
Environmental Assessment for MacDill Air Force Base
Land Leasing Project to Site, Construct, and Operate a
Tampa Electric Company-Owned Distributed Generation Facility

March 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION	1
1.1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.2	BACKGROUND.....	2
1.3	PURPOSE OF THE ACTION	3
1.4	NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION	3
1.5	INTERAGENCY/INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION AND CONSULTATIONS.....	4
1.5.1	Interagency Coordination and Consultations.....	4
1.5.2	Government to Government Consultations.....	4
1.5.3	Other Agency Consultations	5
1.6	PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW OF THE EA.....	5
2.0	DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES	7
2.1	PROPOSED ACTION	7
2.1.1	Onsite Facilities	7
2.1.2	Offsite Facilities.....	14
2.2	SELECTION STANDARDS	15
2.3	SCREENING OF ALTERNATIVES.....	19
2.3.1	Onsite Facilities	19
2.3.2	Offsite Facilities.....	21
2.4	DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS.....	27
2.4.1	No-action Alternative.....	27
2.4.2	Alternatives Eliminated from Further Study.....	28
2.4.3	Preferred Alternative.....	29
3.0	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	31
3.1	AIR QUALITY	31
3.2	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	31
3.3	CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	34
3.4	NOISE	36
3.5	TRANSPORTATION	37
3.6	WASTES, HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND STORED FUELS	37
3.7	WATER RESOURCES.....	39
3.8	FLOODPLAINS.....	39
3.9	SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH	42
3.10	ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE.....	42
4.0	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	46
4.1	AIR QUALITY	46
4.1.1	Proposed Action.....	46
4.1.2	No-action Alternative.....	48

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(Continued, Page 2 of 3)

4.2	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	49
4.2.1	Proposed Action.....	49
4.2.2	No-Action Alternative	50
4.3	CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	50
4.3.1	Proposed Action.....	50
4.3.2	No-action Alternative.....	51
4.4	NOISE	51
4.4.1	Proposed Action.....	51
4.4.2	No-action Alternative.....	54
4.5	TRANSPORTATION	54
4.5.1	Proposed Action.....	54
4.5.2	No-action Alternative.....	55
4.6	WASTES, HAZARDOUS MATERIAL, AND STORED FUEL.....	55
4.6.1	Proposed Action.....	55
4.6.2	No-action Alternative.....	57
4.7	WATER RESOURCES.....	57
4.7.1	Proposed Action.....	58
4.7.2	No-action Alternative.....	59
4.8	FLOODPLAINS.....	59
4.8.1	Proposed Action.....	59
4.8.2	No-action Alternative.....	60
4.9	SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH	60
4.10	ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE.....	60
4.10.1	Proposed Action.....	60
4.10.2	No-action Alternative.....	62
4.11	OTHER ITEMS WITH NO POTENTIAL IMPACTS	62
4.12	COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES	63
4.12.1	No-action Alternative.....	63
4.12.2	Proposed Action.....	63
4.13	FORSEEABLE FUTURE PROJECTS / CUMULATIVE EFFECTS.....	65
4.13.1	Air Quality	68
4.13.2	Noise	68
4.13.3	Water Resources	68
5.0	CONCLUSIONS	70
6.0	MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS.....	71
6.1	AIR QUALITY	71
6.2	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/WASTES	71
6.3	WATER RESOURCES.....	71

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued, Page 3 of 3)

6.4	SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH	71
6.5	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	72
7.0	PERSONS CONTACTED.....	73
8.0	LIST OF PREPARERS	74
9.0	REFERENCES.....	75

TABLES

Table 2-1.	Screening of Onsite Alternatives	21
Table 2-2.	Quantitative Evaluation of Pipeline Route Alternatives	24
Table 3-1.	City of Tampa Industrial Sound Level Limits	37
Table 4-1.	Potential Source of Non-stationary Air Emissions from Construction Activities	47
Table 4-2.	Potential Source of Stationary Air Emissions from Operations.....	48
Table 4-3.	Construction Equipment and Composite Site Noise Levels	52
Table 4-4.	Projected Average Construction Noise Levels at Nearest (Western) Property Boundary Based on Composite Noise Levels	53
Table 4-5.	Determination of Minority and Low-Income Populations.....	61
Table 4-6.	Determination of Age Populations (Percent).....	61
Table 4-7.	Comparison of Environmental Consequences	64
Table 4-8.	Reasonably Foreseeable/Cumulative Projects	66

FIGURES

Figure 2-1	Site Location Map.....	8
Figure 2-2.	Project Site Map.....	9
Figure 2-3.	Project Site Layout Map	10
Figure 2-4.	Conceptual Natural Gas Pipeline Route	16
Figure 2-5.	Alternative Sites Map	18
Figure 2-6.	Alternative Sites Flood Zone Map.....	22
Figure 2-7.	Alternative Pipeline Routes Considered	25
Figure 2-8.	Proposed Pipeline and Alternatives FEMA Flood Hazard Map	26
Figure 3-1.	Preferred Site Listed Species Map	33
Figure 3-2.	Preferred Site Cultural Resources.....	35
Figure 3-3.	FEMA Flood Zone Hazard Map	40
Figure 3-4.	FEMA Flood Hazard Map – On- and Offsite Features.....	41
Figure 3-5.	Region of Influence Map	44

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	AIR FORCE FORM AF 813	A-1
APPENDIX B	PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER LIST AND COMMUNICATIONS AND OTHER AGENCY CONSULTATIONS	B-1
APPENDIX C	CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS	C-1
APPENDIX D	NOISE SURVEY	D-1

GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AFB	Air Force Base
AFI	Air Force Instruction
AICUZ	air installation compatible use zone
APE	area of potential effect
BESS	battery energy storage system
BHP	brake-horsepower
BMP	best management practice
CAA	Clean Air Act
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CGP	Construction General Permit
CO	carbon monoxide
CZMA	Coastal Zone Management Act
dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibel
DNL	day/night average sound level
DOD	U.S. Department of Defense
EA	environmental assessment
EAL	energy assurance lease
EBS	environmental baseline survey
EIAP	Environmental Impact Analysis Process
EIR	economic impact region
EO	executive order
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ERP	Environmental Restoration Program
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FDEP	Florida Department of Environmental Protection
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FONPA	finding of no practicable alternative
FONSI	finding of no significant impact
HAP	hazardous air pollutant
HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
INRMP	Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
IPaC	Information for Planning and Consultation
MGD	million gallons per day
MMBtu	million British thermal units
MMBtu/hr	million British thermal units per hour
MW	megawatt
MWh	megawatt-hour
NAAQS	national ambient air quality standards
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NFA	no further action
NO ₂	nitrogen dioxide
NOA	notice of availability

NO _x	nitrogen oxide
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
OSHA	Occupational and Health Administration
PM	particulate matter
PM ₁₀	particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 10 micrometers
PM _{2.5}	particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 2.5 micrometers
PSD	Prevention of Significant Deterioration
ROI	region of influence
SCR	selective catalytic reduction
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SO ₂	sulfur dioxide
SOCENT	Special Operations Command Central
SO _x	sulfur oxides
SWPPP	Storm water pollution prevention plan
TEC	Tampa Electric Company
tpy	ton per year
U.S.C.	United States Code
USAF	U.S. Air Force
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
VOC	volatile organic compound

