Environmental Impact Analysis Process Document

FONPA and Supporting AF Form 813

Title: Construct U.S. Special Operations Command Operations Support Facility

MacDill Air Force Base, Florida
Finding of No Practicable Alternative
Agency: United States Air Force (USAF), Headquarters, Air Mobility Command

Background: Pursuant to the provisions of Executive Orders 11988 and 13690, and AFI 32-7064, Paragraph 5.3, the U.S. Air Force conducted an assessment of the potential environmental consequences associated with implementation of the following Proposed Action: construct Operational Support Facility (OSF) within the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) complex. The Proposed Action was found to fit within a Categorical Exclusion (32 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 989, Appendix B, paragraph A2.3.11); therefore, further environmental analysis under National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) was not required (see attached AF Form 813). This Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA) summarizes the alternatives considered and explains why the project was designed and sited as proposed. The Tampa Tribune published a Notice of Availability on 14 April 2016, and the Air Force placed a copy of the Draft Air Force Form 813 and Draft FONPA in the public library for review. No comments were received during the public comment period ending 15 May 2016.

Proposed Action: The USSOCOM is proposing to construct a 36,300 square foot, two-story facility to support the Enterprise Data Center. The multi-level, concrete structure would house emergency backup power generators, uninterrupted power supply systems, as well as heating, ventilation and air conditioning equipment. Demolition of several building (40, 503, 504, and 519) is required to create space for the new construction. The new facility would be constructed on the site of Building 40. This project would also include new construction as well as alteration of existing roadways to support new vehicle circulation and facility maintenance operations. Security gates and vehicular barriers would be installed to meet force protection requirements. Two fuel tanks, including an 8,000 gallon underground storage tank for Building 519 and a 1,000 gallon above ground storage tank for Building 40, are proposed to be removed for this project. The project would also involve the removal of five existing emergency generators located in Buildings 40, 504, and 519.

Alternatives: Two alternatives to implementation of the Proposed Action were considered during the environmental impact analysis process. One primary alternative was construction of the USSOCOM OSF at an alternative location. Because the OSF must be located in the immediate vicinity of the Enterprise Data Center in Building 501, and the footprint of the USSOCOM Complex is highly constrained, an alternative location for then OSF was not practical. The second alternative considered was the No Action alternative, which would not construct an OSF. This alternative was determined impractical because without the construction of the OSF, the HQ USSOCOM Enterprise Data Center will not be capable to function at its intended full operations capability. This creates an unacceptable mission risk for HQ USSOCOM to support the SOF enterprise without failures and unplanned down time during utility outages.

Floodplains: The location of the proposed project is in the 100-year coastal floodplain. Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, as amended on 30 January 2015 by EO 13690, Establishing a Federal Risk Management Standard and a Process for Further Soliciting and Considering Stakeholder Input, 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”. Although being completed in the 100-year floodplain, construction of the OSF would have no long-term impacts to the floodplain. The proposed finished floor elevation of the
new facility would be 13.0 feet above mean sea level (msl) which is substantially above the 100-year floodplain elevation of 10 feet msl in this portion of the base. Because the OSF would be constructed well above the floodplain elevation, the facility would not be subject to flooding and would not jeopardize human health or welfare or create any additional safety risks. Likewise, government assets would not be at risk of damage from flooding since the finished floor elevation is three feet above the floodplain elevation. The OSF is being built on the site of an existing facility (Building 40) and would discharge stormwater to an existing stormwater management area. The OSF would not result in a substantial increase in impervious surfaces in the floodplain or adversely affect the natural and beneficial values served by the floodplain.

**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) or a Negative Determination found. The Air Force has determined the project has no coastal effects, prepared a Negative Determination, and concurrence by the State of Florida is pending.

**FINDING OF NO PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE:** Considering the information contained herein (including the attached AF Form 813), in accordance with EO 11988 as amended by EO 13690, and pursuant to the authority delegated to me, I find that there is no practicable alternative to completing the proposed project within the 100-year coastal floodplain. The Proposed Action, as designed, includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to and within the coastal floodplain.

JOHN H. BONAPART, JR., SES, DAFC  
Director of Installations and Mission Support  
Headquarters Air Mobility Command  
Scott Air Force Base, Illinois
Supporting AF Form 813
### REQUEST FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

**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 item number(s).

#### SECTION I – PROPOINENT INFORMATION

1. **TO** (Environmental Planning Function)
   
2. **FROM** (Proponent Organization and functional address symbol)
   
3. **TITLE OF PROPOSED ACTION**
   Construct Operational Support Facility (OSF) at HQ USSOCOM (NVZR143703)

4. **PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION**
   (Identify decision to be made and need date)
   (see attached)

5. **DESCRIPTION OF ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES (DOPAA)**
   (Provide sufficient details for evaluation of the total action)
   (see attached)

6. **PROPOINENT APPROVAL**
   
6a. **SIGNATURE**
   
6b. **DATE**
   Jolowski, Robert D., P.E., GS13
   HQ USSOCOM //SIGNED ELECTRONICALLY// 19 Nov 15

#### SECTION II – PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL SURVEY

(Check appropriate box and describe potential environmental effects including cumulative effects) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBLE USE ZONE/LAND USE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. AIR QUALITY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. WATER RESOURCES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/WASTE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. CULTURAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. SOCIOECONOMIC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. OTHER (Potential impacts not addressed above.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SECTION III – ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS DETERMINATION

17. **PROPOSED ACTION QUALIFIES FOR CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION (CATEX) # A2.3.11**; OR

18. **REMARKS**

MacDill AFB is in attainment for all criteria pollutants and no conformity determination under the Clean Air Act is required.

CATEX A2.3.11 - actions similar to other actions which have been determined to have insignificant impact in a similar setting as established in an environmental impact statement (EIS) or an EA resulting in a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

19. **ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING FUNCTION CERTIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT B. HUGHES, GS-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, 6th Civil Engineer Squadron</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19a. **SIGNATURE**

19b. **DATE**

AF FORM 813, 19990901 (EF-V1)
4.0 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION

4.1 PURPOSE

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to construct a two-story 36,300 square foot, operational support facility (OSF) within the Headquarters United States Special Operations Command (HQ USSOCOM) complex to support HQ USSOCOM’s Enterprise Data Center functioning at full operational capacity.

4.2 NEED FOR ACTION

The HQ USSOCOM Enterprise Data Center (EDC) is a DoD mission essential asset which provides mission critical data and communications support directly to special operations forces (SOF) worldwide. The EDC was built to accommodate a phased increase in tenants and supported units throughout the SOF enterprise. The EDC stood up functioning at initial operating capability using existing utilities infrastructure. In order to function at full operating capability, the EDC must be provided with reliable and redundant utilities. All supporting electrical power, heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems must be provided with redundancy allowing for planned site infrastructure maintenance without communications systems disruptions as well as facilitating mission shut-down and transfer of mission control in case of primary power loss. The OSF project will provide the necessary systems redundancy for the EDC, a DoD mission essential asset which provides mission critical data and communications support directly to special operations forces (SOF) worldwide.

