FL 33621-5207

If you have any questions or concerns about this submittal, please call Jason Kirkpatrick at (813) 828-0459.

Best Regards,

Kathy Garvin

Enclosures

c: Jason Kirkpatrick, 6 CES/CEVN; Master File 79524

February 1, 2005

Mr. Steve West
Florida Department of Environmental Protection
Bureau of Beaches and Coastal Systems
3900 Commonwealth Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-3000

Subject: Draft *Environmental Assessment for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and *Finding of No Significant Impact* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative* Project No. 79524

Dear Mr. West:

Earth Tech is pleased to submit this Draft *Environmental Assessment (EA) for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and the associated *Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA)* documents. This Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA are being submitted to you for your review.

We respectfully request that you provide us with any comments, edits, or changes to this Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA by March 11, 2005, at which time we will modify the EA and FONSI/FONPA based on any comments received to produce the Final. Please send any comments, edits, or changes you may have, along with a letter stating that you have reviewed the enclosed documents to:

Mr. Jason Kirkpatrick
6 CES/CEVN
7621 Hillsborough Loop Dr.
MacDill AFB, FL 33621-5207

If you have any questions or concerns about this submittal, please call Jason Kirkpatrick at (813) 828-0459.

Best Regards,

Kathy Garvin

Enclosures

c: Jason Kirkpatrick, 6 CES/CEVN; Master File 79524

February 1, 2005

Ms. Laura Kammerer
Division of Historical Resources
Compliance Review Section
500 South Bronough Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0250

Subject: Draft *Environmental Assessment for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and *Finding of No Significant Impact* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative* Project No. 79524

Dear Ms. Kammerer:

Earth Tech is pleased to submit this Draft *Environmental Assessment (EA) for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and the associated *Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA)* documents. This Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA are being submitted to you for your agency's compliance review.

We respectfully request that you provide us with any comments, edits, or changes to this Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA by March 11, 2005, at which time we will modify the EA and FONSI/FONPA based on any comments received to produce the Final. Please send any comments, edits, or changes you may have, along with a letter stating that you have reviewed the enclosed documents to:

Mr. Jason Kirkpatrick
6 CES/CEVN
7621 Hillsborough Loop Dr.
MacDill AFB, FL 33621-5207

If you have any questions or concerns about this submittal, please call Jason Kirkpatrick at (813) 828-0459.

Best Regards,

Kathy Garvin

Enclosures

c: Jason Kirkpatrick, 6 CES/CEVN; Master File 79524

February 1, 2005

Hillsborough County Public Library
Attn: Ms. Judy McAfee
900 North Ashley Drive
Tampa, FL 33602

Subject: Draft *Environmental Assessment for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and *Finding of No Significant Impact* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative* Project No. 79524

Dear Ms. McAfee:

Earth Tech is pleased to submit this Draft *Environmental Assessment (EA) for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and the associated *Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA)* documents. This Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA are being submitted to you for you to make available in the Humanities Section of the library for public review.

We respectfully request that you make the Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA available to the public during the time period of February 10, 2005 through March 11, 2005. Once the availability period is closed, we will consider all public comments received and include them in the Final EA and FONSI/FONPA documents. Please find attached a copy of the public notice and notice of availability that were published in the Tampa Tribune in order to notify the public of the availability of the documents. The attached advertisement provides the address where comments can be submitted.

If you have any questions or concerns about this submittal, please call me at (864) 234-3000 or Jason Kirkpatrick at (813) 828-0459.

Best Regards,

Kathy Garvin

Enclosures

c: Jason Kirkpatrick, 6 CES/CEVN; Master File 79524

February 1, 2005

Lt. Col Yaktus
HQ AMC/CEVP
507 Symington Drive
Scott AFB, IL 62225-5022

Subject: Draft *Environmental Assessment for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and *Finding of No Significant Impact* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative* Project No. 79524

Dear Lt. Yaktus:

Earth Tech is pleased to submit this Draft *Environmental Assessment (EA) for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and the associated *Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA)* documents. This Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA are being submitted to you for your review.