1.0 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Air Force Civil Engineer Center, Installations Directorate, as delegated by the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations, proposes to enter into a Title 10, United States Code (U.S.C.), Section 2667 authorized Energy Assurance Lease (the Federal Action) with Tampa Electric Company (TEC) (the Lessee) for the purpose of siting, constructing, owning and operating a distributed generation facility, battery storage, and underground transmission (the Lessee Improvements) on 4.5 acres of underutilized, non-excess real property on MacDill Air Force Base (AFB), Florida. The Lessee Improvements augment the existing power grid for South Tampa and provide energy resiliency for MacDill AFB during a grid outage or emergency consistent with Air Force Policy Directive 90-17, Energy and Water Management, which directs favorable consideration of projects that improve energy and water resilience for assets critical to mission accomplishment and leveraging alternative financing mechanisms to acquire onsite generation and resilience.

This environmental assessment (EA) was prepared to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of leasing these properties for development and associated construction activities, in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4331 *et seq.*), the regulations of the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) that implement NEPA procedures (Title 40, Parts 1500 through 1508, Code of Federal Regulations [CFR]), the U.S. Air Force's (USAF's) Environmental Impact Assessment Process Regulations at 32 CFR 989, and Air Force Instruction (AFI) 32-1015, Integrated Installation Planning (Secretary of the Air Force, 2019, updated 2020).

MacDill AFB is located in Hillsborough County, Florida, within the City of Tampa, and occupies 5,696 acres of land. It was established in 1941 and has hosted a variety of missions and aircraft types throughout its history. MacDill AFB is home to the 6th Air Refueling Wing and U.S. Central Command, the U.S. Special Operations Command headquarters, and other tenants.

1.2 BACKGROUND

This EA refers to the parcel proposed for leasing and development under an EAL as a distributed generation facility, battery storage, underground transmission, and offsite natural gas lateral pipeline not directly associated with the lease. EAL allows the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) and its branches and agencies, under the authority of 10 U.S.C. §2667, to lease real property under its control that is not needed for public use, is not excess property, and would meet the specified lease conditions in the statute.

Under 10 U.S.C. §2667 Leases: Non-excess Property of Military Departments and Defense Agencies, USAF is permitted to lease non-excess real property for payment (in cash or in kind) that is not less than the fair market value for uses that promote the national defense or are in the public interest. The Federal Action requires the payment (in cash or in kind) by the Lessee of consideration in an amount that is not less than the fair market value of the lease interest. The preferred consideration for this Federal Action is the provision of utility services, which shall prioritize energy resilience in the event of commercial grid outages as authorized by the DOD leasing authority.

The objective of this project is to secure a long-term lease for the purpose of siting, developing, and operating up to an approximately 75-megawatt (MW) commercial distributed generation facility with optional 20-MW per 40-megawatt-hour (MWh) battery energy storage system (BESS) on approximately 4.5 non-contiguous acres of non-excess property on the perimeter of MacDill AFB. This third-party funded energy security capability minimizes the impact to critical missions at MacDill AFB in the event the primary grid fails or in the event of declared emergency. The natural gas plant and BESS will feed the commercial grid during normal operations, and TEC will be contractually obligated to enable electrically islanded capabilities at MacDill AFB from the Lessee Improvements when the primary source of electricity is disrupted or a state or national emergency is declared. This energy security capability is the preferred in-kind consideration for this 10 U.S.C. § 2667 real estate transaction.

The offsite facilities will be subject to all applicable state and local requirements. TEC will work collaboratively with the City of Tampa to develop the offsite portions of the project and will conform to applicable local and county regulations within those jurisdictions.

1.3 PURPOSE OF THE ACTION

The purpose of the proposed EAL on USAF real property for the siting, constructing, and operating of a distributed generation facility, battery storage, underground transmission, and offsite natural gas lateral pipeline is to achieve mutually beneficial results for TEC and MacDill AFB, which USAF has determined would promote the national defense and would be in the public interest. MacDill AFB is unable to fully utilize non-excess real property located in the northeastern corner of the base, just south of the Port Tampa gate. This property is currently used as a contractor laydown area. This current use does not take full advantage of the potential value of the area. The natural gas plant and the BESS will feed the commercial grid during normal operations, and TEC will be contractually obligated to enable electrically islanded capabilities at MacDill AFB from the Lessee Improvements when the primary source of electricity is disrupted or a state or national emergency is declared. The TEC distributed generation facility would primarily augment the existing power grid for South Tampa but would switch to serve as a backup power source for MacDill AFB during emergency situations.

1.4 NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

The need for the proposed EAL at MacDill AFB is to support USAF's strategic goal of assured access to reliable supplies of energy to meet mission essential requirements. The 2012 National Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 81-112) requires that DOD provide "assured access to reliable supplies of energy to meet mission essential requirements. ...and provide power for assets critical to mission essential requirements on the installation in the event of a disruption." Due to increasing cyber, homeland security, and other threats, USAF's legacy diesel generators no longer provide sufficient energy resiliency in all situations, as the diesel generators are designed to be operated for periods lasting a maximum of 3 to 10 days. Therefore, to be sure critical national missions can continue with minimal disruption during a grid outage, MacDill AFB requires enhanced energy resiliency capabilities.

MacDill AFB seeks to improve the installation's energy resilience through establishment of alternative and/or redundant electrical power generation facilities. Redundant electrical power systems are needed to improve mission sustainability.

The USAF Energy Strategic Plan of March 2013 summarizes USAF's current energy strategy. Among its objectives are to mitigate risk that energy security vulnerabilities would impede USAF's ability to carry

out its mission, reduce its demand for energy, assure energy supply by diversifying energy and fuel sources, and foster a culture of energy awareness.

The project location has been strategically selected to improve system reliability and resiliency to the region while leveraging existing infrastructure. This distributed generation project would directly interconnect and feed electrical power to the existing Interbay substation located due north of the AFB. The proposed distributed generation facility would provide needed redundancy, supplying more reliable power to the grid while ensuring emergency backup power to the base.

1.5 INTERAGENCY/INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION AND CONSULTATIONS

1.5.1 Interagency Coordination and Consultations

Scoping is an early and open process for developing the breadth of issues to be addressed in the EA and identifying relevant concerns related to a Proposed Action. Per the requirements of EO 12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs, federal, state, and local agencies with jurisdiction that would be affected by the Proposed Actions were notified during the development of this EA.

Appendix B contains the list of agencies consulted during this analysis and copies of correspondence.