5.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

5.1 PROPOSED ACTION.

5.1.1 The proposed action involves the construction of a 36,300 square foot (SF), two-story facility within the HQ USSOCOM complex adjacent to Florida Keys Avenue. The multi-level reinforced concrete structure would house three emergency backup power generators and associated diesel storage tanks, uninterrupted power supply systems, as well as heating, ventilation and air conditioning equipment. This project would also include new construction as well as alteration of existing roadways to support new vehicle circulation and facility maintenance operations. Security gates and vehicular barriers would be installed to provide the necessary force protection and also facilitate pedestrian circulation. The project also involves the demolition of Buildings 40 (11,737 SF), 503 (421 SF), 504 (1,790 SF) and 519 (890 SF) to create space for the new construction. Asbestos and lead base paint abatement is required in Building 40. Two fuel tanks, including an 8,000 gallon underground storage tank for Building 519 and a 1,000 gallon above ground storage tank for Building 40, are proposed to be removed for this project. The project would also involve the removal of five existing emergency generators located in Buildings 40, 504, and 519. Two new diesel fuel storage tanks would be installed with the proposed action to support five new diesel fired generators. The new storage tanks would be above ground storage systems.

5.1.2 The foundation system would consist of a deep pile foundation, spread footings, and continuous footers. The first floor (lowest level) is expected to be a concrete slab-on-grade floor. The facility would be designed using standard engineering principles, and constructed with common building materials.
5.1.3 The main facility would be constructed on the site of existing Building 40. Prior to disturbing the existing site, a silt fence would be installed around the construction site to reduce erosion resulting from wind and surface water runoff. Hay bales and similar stormwater runoff control devices would be placed in front of stormwater inlets to control sedimentation of the base stormwater system. Construction fencing would also be installed around the entire construction site to secure the site and improve personnel safety. Upon completion of the new facility, the site would be landscaped and any remaining disturbed areas of the site would be covered with a layer of sod.

5.1.4 Demolition and site preparation would be accomplished by equipment such as front-end loaders, bulldozers and track-hoes. Prior to disturbing the site, a silt fence would be installed around the construction site to reduce erosion resulting from wind and surface water runoff. Demolition would be accomplished by physically knocking down the four concrete block buildings and supporting infrastructure. The ‘wet demolition’ method would be used to suppress the release of dust and other particle matter during demolition. The rubble generated during demolition would be loaded into roll-off dumpsters and hauled off base for disposal at a certified construction and demolition debris landfill in the local area. Prior to initiating any demolition activities, the contractor shall perform a comprehensive asbestos National Emissions Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) demolition survey of all portions of facilities 40, 503, 504, and 519 and LBP screening of all facilities. The contractor shall provide notification to the Environmental Protection Commission of Hillsborough County and hire a qualified environmental abatement subcontractor to remove and dispose of any asbestos containing building material found in the respective facilities in accordance with applicable Federal and state regulations. The same environmental firm shall perform environmental monitoring during the abatement work in accordance with military, Environmental Protection Agency, and all other applicable environmental regulations. All waste disposal manifests shall be turned over to the government upon completion of the demolition work.

5.1.5 Construction of the new facility would require trenching and excavation both for construction of the footings and the installation of electrical, water, sewer and communication lines. There are no Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) sites within or adjacent to the HQ USSOCOM complex so the project would not affect or be effected by contaminated media. All fill material excavated during installation of the utility runs would be backfilled following installation of the new utility lines. If contaminated materials are inadvertently discovered during construction of the facility, the construction contractor would halt the project, contact the ERP office, and await further direction.

5.1.6 Construction of the new OSF would also include modification of existing storm water management systems as required by regulations established by the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD). The need for additional treatment would be determined during project design. Appropriate stormwater management permits would be secured following project design.

5.1.7 The proposed facility would be constructed in an area of the base that is already fully developed, so there would be no adverse effects to natural areas on base. The proposed site does not provide unique or even beneficial habitat for wildlife species since it is dominated by asphalt, concrete, and existing buildings. Likewise, it is outside of the MacDill Field Historic District and would not adversely affect historic resources.
5.1.8 The location of the Proposed Action is in the 100-year floodplain. The facility would be constructed in accordance with the floodplains management guidelines outlined in Section 4.2 of the MacDill Floodplains Management Plan. The facility would be elevated above the 100-year floodplain. Removal of the four buildings proposed for demolition would eliminate 14,838 square feet of impervious surface from the floodplain. The new two-story OSF would have a footprint of roughly 18,000 square feet, so the net change in impervious surface would be around 3,100 square feet, although changes to the configuration of access roads and sidewalks might increase or decrease this anticipated net change slightly.

5.2 Description of Alternatives.

Two alternatives to the Proposed Action were considered to determine whether they met the underlying purpose and need for the Proposed Action: 1) Alternative Location for the OSF and 2) No action. Each of the alternatives are briefly summarized below.

5.2.1 Alternative Location for OSF: The footprint of the HQ USSOCOM Complex at MacDill AFB is severely constrained by existing occupied facilities inside and outside the HQ USSOCOM boundary. There is no other feasible location within or in the immediate vicinity of the HQ USSOCOM Complex.

5.2.2 No Action: This alternative would not construct a new OSF. Without the construction of the OSF, the HQ USSOCOM Enterprise Data Center will not be capable of functioning for its intended full operations capability. This creates an unacceptable mission risk for HQ USSOCOM to support the SOF enterprise without failures and unplanned down time during utility outages. This is not a desirable alternative.

6.0 SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION.

MacDill Air Force Base completed an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Construction of Visiting Quarters – Phases One and Two in June 2011. The EA for the Visiting Quarters project evaluated the demolition of the existing Officers Club (Building 397), Visiting Quarters (Building 312 and 366), and a section of Florida Keys Boulevard. Once the demolition and site preparation is complete, a new three-story 175,000 ft² facility was proposed to be constructed to increase the current billeting capacity at MacDill AFB. The new VQ facility would provide 350 new rooms for visiting personnel and include space for administrative functions, housekeeping, guest laundry, and lobby areas. Phase Two of the VQ project involved the construction of a two-story, 100-room 50,000 ft² VQ facility. Phase Two of the Construct VQ project would be built at the intersection of Tampa Point Boulevard and Bayshore Boulevard. The EA examined the following resource areas; land use, wastes, stored fuel, airspace/airfield operations, air quality, noise, hazardous materials, water resources, floodplains, biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomic and environmental justice, transportation, safety and occupational health, and geology and soils; to evaluate the potential environmental effects the visiting quarters on MacDill Air Force Base would have on these resources. The EA determined the visiting quarters would not individually or cumulatively have a significant impact on the environment and a Finding of No Significant Impact/Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONSI/FONPA) was signed by AMC/A7 on 13
July 2011. The MacDill Environmental Planning Function believes the actions included in the Proposed Action are sufficiently similar to the Construction of Visiting Quarters.