We respectfully request that you provide us with any comments, edits, or changes to this Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA by March 11, 2005, at which time we will modify the EA and FONSI/FONPA based on any comments received to produce the Final. Please send any comments, edits, or changes you may have to:

Mr. Jason Kirkpatrick
6 CES/CEVN
7621 Hillsborough Loop Dr.
MacDill AFB, FL 33621-5207

If you have any questions or concerns about this submittal, please call Jason Kirkpatrick at (813) 828-0459.

Best Regards,

Kathy Garvin

Enclosures

c: Jason Kirkpatrick, 6 CES/CEVN; Master File 79524

February 1, 2005

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Mobile District
Attn: Ms. Dawn Shinsato
P.O. Box 6230
MacDill AFB, FL 33608-6230

Subject: Draft *Environmental Assessment for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and *Finding of No Significant Impact* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative* Project No. 79524

Dear Ms. Shinsato:

Earth Tech is pleased to submit this Draft *Environmental Assessment (EA) for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and the associated *Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA)* documents. This Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA are being submitted to you for your review.

We respectfully request that you provide us with any comments, edits, or changes to this Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA by March 11, 2005, at which time we will modify the EA and FONSI/FONPA based on any comments received to produce the Final. Please send any comments, edits, or changes you may have, along with a letter stating the conclusion of your review to:

Mr. Jason Kirkpatrick
6 CES/CEVN
7621 Hillsborough Loop Dr.
MacDill AFB, FL 33621-5207

If you have any questions or concerns about this submittal, please call Jason Kirkpatrick at (813) 828-0459.

Best Regards,

Kathy Garvin

Enclosures

c: Jason Kirkpatrick, 6 CES/CEVN; Master File 79524

February 1, 2005

Mr. Art Bagley
University of Tampa
Merl Kelce Library
401 West Kennedy Boulevard
Tampa, FL 33602

Subject: Draft *Environmental Assessment for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and *Finding of No Significant Impact* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative* Project No. 79524

Dear Mr. Bagley:

Earth Tech is pleased to submit this Draft *Environmental Assessment (EA) for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and the associated *Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA)* documents. This Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA are being submitted to you for you to make available for public review.

We respectfully request that you make the Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA available to the public during the time period of February 10, 2005 through March 11, 2005. Once the availability period is closed, we will consider all public comments received and include them in the Final EA and FONSI/FONPA documents. Please find attached a copy of the public notice and notice of availability that were published in the Tampa Tribune in order to notify the public of the availability of the documents.

If you have any questions or concerns about this submittal, please call me at (864) 234-3000 or Jason Kirkpatrick at (813) 828-0459.

Best Regards,

Kathy Garvin

Enclosures

c: Jason Kirkpatrick, 6 CES/CEVN; Master File 79524

February 1, 2005

U.S Fish and Wildlife Service
Attn: Brian Pridgen
9549 Koger Blvd.Suite 111
St. Petersburg, FL 33702

Subject: Draft *Environmental Assessment for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and *Finding of No Significant Impact* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative* Project No. 79524

Dear Mr. Pridgen:

MacDill Air Force Base is pleased to submit this Draft *Environmental Assessment (EA) for Construction of Security Forces Facility/Demolition of Existing Building 528, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida* and the associated *Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)* and *Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA)* documents. This Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA are being submitted to you for your review.

We request that you provide us with any comments, edits, or changes to this Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA by March 11, 2005, at which time we will modify the EA and FONSI/FONPA based on any comments received to produce the Final. Please send any comments, edits, or changes you may have, along with a letter stating that you have reviewed the enclosed documents to:

Mr. Jason Kirkpatrick
6 CES/CEVN
7621 Hillsborough Loop Dr.
MacDill AFB, FL 33621-5207

If you have any questions or concerns about this submittal, please call Jason Kirkpatrick at (813) 828-0459.

Best Regards,

Kathy Garvin

Enclosures

c: Jason Kirkpatrick, 6 CES/CEVN; Master File 79524