1.5.2 Government to Government Consultations

Consistent with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and implementing regulations (36 CFR 800), DOD Instruction 4710.02, *Interactions with Federally Recognized Tribes*, and DAFI 90-2002, *USAF Interaction with Federally Recognized Tribes*, federally recognized tribes that are historically affiliated with the MacDill AFB geographic region are invited to consult on proposed undertakings that have a potential to affect properties of cultural, historical, or religious significance to the tribes. The tribal consultation process is distinct from NEPA consultation or the interagency coordination process, and it requires separate notification of the relevant tribes. The timelines for tribal consultation are also distinct from those of other consultations. The MacDill AFB point-of-contact for Native American tribes is the installation commander. Initial consultation with tribal governments began with letter correspondence regarding the project from the commander.

Appendix B lists the Native American tribal governments that were coordinated or consulted with regarding these actions and documentation of consultation correspondence.

1.5.3 Other Agency Consultations

Per the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and implementing regulations (36 CFR 800), Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 and implementing regulations, the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), findings of effect and request for concurrence were transmitted to the Florida State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Florida State Clearinghouse, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

The Florida SHPO concurred on September 9, 2020, with MacDill AFB's finding that the action is "unlikely to adversely affect historic properties listed, or eligible for listing, in the NRHP, or otherwise of historical, architectural, or archaeological value within the area of potential effect." On April 9, 2021, MacDill AFB received the Florida State Clearinghouse concurrence with their CZMA consistency determination. On August 20, 2020, USFWS concurred with MacDill AFB's effect determination that the proposed action may affect but is not likely to adversely affect the wood stork and eastern indigo snake and that the Proposed Action would have no effect on any other federally listed species.

Appendix B presents copies of correspondence regarding the findings and concurrence and resolution of any adverse effects.

1.6 PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW OF THE EA

Because the Proposed Action area and connected action for the natural gas pipeline coincide with wetlands and/or floodplains, it is subject to the requirements and objectives of EO 11990, Protection of Wetlands, and EO 11988, Floodplain Management. USAF published early notice that the Proposed Action would occur in a floodplain/wetland in the newspaper of record, the Tampa Bay Times, on October 25, 2020. The notice identified state and federal regulatory agencies with special expertise that had been contacted and solicited public comment on the Proposed Action and any practicable alternatives. The comment period for public and agency input on these projects ended November 25, 2020.

A notice of availability (NOA) of the Draft EA and FONPA/FONSI was published in the newspaper of record, Tampa Bay Times, announcing the availability of the EA for review on February 21, 2021. The NOA invited the public to review and comment on the Draft EA. The Draft EA and Draft FONPA/FONSI were made available for a 30-day public comment period to solicit input of the public, agencies, and other interested parties. The public and agency review period ended on March 21, 2021. Appendix B contains copies of the NOA and agency comments. No comments were received from the public.

The NOA and early notice of project execution in a floodplain/wetland were published in the Tampa Bay Times newspaper, Tampa, Florida. Appendix B includes a copy of the proof of notice publication.

Copies of the Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA were also made available online at <http://macdill.af.mil/> for review and at the John F. Germany Public Library (Tampa/Hillsborough County), 900 North Ashley Drive, Tampa, Florida 33606.

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

2.1 PROPOSED ACTION

USAF and MacDill AFB propose to lease approximately 4.5 acres of non-excess, underutilized USAF-owned property to TEC for the purpose of developing the area for constructing and operating a distributed generation facility, battery storage, underground transmission, and offsite natural gas lateral pipeline. Requirements, authorities, and procedures for USAF real property transactions are established in AFI 32-9002, *Management of Real Property*, and AFI 32-9003, *Granting Temporary Use of Air Force Real Property*.

The development would include installation of four natural gas reciprocating internal combustion engines, two natural gas-fired emergency generators, a diesel fuel-fired emergency fire water pump, and supporting auxiliary equipment. The facility, as currently designed, would be capable of generating up to 75-MW of power with an additional optional battery energy storage system capable of 20-MW output for two hours. The proposed facility would include the necessary support equipment and utility systems. The distributed generation facility would connect to an existing electrical substation located north of the AFB via an underground transmission line. The project would also include installation of an offsite lateral natural gas pipeline that would connect the existing Tampa SW Gate Station to the new distributed generation facility to power the reciprocating internal combustion engines.

2.1.1 Onsite Facilities

2.1.1.1 Facilities Design Features

TEC intends to install up to 75 MW natural gas reciprocating internal combustion engines, two backup emergency generators, one emergency fire water pump, one fuel gas heater, and supporting auxiliary equipment. An optional battery energy storage system capable of 20-MW output is also proposed. Figures 2-1 through 2-3 illustrate the site location, overall facility layout, and equipment layout. A short underground section of the lateral natural gas pipeline would connect to the combustion engines through MacDill AFB.




FIGURE 2-1.
SITE LOCATION MAP
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION PROJECT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources: ESRI, 2021; ECT, 2022.

ECT




FIGURE 2-2.
PROJECT SITE MAP
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION PROJECT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources: SWFWMD Imagery, 2020; ECT, 2022.

ECT




FIGURE 2-3.
PROJECT SITE LAYOUT MAP
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION PROJECT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources: SWFWMD Imagery, 2020; ECT, 2022.

ECT

Reciprocating Engines

Reciprocating engines up to approximately 75 MW are proposed to generate electrical power. Each unit consists of a four stroke, lean-burn, reciprocating internal combustion engine, such as Wärtsilä Model 18V50SG-B or approved equal, rated at 26,820 brake-horsepower (BHP) to provide a nominally rated electrical output of 18,879 kilowatts-electrical from the generator. Each engine fires pipeline-quality natural gas exclusively to power the generator. The engines would be housed in a building to protect the equipment from the elements. Each engine would exhaust to atmosphere through a vertical exhaust stack, which would be approximately 75 feet above grade.

Backup Generators

The project includes two emergency generator engines, Caterpillar® Model G3512 or approved equal with a nominal engine output of 1,114 BHP. Each engine is a four-stroke, lean-burn, reciprocating internal combustion engine. One generator would supply power to the battery storage system. The second generator would supply backup power to reciprocating engines 1 through 4 and associated equipment. Each emergency generator unit would fire natural gas to generate the backup electrical energy to serve the auxiliary loads of the BESS and reciprocating engines so they can be started and operated when electrical power from the grid is unavailable. Each emergency generator would be housed in an enclosure designed to protect it from the elements as well as reduce noise emanating from the engine. The engine would exhaust to atmosphere through a vertical exhaust stack, which would be approximately 15 feet above grade.

Emergency Fire Water Pump

The project includes one emergency fire water pump engine, Cummins® Model CFP7E-F10 or approved equal with a nominal engine output of 174 BHP. The engine is a four-stroke, compression ignition, reciprocation internal combustion engine. In the event of a fire, the emergency fire water pump engine would be engaged to operate the fire suppression system when service power is unavailable. The engine would operate on ultra-low-sulfur diesel fuel to meet the emergency backup fire water requirements. A 200-gallon onsite tank would be adequate for fuel storage to run the emergency pump during an event. The emergency fire water pump engine would be housed in a building designed to protect it from the elements, as well as, reduce noise emanating from the engine.