6.1 The Air Force Environmental Impact Analysis Process uses the AF Form 813 to narrow and focus the issues on potential environmental impacts and to document certain categorical exclusion (CATEX) determinations. CATEX’s define those categories of actions that do not individually or cumulatively have the potential for significant effects on the environment. Actions that usually do not require additional environmental analysis include those that have minimal adverse effects on the environment; do not result in any significant change to the existing environment; do not have any significant cumulative environmental impacts; or those actions that are similar to actions that have previously been assessed and found to have no significant environmental impacts. CATEX’s are described in Appendix B to 32 Code of Federal Regulations Part 989.

6.2 The MacDill AFB Environmental Planning Function (6 CES/CEIE) believes the Proposed Action qualifies for exclusion from further environmental analysis under CATEX A2.3.11. CATEX A2.3.11 exempts from further environmental analysis “actions similar to other actions which have been determined to have an insignificant impact in a similar setting as established in an Environmental Impact Statement or Environmental Assessment resulting in a Finding of No Significant Impact.” The MacDill Environmental Planning Function believes the actions included in the Proposed Action are sufficiently similar to the Construction of Visiting Quarters – Phases One and Two and would occur in a similar environmental setting based on the following observations:

6.2.1 The Proposed Action would result in construction of a new 36,300 ft² two-story facility at MacDill AFB within the HQ USSOCOM complex. The construction activities required to construct this facility are considered similar to construction techniques used for the Visiting Quarters project. The Visiting Quarters EA evaluated the construction of a three-story, 175,000 ft² facility and a two-story, 50,000 ft² facility. The location of the visiting quarters and the location of the Proposed Action overlain against existing base constraints are presented in Figure 3. The location of the Visiting Quarters phase one is approximately 1,500 feet from the Proposed Action. A discussion of the resource areas analyzed for the Visiting Quarters EA as they related to the Proposed Action follows. As with the Visiting Quarters, the Proposed Action would not affect Land Use, Waste, and Airspace/Airfield Operations. Sections 6.3.2 thru 6.3.12 contains further discussion of the potential impacts on Air Quality, Noise, Hazardous Materials, Stored Fuel, Water Resources, Floodplains, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Socioeconomic and Environmental Justice, Transportation, Safety and Occupational Health, and Geology and Soils.

6.2.2 Air Quality: The Proposed Action’s potential to impact Air Quality is similar to the Visitors Quarters EA. Insignificant short-term minor intermittent impacts to air quality would be expected to result from the construction activities. These impacts would result from vehicle emissions from heavy equipment, as well as, fugitive dust generated by construction activities. The Visiting Quarters EA calculated the emissions for the criteria pollutants that would result from construction of visiting quarters. The calculated emissions for the visiting quarters phase one and Proposed Action are provided in the following table. MacDill AFB is located in Hillsborough County, which is in attainment for all criteria pollutants, so a conformity determination is not required. Furthermore, the criteria pollutants generated by the construction of the operational support facility would not exceed 10 percent of Hillsborough County emissions values.
Proposed Project Construction Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>NOx (tpy)</th>
<th>VOC (tpy)</th>
<th>CO (tpy)</th>
<th>SOx (tpy)</th>
<th>PM10 (tpy)</th>
<th>PM2.5 (tpy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitors Quarters – Phase One</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>20.54</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Action</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% of Hillsborough County Emissions</td>
<td>5,819</td>
<td>3,488</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>6,589</td>
<td>2,238</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

tpy – tons per year

Insignificant impacts to air quality would be expected to result from operational activities. These impacts would result from the demolition of five existing emergency generators located in Buildings 40, 504, and 519 and installation of three new emergency generators to be located in the HQ USSOCOM OSF. A construction Application for Air Permit has been prepared and submitted to the Environmental Protection Commission of Hillsborough County. The calculated operational emissions for the demolition and installation of emergency generators are provided in the following table. Changes in emissions would not exceed the major source threshold of 100 tpy.

Proposed Project Operational Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project Operational Emissions</th>
<th>NOx (tpy)</th>
<th>VOC (tpy)</th>
<th>CO (tpy)</th>
<th>SOx (tpy)</th>
<th>PM10 (tpy)</th>
<th>PM2.5 (tpy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing MacDill Potential Emissions</td>
<td>85.49</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Action Generator Installation</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Action Generator Demolition</td>
<td>-4.48</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Proposed Action Emissions</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised MacDill Potential Emissions</td>
<td>90.57</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Source Threshold</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.3 Noise: Similar to the construction of the Visitors Quarters, short-term minor adverse effects on noise levels would be expected from the construction activities of the Proposed Action. The noise emanating from the proposed construction of a 36,300 ft² two-story facility would be localized, short-term, and intermittent during operation of construction equipment. Construction noise varies depending on the type of construction being done, the area that the construction would occur in, and the distance from the source. The construction of the Proposed Action would be expected to result in noise levels similar to the Visitors Quarters. The closest noise-sensitive receptors to the Proposed Action are the HQ USSOCOM facilities (Buildings 501, 501A, 501B, 501C, 501D, 501E, and 306), which range from 70 feet to 750 feet from the Proposed Action. The
closest non-USSOCOM facilities are buildings 102, 307, and 261 which are 255 ft, 102 ft, and 306 ft away, respectively. 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 patrons and workers to the construction site. In addition, the impacts vary according to the activity occurring on any particular day, and impacts would cease when construction is completed. Because the construction noise would occur only during the day for a short period of time and would occur at fairly low levels, patrons and workers would not be adversely impacted. Noise from use of the OSF upon completion of the project would be similar to the noise before the construction.

6.2.4 Hazardous Materials: Similar to the Visitors Quarters project, the facilities proposed for demolition could potentially have asbestos and/or lead-based paint in their building materials. During the project design stage, Buildings 40, 503, 504, and 519 are being evaluated for the presence of asbestos and lead-based paint. If these materials are identified during the design stage, their removal would be incorporated into the demolition work and the material would be removed prior to demolition of the buildings. As a result, asbestos and lead based paint, if present, should not result in an environmental impact. The Proposed Action is not located on or near any Environmental Restoration Program sites. Therefore, no impacts to hazardous materials would occur as a result of the Proposed Action.

6.2.5 Stored Fuel: Construction of the proposed OSF would result in the removal of two storage tank systems for diesel fuel, and the installation of two new diesel fuel storage tanks. One of the storage tank systems being removed is an 8,000 gallon underground storage tank located near Building 519. The other tank slated for removal is a 1,000 gallon above ground storage tank associated with Building 40. Both of these storage tank systems contain diesel fuel to operate emergency power generators. These storage tanks are both regulated by the Environmental Protection Commission of Hillsborough County (EPCHC) and their removal must be documented through application for a storage tank removal permit. In addition, removal of the underground storage tank system will require completion of a closure assessment report to confirm that the tank has not leaked or contaminated the surrounding soil. The Proposed Action also requires the installation of two new above ground storage tanks. Each 16,000 gallon tank would store diesel fuel to operate the new emergency power generators. The tanks would be double wall metal construction, constructed by a tank manufacturer and delivered to the site for installation. Installation of the new storage tanks would require permitting through the EPCHC. The new storage tanks will be installed side by side within a walled concrete storage tank service yard. Removal of the 8,000 gallon underground storage tank system is expected to have a positive impact on the environment by removing a storage tank system that would more readily impact soil and groundwater if the tank ruptured. Both of the storage tank systems proposed for removal are each greater than 16 years old. With increased age, there is a greater potential for leakage or fuel releases due to wear and tear or material failure. The older storage tanks would be replaced with modern, storage tank systems constructed on new material and equipped with state-of-the-art leak detection systems. Consequently, replacement of the older storage tanks with new, properly equipped storage tanks is expected to have a net positive impact on stored fuel at MacDill AFB.

6.2.6 Water Resources: Similar to the construction of the Visitors Quarters (VQ), the VQ EA determined that the construction of the visiting quarters could cause insignificant adverse impacts to water resources resulting from erosion and sedimentation associated with ground-disturbing
activities. Proposed construction activities also have the potential to result in insignificant adverse impacts to water resources since the type of work performed would be similar. However, since the Proposed Action involves substantially less demolition than the VQ project, the potential for impacts to water resources would be correspondingly smaller. To reduce the adverse effects associated with groundbreaking activities, best management practices (BMPs) in accordance with MacDill’s SWPPP would be implemented. BMPs for erosion and sedimentation control include the use of silt fence, hay bailing stormwater inlets, and sodding of any disturbed areas upon completion of the OSF. Proposed activities are not expected to result in any increased demand on water supply on base. The proposed OSF would result in a slight increase in impervious surfaces within the floodplain, although the increase is negligible since the majority of the site proposed for construction is already covered with existing buildings, concrete sidewalks, and asphalt parking lots. The OSF project would modify the existing stormwater management retention pond to accommodate stormwater discharge from the new facility. A modification to the existing stormwater management permit through the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) would occur for the Proposed Action.

6.2.7 Floodplains: Similar to the construction of the Visitors Quarters, the Proposed Action is sited within the 100-year floodplain. The OSF would be constructed in accordance with the floodplains management guidelines outlined in Section 4.2 of the MacDill Floodplains Management Plan. The new facility is required to be elevated above the 100-year floodplain since it will be an occupied facility which contains expensive government assets which would be damaged if flooded. This AF Form 813 considered alternatives to construction of the Proposed Action in the floodplain as required by Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, and concluded none of the available alternatives met the underlying need for the proposed action.

6.2.8 Biological Resources: As with the construction of the Visitors Quarters, the Proposed Action site is located in a densely developed portion of the installation with very few natural resources present. Implementation of the Proposed Action would have no impact on wetlands. Likewise, no Federal or state-listed species or habitat is present at the proposed construction site. Therefore, no impacts to biological resources would result from project activities.

6.2.9 Cultural Resources: As with the construction of the Visitors Quarters, the Proposed Action is not located within either of the historic districts on MacDill AFB. The proposed OSF site is actually located about mid-way between the MacDill Field Historic District about 1,500 feet to the west, and the Staff Circle Historic District about 1,800 feet to the east. Although not located within a historic district, the OSF would be constructed near the Base Theater (Building 41). The Base Theater was constructed in 1941 as a semi-permanent structure, but was completely remodeled in 1949 and made a permanent type theater. Building 41 is considered individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listing. The facility has been renovated numerous times over the years; however, renovations have not substantially altered the facility appearance and the present condition reflects the 1949 modifications. Most exterior architectural features remain intact, including quoins, signage, and paint scheme. The building still fulfills its original design and function. The Proposed Action would also be constructed immediately adjacent to Building 501. Building 501, HQ USSOCOM Headquarters, was constructed in 1968 and was identified in the 2006 Architectural Resources Survey as a resource that may be potentially eligible for the NRHP due to its clear association with the Cold War. The facility is not considered potentially eligible due to architectural features, but it may be considered exceptionally important and therefore be potentially eligible under Criteria Consideration G. Unfortunately, Building 501
could not be accessed during the 2006 survey due to security restrictions, and at this time the facility still requires further evaluation to determine NRHP eligibility. Although the Proposed Action is located adjacent to Buildings 41 and 501, the new OSF would not directly affect either resource.

The OSF project would also include the demolition of several smaller facilities to create room for the new OSF building. Facilities 40, 503, 504, and 519 would be demolished as part of the Proposed Action. Buildings 40, 503, 504, and 519 were constructed in 1951, 1983, 1983, and 2005 respectively. Building 40 was evaluated during the 2006 Architectural Resources Survey and was determined to not meet National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) significance criteria. Buildings 503 and 504 were evaluated in 2014 for historic significance and determined not eligible for listing in the NRHP. Correspondence from the SHPO on the evaluations for Building 40 and Buildings 503 and 504 was received in 25 January 2007 and 18 April 2014, respectively and are attached for reference. Since Building 2005 was constructed after the Cold War period and was not associated with a historically significant event, it was not evaluated for historic significance. The Air Force determined that demolition of the four facilities or construction of the OSF would not have an adverse effect on the historic structures or the views associated with the two historic resources. The Florida SHPO concurred that the Proposed Action would not have an adverse effect. Consultation letters between the Air Force and the Florida SHPO are attached.

6.2.10 Socioeconomics: Similar to the construction of the Visitors Quarters, the proposed construction activity would provide temporary employment for construction contractors in the area, resulting in a short-term positive economic impact to the local economy. The proposed work would occur entirely on MacDill AFB property and would have little potential to impact off-base resources. No minority or low-income populations exist in the area of the Proposed Action and there will be no disproportionately high or adverse impacts on such populations. The Proposed Action would not pose any adverse or disproportionate environmental health or safety risks to children living in the vicinity of the base. Since Proposed Action construction site is fenced off, the likelihood of the presence of children is considered minimal, which further limits the potential for effects. Therefore, no significant adverse effects would be expected.

6.2.11 Transportation: As with the construction of the Visitors Quarters, the increase in traffic during the construction of the Proposed Action is expected to be negligible. Short-term impacts to traffic flow within the USSOCOM complex would occur during the construction of the OSF since the interior road and parking areas would be reconfigured with the project. No long-term impacts to transportation would result from the Proposed Action. Implementation of the Proposed Action would have no significant adverse impacts on transportation at MacDill AFB.