Fuel Gas Heater

The project includes one natural gas-fired fuel gas heater with a rated heat input capacity of 500,000 British thermal units per hour. The heater is necessary to avoid the formation of hydrates, liquid hydrocarbons, and water as a result of pressure reduction when natural gas moves from the high-pressure pipeline to the lower pressure fuel gas lines at the station. The gas heater is designed to raise the temperature of the natural gas so that after pressure reduction, the temperature of the gas is above the dew point temperature at operating conditions and maximum flow required for the reciprocating engines.

BESS Units

The batteries would be containerized lithium-ion battery units with a 20-MW, 40-MWh capacity. The proposed layout includes 10 battery containers and 10 inverter modules, although the exact number of containers and inverters may change once a specific manufacturer is selected. Each inverter would be integrated with a transformer to step the voltage up to distribution level. There would also be a small building housing common electrical and controls equipment. Each battery container would have multiple heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) or chiller units for cooling purposes. The battery containers and inverters would be adequately separated to meet fire code and insurance requirements. There would be a backup natural gas generator to run the battery cooling system in the event of a grid outage. The output of the batteries would be interconnected to the existing Interbay substation utilizing a new 13.2-kilovolt underground cable.

2.1.1.2 Facility Construction

Construction would be performed to minimize disturbance to natural ground cover. Construction mats and low-pressure, rubber-tired or non-tracked vehicles would be used, when appropriate, to minimize potential for erosion. Turbidity screens, erosion control devices, and other best management practices (BMPs) would be utilized to minimize impacts to adjacent wetlands and water bodies to control the quality of runoff.

Soil contaminated with polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and arsenic was identified in the area proposed for construction during the environmental baseline survey work from a former railroad track and rail spur. Soil concentrations were compared to the soil cleanup target levels (SCTLs) provided in Chapter 62-777 of the Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.). Three criteria were assessed: the residential

and commercial/industrial risk-based scenarios direct exposure SCTLs and the leachability SCTLs. The direct exposure-based SCTLs are used as a metric to signify the concentration at which exposure to a given chemical is safe under either a residential or a commercial/industrial land use scenario. The leachability-based SCTLs represent concentrations of a given chemical that will generate leachate that exceeds its cleanup criteria for groundwater or surface water. Due to the limited exposure of construction workers and operational personnel and potential visitors at the proposed Distributed Generation facility relative to the exposure assumptions used to derive the direct exposure-based SCTL for a residential scenario, the applicable direct exposure scenario is the commercial/industrial risk-based SCTLs. Approximately 305 cubic yards (430 tons) of contaminated soil above the Chapter 62-777, F.A.C. commercial/industrial risk-based direct exposure SCTL is required to be properly removed and disposed as a part of the Proposed Action prior to construction. Analysis of the groundwater in the area proposed for construction indicated that the groundwater was not contaminated above the groundwater cleanup target level. Therefore, special handling of groundwater is not required. Additional information regarding this ERP site can be found in Sections 3.6 and 4.6.1.

The facility would be constructed using materials common to most industrial facilities. The building housing the reciprocating engines would likely be supported on pile foundations and a concrete slab at grade level. The building itself would likely be a pre-engineered metal building with integral insulation for sound containment. Cast-in-place or tilt-up concrete construction would also be evaluated as a potential material for the building walls. The building would be one story with an estimated height of 55 feet and an open interior to sufficiently house and operate the equipment. Most of the building would have an unfinished interior; however, the building would contain an electrical room, battery room, information technology room, bathroom, and control room, portions of which would be finished. There would be some equipment located outside the building on concrete foundations or supported on elevated structural steel framing. The exhaust ductwork and stacks would include insulation as required for soundproofing and personnel protection. There would be paved access between the building and existing roads. The area around the building and outdoor equipment would primarily be gravel surfacing to facilitate access and maintenance.

The portion of the facility where the batteries are located would primarily consist of metal containers housing the lithium-ion battery units. Outside and adjacent to each battery container would be associated inverters and transformers. Also, near the battery containers would be one small building housing the

electrical equipment common to all the battery containers. This small building would likely be a pre-engineered or pre-built metal building manufactured offsite and delivered to the site. The containers, inverters, and common electrical building would be set on concrete foundations or on elevated structural steel framing. The area surrounding the batteries would likely be gravel surfacing to facilitate access and maintenance.

2.1.1.3 Operation and Maintenance Activities

The proposed facility would typically be operated remotely, with no permanent staff onsite. However, there would be daily maintenance activities and checks performed to confirm fluid levels are adequate, checking for leaks, and generally that the equipment is operating as intended or ready to do so when called upon. Periodic deliveries of lubricating oil and selective catalytic reduction reagent (urea) would be required. There would be regular preventative maintenance activities performed on equipment such as HVAC units, pumps, and motors. There would also be occasional maintenance required on major pieces of equipment such as the reciprocating internal combustion engines at scheduled intervals that would require additional maintenance personnel for a limited period.

2.1.2 Offsite Facilities

An offsite lateral pipeline would supply natural gas to the new facility, connecting to an existing Peoples Gas System Tampa SW Gate Station on McCoy Street. The conceptual route for this associated offsite linear facility is approximately one mile in length and is depicted in Figure 2-3. Proposed construction would be a new 6-inch steel pipeline largely collocated along existing pipeline infrastructure on McCoy Street and Manhattan Avenue. A short section of the underground lateral pipeline would extend through MacDill AFB to connect the supply to the generating units on site.

Some limited site improvements and minor modifications are expected to be needed to the existing Gate Station at the McCoy Street Gas Yard, although the detailed design has not yet taken place and the amount of civil engineering required is not known at this time. No additional construction is anticipated.

A water pipeline connection would tie to the city potable water line along Manhattan Avenue. Electrical transmission interconnection would take place by way of a reinforced underground conduit from the

battery storage units to the offsite Interbay substation to the north and separately from the reciprocating engines to the Interbay substation (Figure 2-4).

2.2 SELECTION STANDARDS

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and CEQ regulations mandate consideration of reasonable alternatives for the Proposed Action. “Reasonable alternatives” are those that “meet the underlying purpose and need for the proposed action that would cause a reasonable person to inquire further before choosing a particular course of action”. Per the requirements of 32 CFR 989, USAF Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) regulations, selection standards are used to identify alternatives for meeting the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action.

Any proposed energy development on USAF property must support the purpose of and need for the action and meet the following baseline requirements to be advanced for proposal for leasing and construction-related activities under the EAL program:

- Be compatible with the existing, ongoing military mission and activities at MacDill AFB and other DOD installations in the area.
- Comply with USAF and DOD planning and design manuals, design standards, and safety requirements for USAF facilities and use market standards for development outside the MacDill AFB perimeter fence.
- Be compatible with existing infrastructure and development at MacDill AFB and its vicinity.
- Meet antiterrorism and force protection requirements within the installation perimeter fence.
- Be economically viable, cost effective, and financeable at reasonable market rates.

TEC is required to meet the growing electricity demand for its customers. To meet this need, TEC approached MacDill AFB to install four natural gas reciprocating internal combustion engines within the installation boundary. The location of the proposed project is strategic in its selection to provide system reliability and resilience while leveraging existing infrastructure and minimizing impacts associated with the facility. Location at the AFB puts the proposed generation near the anticipated load, while the exact site within the AFB boundary takes advantage of proximity to existing infrastructure.