6.2.12 Safety: Similar to the construction of the Visitors Quarters, short-term minor adverse effects on safety would be expected as a result of increased risk associated with construction-type activities including use of cranes, risks for falls, and falling objects. Construction activities would be accomplished in accordance with Federal, state, and local regulations to minimize hazards associated with falls, overhead hazards, crane operation, hazardous materials, wastes, and substances.

6.2.13 Geological Resources: Similar to the construction of the Visitors Quarters, short-term minor adverse effects would be expected from grading, excavating, and grooming of the soil. Impacts on previously undisturbed soils would be expected to be minimal because this portion of MacDill AFB has historically been intensely used. Grading, excavation and re-contouring of soil
materials would adhere to all Federal, state, and local regulations. Therefore, no significant impacts on soils would be expected from the Proposed Action.

7.0 COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT COMPLIANCE:

7.1 The Federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) creates a state-Federal partnership to ensure the protection of coastal resources. The Federal CZMA requires each Federal agency activity, within or outside the coastal zone, which affects any land or water use or natural resources of the coastal zone, to be carried out in a manner that is consistent, to the maximum extent practicable, with the enforceable policies of the Florida Coastal Management Program (CMP) of 1981. The Florida CMP presumes that “direct Federal activities” will directly affect the coastal zone. According to the Florida CMP, “direct Federal activities” are those that “are conducted or supported by or on behalf of a Federal agency in the exercise of its statutory responsibilities, including development projects.”

7.2 The Federal CZMA requires Federal agencies carrying out activities subject to the Act to provide a “negative determination” to the relevant state agency. The Federal regulations implementing the Act then require the state agency to inform the Federal agency of its agreement or disagreement with the Federal agency’s negative determination. Therefore, the Proposed Action and the Alternative to the Proposed Action analyzed in this AF Form 813 require the Air Force to submit a negative determination to the relevant Florida agency and requires a response from the State of Florida of either agreement or disagreement with that determination.

7.3 The AF Form 813, FONPA, and negative determination were submitted to the Florida State Clearinghouse for review (see attached). Department staff did not object to the Air Force’s negative determination and agreed that the proposed action meets the requirements of 15 CFR 930.35 (see attached).

8.0 EXECUTIVE ORDER 11988 – FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT

The location of the proposed project is in the 100-year coastal floodplain.

Executive Order (E.O.) 11988 requires Federal agencies 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. The E.O. also requires Federal agencies to evaluate the potential effects of any actions it takes in the floodplain to ensure that its planning programs and budget requests reflect consideration of flood hazards and floodplains management. When an action is proposed for location in the floodplain, the Air Force is required to consider alternatives to avoid adverse effects and incompatible development in the floodplain. When there are no practicable alternatives outside the floodplain, the agency taking action is required to design or modify its action to minimize potential harm to the floodplain.

Information available from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA Maps dated 2008), shows that 80 percent (4,510 acres) of MacDill is within the 100-year floodplain. Residential, industrial, and institutional land uses on the Base are within the 100-year floodplain, along with most of the commercial and aviation support areas. The runway and airfield occupy approximately 80 percent of the land mass outside the floodplain on MacDill AFB and is constrained from further development for safety reasons. Overall, less than three percent of MacDill’s land mass is outside the 100-year floodplain and suitable for development.
The proposed OSF is an enclosed/semi-enclosed structure used exclusively for supporting the Enterprise Data Center and other critical infrastructure within the HQ USSOCOM Complex. It would be built to withstand 130 mile per hour wind loads. The new facility would have a finished floor elevation of 13.0 feet above mean sea level (msl) which is substantially above the 100-year floodplain elevation of 10 feet msl in this portion of the base. Because the OSF would be constructed well above the floodplain elevation, the OSF would not be subject to flooding and would not jeopardize human health or welfare or create any additional safety risks. Likewise, government assets would not be at risk of damage from flooding since the finished floor elevation is three feet above the floodplain elevation. The OSF is being built on the site of an existing facility (Building 40) and would discharge stormwater to an existing stormwater management area. The OSF would not result in a substantial increase in impervious surfaces in the floodplain or adversely affect the natural and beneficial values served by the floodplain. Therefore, although being completed in the floodplain, the Proposed Action would have no significant impacts to the floodplain.

9.0 EXECUTIVE ORDER COMPLIANCE:

9.1 The Air Force complied with the E.O. 11988 requirement to prepare and circulate a notice containing an explanation of why the action is proposed to be located in the floodplain and the requirement to allow a brief comment period prior to taking action. Notice of the Proposed Action in this case was published in the Tampa Tribune 14 April 2016. The Tampa Tribune is a local newspaper of general circulation and the advertisement was placed in a prominent section of the newspaper. The Notice advised the public that the comment period for the Proposed Action would run 15 May 2016. The Notice advised the public that the Air Force invited public review and comment on the DRAFT AF Form 813, the Draft FONPA, and of the location where copies of the documents could be obtained. No comments were received during the comment period and no resources were committed or actions taken which would have an environmental impact or limit the choice of reasonable alternatives prior to expiration of the comment period. The FONPA was signed by HQ AMC/A7 on [Date].

9.2 The environmental analysis in the Visiting Quarters EA, the supplemental analysis included in this AF Form 813, and the FONPA completes the environmental impact analysis process under Air Force instructions.
Public Notice
The Air Force (AF) is inviting public review and comment on AF Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) documents for four projects at MacDill AFB. Project #1: Construct Active Shooter House involves the construction of a 2,752 ft² two-story facility with a driveway, sidewalks, and parking lot. The new facility would be used by the 6 Security Forces Squadron to train for emergency response scenarios, such as an active shooter. Project #2: Construct U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) Operational Support Facility (OSF) involves the construction of a 36,000 ft² two-story facility within the USSOCOM complex. The OSF would provide reliable and redundant utilities to ensure that power and communication utilities for the USSOCOM Enterprise Data Center are not disrupted. This project would also involve the demolition of several small facilities within the USSOCOM complex to create space for the new OSF. Project #3: Construct Marine Radar Access Road involves the construction of a 12 ft wide by 765 ft long paved road which will provide reliable access to the south marine radar facility. The marine radar is currently only accessible via a dirt road which is impassible during the rainy season. Project #4: Demo Consolidate Vehicle Operations Building 52 would relocate the Vehicle Operations function to a different facility. The project involves internal renovation to Building 52, construction of a new parking area and wash rack adjacent to Building 52, and demolition of three small facilities at the current Vehicle Operations area.

MacDill AFB has evaluated each of these actions in accordance with Executive Order 11988 – Floodplain Management. For each action, MacDill AFB finds that there is no practical alternative to construction within the floodplain.