FIGURE 2-4.
CONCEPTUAL NATURAL GAS PIPELINE ROUTE
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION PROJECT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources: SWFWMD Imagery, 2020; ECT, 2022.

ECT

In selecting possible candidate parcels to lease under an EAL, USAF and TEC looked for sites that met the following selection standards:

1. Proximity to the existing substation for economic efficiency (or to reduce utility run distance).
2. Ability to locate facility within 0.5-mile of the installation boundary to provide easy access for TEC staff, limit traffic, and minimize potential conflicts with on-base activities.
3. At least 4.5 acres of non-contiguous land area.
4. Ability to minimize construction within the 100-year floodplain.
5. Located in the northwest portion of the base to minimize the length of the natural gas pipeline for economic efficiency and reduce potential underground utility conflicts.
6. Ability to locate facility sufficiently set back from runway so the exhaust stacks do not interfere with airfield operations.
7. Facility capable of generating sufficient capacity to meet the USAF resiliency objective.

Figure 2-5 identifies five locations considered for placement of the distributed generation facilities.

Any new linear facility should demonstrate in its route selection that certain considerations were evaluated, including costs, safety, long-range area planning, environmental factors, and alternative routes for the project. Considerations for identifying the offsite natural gas supply line options included the following routing criteria and selection standards:

1. Minimization of location through residential areas.
2. Minimization of parcels crossed.
3. Minimization of proximity to schools, community facilities (churches, recreational centers, parks).
4. Avoidance of impacts to known archaeological and historic resources.
5. Maximization of collocation opportunities (with existing utility, road, or rail rights-of-way).
6. Minimization of environmental impacts (wetlands, waterbodies, protected habitat).
7. Minimization of distance through 100-year floodplain.
8. Avoidance of contaminated lands, including known landfills and avoidance of potable wells.
9. Minimization of engineering constraints such as conflicts with existing infrastructure, sharp points of inflection.
10. Overall route length.
11. Estimated cost.




FIGURE 2-5.
ALTERNATIVE SITES MAP
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION PROJECT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources: SWFWMD Imagery, 2020; ECT, 2022.

ECT

The primary consideration for the location of the underground transmission interconnection was minimization of distance to the existing offsite Interbay substation.

2.3 SCREENING OF ALTERNATIVES

For the purpose of discussing alternatives for the Proposed Action, we are addressing onsite and offsite facilities in separate sections.

2.3.1 Onsite Facilities

The following potential onsite alternative sites and alignments that might meet the purpose and need for construction and operation of a distributed generation facility and battery storage were considered:

1) Alternative 1 – Site A

Approximately 3.2 acres located south of North Boundary Boulevard. This proposed construction parcel has been disturbed by previous base activities and the installation of underground utilities, ditching, and removal of contaminated soil in the eastern portion of the parcel. Most of the land is currently used for equipment storage.

2) Alternative 2 – Site B

Approximately 4.2 acres located in the wooded area south of North Boundary Boulevard. The site would require additional site work, including tree clearing in wetlands, and has the added challenge of a nearby jet fuel pipeline. Additionally, this area is a potential location of the Port Tampa Cemetery.

3) Alternative 3 - Site C

Approximately 1.0 acre located north of North Boundary Road. This site is too small to accommodate the project facilities but is contemplated for construction laydown and for placement of the proposed battery storage units.

4) Alternative 4 – Site D

Approximately 3.0 acres along West Boundary Street. This proposed construction parcel is currently used for storage and contains multiple temporary outbuildings.

5) Alternative 5 – Site E

Approximately 11.0 cleared acres near the Defense Fuels Supply Point, south of bulk fuel storage tanks at North Boundary Boulevard. The property is currently being managed under land use controls and is being monitored for petroleum contamination of the soil.

Additionally, another alternative included the building of a solar facility. This option was quickly eliminated from consideration because there was not enough land to install sufficient capacity to meet the electric load. Similarly, because of the intermittency of solar energy, this generation type did not meet the USAF's resiliency objectives.

The selection standards described in Section 2.2 were applied to these alternatives to determine which alternative(s) would maximize the value of currently available real property and other needs of the Proposed Action (Table 2-1). Alternative configurations for construction of the facility were considered in an attempt to avoid construction within contaminated areas of the project site; however, due to limited space on the Proposed Action site and the anticipated size of the building it was impossible to avoid construction within the contaminated areas of the environmental restoration site. See Section 4.6.

Table 2-1. Screening of Onsite Alternatives

Alternative Descriptions	Selection Criteria						
	Proximity to Existing Infrastructure	Accessibility	Minimum 4.5 Acres of Non-contiguous Land Area	Outside of 100-year Floodplain	Minimization of New Infrastructure and Clearing Impacts	Suitable Distance from Runway/ Compatibility with AFB Operations	Ability to Produce Generation Capacity For Resiliency Objective
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Solar Generation Option	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	No
Alternative 1 - Site A	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Alternative 2 – Site B	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Alternative 3 – Site C	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Alternative 4 – Site D	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Alternative 5 – Site E	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
No-Action Alternative	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	No

2.3.2 Offsite Facilities

Lateral Pipeline

Using the criteria and selection standards identified in Section 2.2 for offsite features, the following pipeline routes to supply the generators were identified for evaluation and comparison. Figure 2-6 shows the alternative sites flood zone map. Each offsite route considered includes a short connection through the base to connect to the proposed facilities.

Conceptual Route—This route follows along an existing pipeline from the gas yard on McCoy Street. Exiting the gas yard from the south, the proposed route turns east along the south side of McCoy Street and collocates along the existing pipeline alignment for approximately 0.3 mile then turns south along the west side of South Manhattan Avenue, where it turns again south and continues another 0.44 mile south. From this point, the route turns east and enters the AFB property at a point south of the North Boundary Boulevard, where it continues the final 0.1 mile to the location of the proposed generation units. The overall route length of this option is approximately 0.89-mile.




FIGURE 2-6.
ALTERNATIVE SITES FLOOD ZONE MAP
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION PROJECT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources: FEMA, 2022; SWFWMD Imagery, 2020; ECT, 2022.

ECT

Alternative Route 1—This alternative route exits the McCoy Street gas yard from the north, following along the parcel boundary for approximately 0.10 mile before turning east along an abandoned rail corridor, now owned by the City of Tampa. This route option continues east along the south side of the city-owned linear parcel for approximately 0.27 mile to the west side of South Manhattan Avenue. At this point Alternative Route 1 follows road right-of-way approximately 0.43 mile along the west side of South Manhattan Avenue to the south side of Interbay Boulevard where the route turns again east and continues another 0.12 mile to the east side of Tanker Way before turning south. The last 0.19 mile follows along Tanker Way into the AFB and terminates at the proposed generation units. The overall route length is approximately 1.1 miles.

Alternative Route 2—Alternative Route 2 exits the gas yard from the east and turns south along South Trask Road, traversing approximately 0.49 mile along the west side of Trask Road before turning east at West Loughman Street. Continuing another 0.34 mile due east from this location, the alignment terminates at the proposed generation units on the AFB property. The overall route length is approximately 0.89 mile.