**Notice of Availability**

MacDill AFB has prepared EIAP documents for all four of these actions to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The documents are available for public review and comment from April 15th through May 15th at the Tampa/Hillsborough County Public Library, located at 900 N. Ashley Drive, Tampa, FL 33606. The documents may be found in the Humanities Section of the Main Library and on the MacDill AFB public web site, [http://www.macdill.af.mil/](http://www.macdill.af.mil/). 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.
Supporting Documents

(If available or required)

Figures;
ERP Information;
Other
Figure 1 – General Site Location of Proposed USSSOCOM Operational Support Facility project.
Figure 2 – Aerial photograph showing the site location for the proposed USSOCOM Operational Support Facility.
Figure 3 – Design drawings of the proposed USSOCOM Operational Support Facility showing the site plan and local area topography.
Figure 4 – The proposed location for the USSOCOM Operational Support Facility in relation to the location of the Visiting Quarters project which was evaluated previously and considered similar to the OSF construction effort. The two project locations are overlain against base constraints in the vicinity of both projects.
Figure 5 – The location of the proposed USSOCOM Operational Support Facility shown in relation to the two historic districts on MacDill AFB, as well as Building 41 and Building 501, both of which have been determined potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.
MEMORANDUM FOR DIVISION OF HISTORIC RESOURCES
ATTN: MR. JASON ALDRIDGE
R. A. GRAY BUILDING
500 SOUTH BRONOUGH STREET
TALLAHASSEE FL 32399-0250

FROM: 6 CES/CL
7621 Hillsborough Loop Drive
MacDill AFB FL 33621

SUBJECT: Proposed Construction of Operational Support Facility at MacDill AFB

1. MacDill Air Force Base intends to construct a two-story operational support facility within the Headquarters (HQ) United States Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) compound. The new facility would house emergency backup power generators, uninterrupted power supply systems, as well as heating, ventilation and air conditioning equipment. The operational support facility would provide the necessary systems redundancy for the USSOCOM Enterprise Data Center, a Department of Defense mission essential asset which provides mission critical data and communications support directly to special operations forces worldwide.

2. The proposed new facility would be constructed within the USSOCOM complex along Florida Keys Avenue in the location where Building 40 now exists. Demolition of several buildings including Buildings 40, 503, 504, and 519 would be required to create space for the new operational support facility project. Buildings 40, 503, 504, and 519 were constructed in 1951, 1983, 1983, and 2005 respectively. Building 40 was evaluated during the 2006 Architectural Resources Survey and was determined to not meet National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) significance criteria. Buildings 503 and 504 were evaluated in 2014 for historic significance and determined not eligible for listing in the NRHP. The State Historic Preservation Office concurred with the Air Force on its determination that demolition of Building 40 and Buildings 503 and 504 (evaluated together) would not have an adverse impact to historic resources. Concurrency from your office on the Air Force determinations for Building 40 and Buildings 503 and 504 (evaluated together) were received in 25 January 2007 and 18 April 2014, respectively. These letters are provide in Attachment 1 for reference. These letters are provided in Attachment 1 for reference.

3. The proposed operational support facility would be constructed in the vicinity of Building 41. Building 41, Base Theater, was constructed in 1941 as a semi-permanent structure, but was completely remodeled in 1949 and made a permanent type theater. Building 41 is considered individually eligible for listing in the NRHP. The facility has been renovated numerous times over the years; however, renovations have not substantially altered the facility appearance and the present condition reflects the 1949 modifications which made it permanent. Most exterior

RAPID GLOBAL MOBILITY ... UNMATCHED INSTALLATION SUPPORT!
architectural features remain intact, including quoins, signage, and paint scheme and the building still fulfills its original design and function. Building 501 is also located in the immediate vicinity of the proposed operational support facility. Building 501, USSOCOM Headquarters, was constructed in 1968 and was identified in the 2006 Architectural Resources Survey as a resource that may be potentially eligible for the NRHP due to its clear association with the Cold War. The facility is not considered potentially eligible due to architectural features, but it may be considered exceptionally important and therefore be potentially eligible under Criteria Consideration G. Unfortunately, Building 501 could not be accessed during the 2006 survey due to security restrictions, and at this time the facility still requires further evaluation to determine NRHP eligibility. Neither of these facilities are located within the MacDill Field Historic District (Attachment 2). Although the Proposed Action is located adjacent to these resources, the new operational support facility would not directly affect the resources. The Air Force determined that construction of the USSOCOM operational support facility would not have an adverse effect on historic structures or the viewshed associated with the two historic resources.

4. If you have any questions or concerns about this proposed course of action, please contact Mr. Jason Kirkpatrick at (813) 828-0459.

[Signature]
ROBERT B. HUGHES, GS-14
Director, 6th Civil Engineer Squadron

2 Attachments:
1. State Historic Preservation Office Correspondence for Buildings 40 and 503 & 504
2. Figure Showing Location of USSOCOM OSF with Location of Historic Districts
ATTACHMENT 1

STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
Mr. Robert D. Moore  
Department of the Air Force  
6 CES/CD  
7621 Hillsborough Loop Drive  
MacDill Air Force Base, Florida 33621-5207

RE: DHR Project File Number: 2014-1068  
Proposed Demolition of Buildings 502, 503 and 504 – SOCOM Utility Buildings  
MacDill Air Force Base, Hillsborough County

Dear Mr. Moore:

This office reviewed the referenced project for possible impact to historic properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places. The review was conducted in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended and 36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties.

Based on the information provided and a review of our records, this office concurs with your determination that Buildings 502, 503 and 504 do not appear to meet the criteria for listing on the National Register. Therefore, it is the opinion of this office that the above-referenced undertaking will have no effect on historic properties.

For any questions concerning our comments, please contact Robin Jackson, Historic Sites Specialist, by electronic mail at robin.jackson@dos.myflorida.com, or at 850.245.6333, or 800.847.7278. We appreciate your continued interest in protecting Florida’s historic properties.

Sincerely,

Robert F. Behnus, Director  
Division of Historical Resources  
and State Historic Preservation Officer

Xc: Jason Kirkpatrick
January 25, 2007

Colonel Timothy S. Smith  
Department of the Air Force  
6th Air Mobility Wing (AMC)  
8208 Hangar Loop Drive, Suite 1  
MacDill AFB, Florida 33621-5407

Received by DHR January 12, 2007  
Final Architectural Resources Survey at MacDill Air Force Base, Florida  
MacDill AFB, Hillsborough County

Dear Colonel Smith:

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, and 1A-46, Florida Administrative Code, Archaeological and Historic Report Standards. 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.

In December 2005, Engineering-Environmental Management, Inc. conducted a Phase I architectural survey of Cold War era buildings and structures at MacDill AFB that had reached 50 years of age or that will reach 50 years of age by 2010. Ninety-three historic buildings and structures (8HI1017 - 8HI10199) were identified and recorded during the course of the investigation and only Facility 540 (8HI10149) was determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register.