Alternative Route 3—Similar to Alternative Route 2, this option also exits the gas yard from the east, however it continues east to South Wall Street before turning south. From here the route continues south for approximately 0.41 mile along the west side of South Wall Street, where it turns again east at West Chisolm Street. Following along parcel boundaries another 0.19 mile to South Manhattan Avenue, this route option turns again south and continues for another 0.09 mile along the west side before turning east and traversing another 0.10 mile into the AFB property along the south side of North Boundary Boulevard and terminating at the proposed generation units. The approximate route length of this option is 0.90 mile.

The linear route criteria described in Section 2.2 were applied to these route options to determine which alternative(s) would meet the needs of the Proposed Action. Table 2-2 provides an overview of the quantitative evaluation of those alternative routes.

Route options are depicted in Figures 2-7 and 2-8.

Table 2-2. Quantitative Evaluation of Pipeline Route Alternatives

Route Option	Overall Length (miles)	Approximate Costs (~\$1.5M per mile)	Distance through 100-Year Floodplain (miles)	Residential Buildings within 250 ft (Qty)	Non-Residential Buildings within 250 ft (Qty)	Schools within 250 ft (Qty)	Parks/Recreational within 250 ft (Qty)	Churches within 250 ft (Qty)	Distance through Parks (miles)	Co-location along Road Right-of-Way (miles)	Co-location along Rail Right-of-Way (miles)	Distance Crossed Through Land Use Type				
												Residential Vacant (miles)	Residential (miles)	Commercial Vacant (miles)	Industrial (miles)	Government (miles)
Conceptual	0.888	1.331	0.236	69	60	0	2	0	0.000	0.834	0.000	0.008	0.161	0.047	0.000	0.096
Alternative 1	1.096	1.644	0.472	53	58	0	2	0	0.265	0.418	0.028	0.000	0.010	0.015	0.050	0.560
Alternative 2	0.890	1.335	0.580	129	38	0	1	1	0.000	0.642	0.000	0.032	0.046	0.002	0.053	0.202
Alternative 3	0.901	1.351	0.323	89	45	0	0	0	0.000	0.591	0.000	0.008	0.240	0.003	0.100	0.096




FIGURE 2-7.
ALTERNATIVE PIPELINE ROUTES CONSIDERED
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION PROJECT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources: SWFWMD Imagery, 2020; ECT, 2022.

ECT




FIGURE 2-8.
PROPOSED PIPELINE AND ALTERNATIVES FEMA FLOOD HAZARD MAP
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION PROJECT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources: FEMA, 2022; SWFWMD Imagery, 2020; ECT, 2022.

ECT

Other options to fuel the reciprocating generation units were considered but eliminated from further evaluation. One included the addition of four mobile liquified natural gas tanks and a vaporizer at the McCoy Street gas yard. Another option was to burn jet fuel supplied by MacDill AFB and operate the generation units using dual fuel with natural gas from the McCoy Street gas yard. Both of these options also required the construction of a pipeline from the gas yard to the base.

Transmission Line

The shortest distance between the generators, battery storage units, and the Interbay substation was identified for the route for the underground transmission line, approximately 0.1 mile. Any potential impacts associated with construction of the line would be avoided by construction techniques (such as horizontal directional drill).

2.4 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

The NEPA and CEQ regulations mandate consideration of reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Action. “Reasonable alternatives” are defined by 32 CFR 989.8 as “alternatives 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.”

The Proposed Action satisfies applicable USAF, DOD, and state and/or federal requirements and supports current and future mission requirements. The NEPA process is intended to support flexible, informed decision-making; the analysis provided by this EA and feedback from the public and other agencies will inform decisions made about whether, when, and how to execute the Proposed Action. Among the alternatives evaluated is a no-action alternative. The no-action alternative will substantively analyze the consequences of not undertaking the Proposed Action, not simply conclude no impact, and would serve to establish a comparative baseline for analysis.

2.4.1 No-action Alternative

Under the no-action alternative, the proposed enhanced use lease of the underutilized non-excess properties, MacDill AFB would not be implemented, and the parcel would not be developed. USAF would fail to maximize the value of its real property assets, and the demand for energy resilience would not be addressed. The no-action alternative cannot be considered reasonable, as it fails to address the purpose of and need for the action as described in Chapter 1; however, it would be carried forward for

further analysis, consistent with CEQ regulations, to provide a baseline against which the impacts of the Proposed Action/preferred alternative and action alternatives can be assessed.

2.4.2 Alternatives Eliminated from Further Study

Onsite

Several options and alternatives on the MacDill AFB property were originally identified and considered for potential use as the site for the generation and battery storage units (Figure 2-5). The primary selection criterion for the preferred site was determined to be in proximity to existing infrastructure (i.e., the existing Interbay substation). As stated in Section 2.2.2, a solar option was initially considered and then eliminated due to lack of sufficient available space to generate capacity to meet resiliency objectives.

Other alternatives dropped from further consideration were Alternatives 2 and 4. Alternative 2 (Site B) was eliminated from further consideration because of constraints associated with location of a jet fuel supply line and it being the potential location of the Port Tampa Cemetery. In addition, there are possible height constraints because of the location of the runway and the amount of site preparation required to make the area construction ready. Cultural resource assessments within the wooded lot, which indicated archaeological finds and the presence of wetlands, also made this site less desirable.

Alternative 4 (Site D) was also dropped from further consideration because of its distance from the existing infrastructure, which was one of the selection criteria. It would have also created the need to relocate several contractor facilities that are actively in use. Distance from the entrance gate increases the distance TEC would need to travel to service the site, increasing the interaction with MacDill staff and potentially interfering with base operations.

Alternative 5 (Site E), the defense fuels supply point site, was rejected from further consideration because of several factors, including the existence of contaminated soils requiring ongoing monitoring and its greater distance from both the Interbay substation and the Tanker Way entrance. Additionally, this alternative site falls within the 100-year floodplain, which was an important consideration that made the site less desirable (Figure 2-6).

Alternative actions considered for further evaluation focus on minimizing conflicts with AFB operations and minimizing the distance for interconnection to existing facilities.

The alternatives retained for further evaluation are identified as the proposed site, which is derived from a combination of Site A and the easternmost portion of Site C, and the no-action alternative.

Offsite

Multiple options were considered for the natural gas supply pipeline. The route selection process considered numerous factors, including environmental, social, cultural, natural resources, land use in proximity, and engineering/construction feasibility. The use of existing linear rights-of-way for collocation opportunity was studied in addition to new routes to accommodate the new pipeline. Challenges identified include existing residential development and the extent of the study area being located in floodplain. See Figures 2-7 and 2-8 for a depiction of the study area and the route alternatives considered. Each offsite route would require a short segment through the base to connect to the generation facilities.

Alternative Route 1 was the longest route, at 1.1 miles and traversed 0.47 mile through floodplain. Alternative Route 2 crossed the greatest distance through 100-year floodplain and had the greatest number of residential buildings within 250 feet of the route. Alternative Route 3 was 0.90-mile long and was slightly longer than the conceptual route, had more residential structures within 250 feet and crossed through a greater distance of 100-year floodplain. For these reasons Alternative Routes 1, 2, and 3 were considered less desirable and were eliminated from further consideration.

The route alternative for the pipeline retained for further evaluation is the conceptual route, which minimizes new impacts to human populations and the environment. The no-action alternative is also retained for further analysis.

2.4.3 Preferred Alternative

The preferred alternative is to implement the Proposed Action, as described in Section 2.1. This alternative provides for usable grounds in proximity to the Interbay substation, with sufficient room for equipment and associated structures without posing conflicts with AFB operations. The preferred alternative is identified as a combination of both Sites A and C, as shown in Figure 2-5. The preferred option for the natural gas pipeline is the conceptual route, which has been determined to minimize new land use, social, and environmental impacts. At 0.89-mile, the conceptual route is the shortest of the

routes considered. It traverses the least distance through 100-year floodplains and is largely collocated along an existing pipeline, further minimizing additional new impacts in the floodplain.

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

This section describes the characteristics of the existing natural and man-made environment that would be affected by the Proposed Action or 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 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) established national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for six “criteria” pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), ozone, sulfur oxides (SO_x), measured as sulfur dioxide (SO₂), lead, and particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 10 micrometers (PM₁₀). These standards are the cornerstone of the CAA. Although not directly enforceable, they are the benchmark for the establishment of emissions limitations by the states for the pollutants EPA determines may endanger public health or welfare.

The Environmental Protection Commission of Hillsborough County is responsible for issuing and enforcing MacDill AFB’s current CAA Non-Title V Air Operation Permit (No. 0570141-023-AO effective June 6, 2019). MacDill AFB is not a major source of potential emissions for any criteria pollutant.

EPA tracks compliance with the air quality standards through designation of a particular region as “attainment” or “nonattainment.” MacDill AFB is located in Hillsborough County within the West Central Florida Intrastate Air Quality Control Region. The area encompassed by MacDill AFB is currently classified as being in attainment for the criteria pollutants stipulated under the NAAQS (40 CFR 81.96 and 40 CFR 81.310).

3.2 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Biological resources include native, or naturalized plant and animal species and the habitats within which they occur. Habitat can be defined as the resources and conditions found present in an area that support plant or animal life. The primary laws protecting biological resources of the study area are the Endangered Species Act (ESA), Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. MacDill AFB implements biological resources management actions per their Integrated Natural

Resources Management Plan (INRMP) (MacDill AFB, 2019). INRMP guides the implementation of the natural resources program on MacDill AFB. This plan applies to both internal and external organizations that are involved with, or interested in, the management or use of MacDill AFB's natural resources to ensure the conservation of MacDill AFB's natural resources, as well as, compliance with related environmental laws and regulations. The INRMP encompasses all land at MacDill AFB, whether leased to others or not, and; therefore, is applicable to the proposed project.

During the initial stages of the environmental impact analysis process, a USFWS Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) report was generated, a survey of the site was performed, and the results of prior protected species surveys were evaluated. The preferred location for the Proposed Action is a previously disturbed area with no known sensitive resources, based on the current survey, prior surveys, and other existing biological resource data. For this reason and due to lack of suitable habitat present, of the thirteen species identified in the IPaC report, only the following four species required agency consultation.

The Proposed Action would occur within a core foraging area for the wood stork (*Mycteria americana*), and wood storks have been observed on MacDill AFB in water features, including drainage swales and ditches. Storm water features and drainage swales are located in the vicinity of the proposed construction site; however, there would be no direct impact to these water features. In addition, the species is habituated to activity and noise levels associated with ongoing activity at MacDill AFB, and noise from construction activities for the Proposed Action would be temporary.

There are two active bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) nests (HL024 and HL982) on the AFB property; however, both are located more than a mile away from the Proposed Action area. Activity associated with construction of the site is not expected to impact the species.

Figure 3-1 provides a map of wood stork core foraging areas and active eagle nests.

The eastern indigo snake (*Drymarchon corais couperi*) can occur in suitable habitat throughout Florida. It has a wide range of habitat preferences and requires large tracts of land for survival. Often considered a gopher tortoise (*Gopherus polyphemus*) commensal, it can be found in xeric habitats but also utilizes more mesic or wetland habitat for foraging. Due to the heavily disturbed nature of the site and lack of



FIGURE 3-1.
PREFERRED SITE LISTED SPECIES MAP
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION PROJECT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources:SWFWMD Imagery, 2020; USFWS, 2021; FWC, 2021; ECT, 2022.



refugia, eastern indigo snakes are unlikely to be found present. No eastern indigo snakes or gopher tortoise burrows were observed during the field assessments of the proposed project area.

Gopher tortoises are currently a candidate species for listing by USFWS. They are typically found within upland habitats with well-drained, sandy soils. Gopher tortoise burrows are used by several other listed and non-listed wildlife species. No gopher tortoise burrows have been observed within the proposed project area during field assessments, and much of the available upland habitat has been previously developed or is heavily disturbed. As such, there is only a low probability of this species occurring within the project area. Nonetheless, TEC proposes to conduct a formal burrow survey within tortoise suitable habitat prior to development. If necessary, tortoises that may be affected by the project would be relocated from harm's way to an onsite recipient area in accordance with the Gopher Tortoise Candidate Conservation Agreement to which MacDill AFB is a party.

3.3 CULTURAL RESOURCES

A Phase I archaeological survey of the western portion of MacDill AFB was recently completed that encompasses the study area for this Proposed Action. No archaeological properties were identified within the footprint of the proposed project area; however, a low-density, precontact lithic scatter was discovered approximately 250 feet east of the project site. This find was determined ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Additional information can be found in Appendix B.

MacDill also recently completed an investigation for the lost Port Tampa Cemetery. Although the location of the cemetery could not be conclusively determined, the preponderance of information gathered during the survey determined the location of the Port Tampa Cemetery to be approximately 400 feet due east of the proposed project area (Figure 3-2).

Additional information regarding cultural resources on MacDill AFB is available through the Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plan for MacDill AFB (USAF, 2018).




FIGURE 3-2.
PREFERRED SITE CULTURAL RESOURCES
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION SITE
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources: SWFWMD Imagery, 2020; ECT, 2022.

ECT

3.4 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 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 Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) study (2014) plotted the DNL from 65 to 80 dB for an average day and a busy day at the base.

The DNL contours reflect the aircraft operations at MacDill AFB. The DNL 65-dB contour covers the main runway and extends approximately one mile southwest over Tampa Bay and approximately one mile northeast over South Tampa. Smaller DNL 65-dB contours are centered near the north and south parking ramps. The easternmost 65-dB contour at the northeastern end of the runway is approximately 0.5 miles from the location of the Proposed Action, except for the proposed location of the grounds maintenance yard, which lies just outside the contour. MacDill AFB conducted an AICUZ Study in 2008 that recommended land use guidelines for land surrounding the installation in the City of Tampa to assist in preparing their local land use plans.