First, this office would like to compliment you and your office on the thoroughness of the survey report and thank you for responding to our questions on the draft report. This office concurs that Facility 540 appears to meet the criteria for listing in the National Register.

In addition, Facility 1105 (8HI10178) Readiness Crew Building (aka SAC Alert Facility or molehole) also appears to meet the criteria for listing in the National Register. We note that there were no evaluations for Facilities 830 – 838, 840 and 849 (8HI10162 – 8HI10171, 8HI10172). The survey report references a document titled “Program Comment for World War II and Cold War Era (1939-1974) Ammunition Storage Facilities” (dated August 2006) from the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP). If the Air Force has completed the treatments outlined in Program Comment, please provide this office with a hard or electronic copy of the list of properties selected by the USAF, and provide a
copy of the historic contexts that were developed.

We concur that the correct classification under "property category" as defined by the National Register should be a site, not a building or structure for Facility Number 1183 (Old Golf Course). The 1862nd Engineering Aviation Battalion may have built the old golf course in 1946, which was an African-American troop. The original holes may still be in existence on the north (Palms) course and may include holes 3-8. While this property may not be appropriate for this survey this office believes that because of its potential significance that this property be documented on a Florida Master Site File form with maps and photographs.

The evaluation of the remaining buildings and structures is a difficult task due in large part that an additional 296 properties related to the Cold War era has not been surveyed. We note that MacDill plans to survey these properties in the future. The building types (operations, support, housing, etc) and their locations of the 296 properties are critical in the overall evaluation.

Concerning section 5.1.3 of the report, it is not uncommon for historic districts to contain multiple periods of significance.

If you have any questions concerning our comments, please contact Laura Kammerer, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer for Review and Compliance, or Scott Edwards, Historic Preservationist, at 850-245-6333.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Frederick P. Gaske, Director, and
State Historic Preservation Officer
ATTACHMENT 2

FIGURES
Figure 5 – The location of the proposed USSOCOM Operational Support Facility shown in relation to the two historic districts on MacDill AFB, as well as Building 41 and Building 501, both of which have been determined potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.
RE: DHR Project File No.: 2016-0094, Received by DHR: January 11, 2016
Project: Proposed Construction of Operational Support Facility at MacDill AFB
County: Hillsborough

Mr. Hughes:

The Florida State Historic Preservation Officer reviewed the referenced project for possible effects on historic properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places. The review was conducted in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and its implementing regulations in 36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties.

The proposed project includes construction of a two-story operational support facility within the Headquarters (HQ) United States Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) compound. The project will include demolition of Buildings 40, 503, 504, and 519. As noted in your letter, our office has previously concurred that Buildings 40, 503 and 504 are not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Building 519 was constructed in 2005 and is also considered not eligible for listing on the NRHP.

The proposed undertaking does have the potential to affect Building 41, Base Theater, (HI6364) and Building 501, USSOCOM Headquarters. Building 41 is considered eligible for listing on the NRHP. At this time, our office has insufficient information to determine the eligibility of Building 501 for listing on the NRHP. However, based on the proposed scope of work, it is the opinion of this office that the proposed undertaking will have no adverse effect on historic properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places.

We note that Building 501 was not documented in the 2006 Architectural Resources Survey due to security restrictions. If security restrictions now permit, we request that the USAF submit a complete Florida Master Site File Historical Structure Form for Building 501. This will assist our office in maintaining a complete record of the historic properties located at MacDill Air Force Base. A copy of the structure form and digital photograph requirements can be downloaded at www.dos.myflorida.com/historical/preservation/master-site-file/.
Mr. Hughes
DHR Project File No.: 2016-0094
February 8, 2016
Page 2

If you have any questions, please contact Jason Aldridge, Historic Sites Specialist, by email at Jason.Aldridge@dos.myflorida.com, or by telephone at 850.245.6333 or 800.847.7278.

Sincerely

[Signature]

Timothy A Parsons, Ph.D.
Interim Director, Division of Historical Resources
and State Historic Preservation Officer
Introduction

This document provides the State of Florida with the U.S. Air Force’s Negative Determination under CZMA Section 307 and 15 CFR Part 930.35. The information in this Negative Determination is provided pursuant to 15 CFR Section 930.35(b).

Pursuant to Section 307 of the Coastal Zone Management Act, 16 U.S.C. § 1456, as amended, its implementing regulations 15 CFR 930.35 this is a Federal Negative Determination for activities described below.

Proposed Federal agency action:

The purpose of the action is to construct a two story 36,300 square foot (ft²) operational support facility for the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM). The new operational support facility would support the USSOCOM Enterprise Data Center (EDC), a DoD mission essential asset, by providing redundant utilities which will keep the center operational in case of primary power loss. The new facility would include construction of numerous sidewalks and additional paved surfaces for access around the new building. The SOCOM OSF would be constructed immediately adjacent to USSOCOM Building 501 in the central administrative portion of MacDill AFB. The Proposed Action is located within the 100-year coastal floodplain.

Federal Review

After review of the Florida Coastal Management Program and its enforceable policies, the U.S. Air Force has made a negative determination that this activity will have any affect on the state of Florida’s coastal zone or its resources.
Figure 1 – Vicinity Map

MacDill AFB
Figure 2 – Location Map of Proposed Action – Construct Operational Support Facility for USSOCOM
## Florida Coastal Management Program Consistency Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statute</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 161 <em>Beach and Shore Preservation</em></td>
<td>The proposed project would not adversely affect beach and shore management, specifically as it pertains to:</td>
<td>Authorizes the Bureau of Beaches and Coastal Systems within DEP to regulate construction on or seaward of the states’ beaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ The Coastal Construction Permit Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ The Coastal Construction Control Line (CCCL) Permit Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ The Coastal Zone Protection Program. All land activities would occur on federal property.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 163, Part II <em>Growth Policy; County and Municipal Planning; Land Development Regulation</em></td>
<td>All activities would occur on federal property.</td>
<td>Requires local governments to prepare, adopt, and implement comprehensive plans that encourage the most appropriate use of land and natural resources in a manner consistent with the public interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 186 <em>State and Regional Planning</em></td>
<td>All activities would occur on federal property.</td>
<td>Details state-level planning requirements. Requires the development of special statewide plans governing water use, land development, and transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 252 <em>Emergency Management</em></td>
<td>The proposed action would not increase the state’s vulnerability to natural disasters. Emergency response and evacuation procedures would not be impacted by the proposed action.</td>
<td>Provides for planning and implementation of the state’s response to, efforts to recover from, and the mitigation of natural and manmade disasters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 253 <em>State Lands</em></td>
<td>All activities would occur on federal property.</td>
<td>Addresses the state’s administration of public lands and property of this state and provides direction regarding the acquisition, disposal, and management of all state lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 258 <em>State Parks and Preserves</em></td>
<td>Recreational areas and aquatic preserves would not be affected by the proposed action.</td>
<td>Addresses administration and management of state parks and preserves (Chapter 258).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statute</td>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 259 Land Acquisition for Conservation or Recreation</td>
<td>All activities would occur on federal property.</td>
<td>Authorizes acquisition of environmentally endangered lands and outdoor recreation lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 260 Florida Greenways and Trails Act</td>
<td>Florida Greenways and Trails would not be affected. All activities would occur on federal property.</td>
<td>Authorizes acquisition of land to create a recreational trails system and to facilitate management of the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 267 Historical Resources</td>
<td>The Air Force and the Florida State Historic Preservation Officer have determined that MacDill has two areas with buildings potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The Proposed Action is not located in either of MacDill’s two historic districts, and would not directly affect any historic resources. Consultation between the Air Force and State Historical Preservation Officer was completed.</td>
<td>Addresses management and preservation of the state’s archaeological and historical resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 288 Commercial Development and Capital Improvements</td>
<td>The proposed action would occur on federal property. The proposed action is not anticipated to have any effect on future business opportunities on state lands, or the promotion of tourism in the region.</td>
<td>Provides the framework for promoting and developing the general business, trade, and tourism components of the state economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 334 Transportation Administration</td>
<td>The proposed project would not have an impact on transportation.</td>
<td>Addresses the state’s policy concerning transportation administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 339 Transportation Finance and Planning</td>
<td>The proposed project would have no effect on the finance and planning needs of the state’s transportation system.</td>
<td>Addresses the finance and planning needs of the state’s transportation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 373 Water Resources</td>
<td>Wetlands would not be disturbed, as there are no wetlands within the footprint of the proposed action. Impervious surface would be permitted through the South West Florida Water Management District, if needed. The proposed action would not significantly impact the floodplain</td>
<td>Addresses the state’s policy concerning water resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statute</td>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 375 <em>Multipurpose Outdoor Recreation; Land Acquisition, Management, and Conservation</em></td>
<td>Opportunities for recreation on state lands would not be affected.</td>
<td>Develops comprehensive multipurpose outdoor recreation plan to document recreational supply and demand, describe current recreational opportunities, estimate need for additional recreational opportunities, and propose means to meet the identified needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 376 <em>Pollutant Discharge Prevention and Removal</em></td>
<td>The proposed action does not involve the transfer, storage, or transportation of pollutants.</td>
<td>Regulates transfer, storage, and transportation of pollutants, and cleanup of pollutant discharges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 377 <em>Energy Resources</em></td>
<td>Energy resource production, including oil and gas, and the transportation of oil and gas, would not be affected by the proposed action.</td>
<td>Addresses regulation, planning, and development of energy resources of the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 379 <em>Fish and Wildlife Conservation</em></td>
<td>There would be no impact to wildlife resources. No threatened or endangered species occur at or near the site of the proposed action. The proposed action would occur within a developed area of the base among numerous buildings, roadways, and other infrastructure.</td>
<td>Addresses the management of the wildlife resources of the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 380 <em>Land and Water Management</em></td>
<td>The proposed action would occur on federally owned lands. Under the proposed action, development of state lands with regional (i.e. more than one county) impacts would not occur. Areas of Critical State Concern or areas with approved state resource management plans would not be affected. Changes to coastal infrastructure such as bridge construction, capacity increases of existing coastal infrastructure, or use of state funds for infrastructure planning, design or construction would not occur.</td>
<td>Establishes land and water management policies to guide and coordinate local decisions relating to growth and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statute</td>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 381 <em>Public Health, General Provisions</em></td>
<td>The proposed action does not involve the construction of an on-site sewage treatment and disposal system. New connections to public drinking water system are necessary, coordination with MacDill’s Environmental Flight and Bioenvironmental Engineering Flight prior to construction would be required to ensure that proper State of Florida permitting requirements are met.</td>
<td>Establishes public policy concerning the state’s public health system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 388 <em>Mosquito Control</em></td>
<td>The proposed action would not affect mosquito control efforts.</td>
<td>Addresses mosquito control effort in the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 403 <em>Environmental Control</em></td>
<td>The proposed action would not affect ecological systems and water quality of state waters. All reasonable precautions will be taken to minimize fugitive particulate (dust) emissions during any ground disturbing/construction activities IAW Chapter 62-296 Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C. Rule 62-296).</td>
<td>Establishes public policy concerning environmental control in the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 553 <em>Building and Construction Standards</em></td>
<td>All activities would occur on federal property. The proposed new facility will meet the Department of Defense and Air Force Unified Facilities Criteria.</td>
<td>Establishes the Florida Building Code and associated applications, permits, and inspections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 582 <em>Soil and Water Conservation</em></td>
<td>Impacts to soils would not be significant. Construction of the stormwater retention basin should not breach the soil/groundwater interface. Standard erosion control measures will be implemented during construction. If the project will “disturb” over one acre of soil and discharge storm water, then a “Generic Permit for Stormwater Discharge from Large and Small Construction Activities under 62-621.300(4)(a) FAC will be required. The proposed action is located within the 100-year coastal floodplain. The new facility would be elevated two feet above the 100-year floodplain.</td>
<td>Provides for the control and prevention of soil erosion, and for the prevention of floodwater and sediment damages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 597 <em>Aquaculture</em></td>
<td>The proposed action would not affect aquaculture efforts.</td>
<td>Enhance the growth of aquaculture, while protecting Florida's environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Jason W. Kirkpatrick -6 CES/CEVN  
7621 Hillsborough Loop Drive  
MacDill AFB, Florida  33621-5207

SAI # FL201604087586C

Dear Jason:

Florida State Clearinghouse staff has reviewed the proposal under the following authorities:  
Presidential Executive Order 12372; § 403.061(42), Florida Statutes; the Coastal Zone Management Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1451-1464, as amended; and the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321-4347, as amended.

As noted in the submission, the proposed construction project will require an Environmental Resource Permit from the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD). The applicant should continue to work with permitting staff at the SWFWMD to resolve any issues.

Based on the information contained in the submittal and minimal project impacts, the state has no objections to allocation of federal action and it is consistent with the Florida Coastal Management Program (FCMP). The state’s continued concurrence will be based on the activity’s compliance with FCMP authorities, including federal and state monitoring of the activity to ensure its continued conformance, and the adequate resolution of any issues identified during subsequent regulatory reviews. The state’s final concurrence of the project’s consistency with the FCMP will be determined during any environmental permitting process, in accordance with Section 373.428, Florida Statutes.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposed plan. If you have any questions or need further assistance, please don’t hesitate to contact me at (850) 717-9076 or Chris.Stahl@dep.state.fl.us.

Yours sincerely,

Chris Stahl

Chris Stahl, Coordinator  
Florida State Clearinghouse  
Florida Department of Environmental Protection  
3900 Commonwealth Blvd, M.S. 47  
Tallahassee, FL  32399-3000