Section 27-282.7 of the City of Tampa Code of Ordinances establishes A-weighted decibel (dBA) noise limits for sound emitted from industrial, manufacturing, and processing operations to residential, commercial, and industrial receiving land that apply to the project. Chapter 27 does not establish any C-weighted decibel noise limit criteria. The equivalent sound levels may not exceed those detailed in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1. City of Tampa Industrial Sound Level Limits

Receiving Land Use	Sound Pressure Level (dBA)	
	Daytime (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.)	Nighttime (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.)
Residential	60	55
Commercial	65	60
Industrial	75	75

Source: City of Tampa Code of Ordinances, Section 27-282.7.

The project may run at all hours of the day, so Tampa's nighttime sound level limits would be used as design goals for project mitigation scenarios. Tampa's limits are applicable to project sound levels only and are not inclusive of the ambient environment.

3.5 TRANSPORTATION

MacDill AFB is served by four operating gates at Dale Mabry Highway, Bayshore Boulevard, MacDill Avenue, and Tanker Way. The Tanker Way gate is used as the large vehicle (contractor truck, deliver vehicle, recreational vehicle) entry point. Large vehicles are inspected, and their credentials and destination are confirmed before entering the base.

The on-base transportation system 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 most recent traffic study (2010) determined the service levels for traffic on-base are generally acceptable.⁽¹⁾

3.6 WASTES, HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND STORED FUELS

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 6 CES/CEIE. Wastes come from approximately 50 locations throughout the base and are managed at satellite accumulation points base-wide.

¹ 2018 Final Environmental Assessment for SOCCENT Operations Facility MacDill AFB, Florida.

Approximately 105 operations base-wide use hazardous materials, which 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 ensure base organizations are approved to use specific hazardous materials.

The base receives jet fuel (Jet A) at the Defense Fuel Support Point by pipeline from Port Tampa. Jet A, diesel, biodiesel, gasoline, and used oil are stored throughout MacDill AFB in small to medium sized underground and aboveground storage tanks ranging in size from 55 to 1.2 million gallons.

The generated wastewater is treated at the base's privatized 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 the base by reclamation, principally through spray application at the golf course located at the southeast quadrant of the base. The western portion of MacDill AFB is not tied to the base's privatized wastewater treatment plant and is served by individual septic systems.

Additionally, Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) sites are located on the MacDill AFB. The types of ERP sites found on base currently include petroleum contamination sites, solid waste management units, areas with land use controls in place to prevent exposure to contaminants, areas subject to long-term monitoring, oil water separators, and general compliance sites. The status of active ERP sites ranges from undergoing assessments to long-term monitoring of remediation systems and/or land use controls (USAF, 2019b).

A Phase II Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) of the proposed action site confirmed that contamination was found to be above the Chapter 62-777, F.A.C. Residential and Commercial/Industrial (C/I) SCTLs (USAF, 2022a). As a result of the Phase II EBS, a new ERP site DA568 was created at the location of the proposed action. The contaminants of concern are PAHs and arsenic in soil. No groundwater or surface water contaminants of concern were identified. It is estimated that the volume of soil contaminated above the C/I SCTL within the Proposed Action footprint is 305 cubic yards (430 tons).

3.7 WATER RESOURCES

Surface water flows at the base are primarily from storm water 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 Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) issued a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Multi-sector Generic Permit for Stormwater Discharge Associated with Industrial Activity (FLR05E128-005) to MacDill AFB in March 2021. FDEP issued a Phase II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit (FLR04E059 [Cycle 4]) to MacDill AFB in January 2018. In accordance with 40 CFR 112, Oil Pollution Prevention, the base has developed a spill prevention control and countermeasures 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 onsite.

3.8 FLOODPLAINS

According to information provided by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (maps dated 2021), approximately 90 percent of the base is within the 100-year coastal floodplain (Figures 3-3 and 3-4). The maps indicate the residential, industrial, and institutional (medical and education) land uses on the base are within the 100-year coastal floodplain, along with most of the commercial and aviation support areas. Most of the 10 percent of land that is above the floodplain is designated for airfield operations.

EO 11988, Floodplain Management, requires federal agencies to avoid to the extent possible the long- and short-term adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of floodplains, and to avoid direct and indirect support of floodplain development wherever there is a practicable alternative. The federal CZMA of 1972 also requires federal agencies to demonstrate a proposed action is consistent with the Florida Coastal Management Program. In accordance with EO 11988, the CZMA, and AFMAN 32-7003, *Environmental Conservation*, the Air Force has issued an early public notice describing the proposed activity within the 100-year floodplain at MacDill AFB (Appendix B).




FIGURE 3-3.
FEMA FLOOD ZONE HAZARD MAP
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION PROJECT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources: FEMA, 2022; SWFWMD Imagery, 2020; ECT, 2022.

ECT




FIGURE 3-4.
FEMA FLOOD HAZARD MAP - ON AND OFFSITE FEATURES
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION PROJECT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources: FEMA, 2022; SWFWMD Imagery, 2020; ECT, 2022.

ECT

3.9 SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

This section focuses on the consideration of impacts to safety and occupational health resulting from placement of temporary facilities and construction of a new permanent facility. Safety and occupational health refers to the health and well-being of MacDill AFB personnel, employees, and contractors and other branches of services/agencies that access MacDill AFB.

All contractors and personnel performing construction activities at MacDill AFB are responsible for adhering to federal Occupational and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations and are required to conduct these activities in a manner that does not increase risk to workers or the public. OSHA regulations address the health and safety of people at work and cover potential exposure to a wide range of chemical, physical, and biological hazards, and ergonomic stressors. The regulations are designed to control these hazards by eliminating exposure to the hazards via administrative or engineering controls, substitution, use of personal protective equipment, and availability of safety data sheets.

No demolition would be associated with the Proposed Action either offsite or within the AFB.

3.10 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Analysis of environmental justice evaluates impacts on environmental justice populations (i.e., minority and low-income populations) and is directed by EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations. EO 12898 requires each federal agency to identify and address whether their Proposed Action results in disproportionately high and adverse environmental and health impacts on low income or minority populations.

Although not specifically identified as environmental justice populations, children and the elderly are considered sensitive receptors due to their inherent vulnerabilities. Analysis of potential impacts on children is directed by EO 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. EO 13045 states that each federal agency “(a) shall make it a high priority to identify and assess environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately impact children; and (b) shall ensure that its policies, programs, activities, and standards address disproportionate risks to children that result from environmental health risks or safety risks.” Activities occurring near areas that could have

higher concentrations of children during any given time, such as schools and childcare facilities, might further intensify potential impacts on children. To the extent to which children might be impacted, disproportionate impact on children is inherent due to their inherent vulnerabilities. There are no standard procedures or regulatory requirements for including the elderly in the impact analysis process; however, the EPA stresses the importance of addressing environmental issues that may adversely impact them (USEPA 2014b).

Consideration of concerns related to environmental justice and sensitive receptor populations includes the race, ethnicity, poverty status, and age of populations near a Proposed Action. For purposes of this EA, minority, low-income, child, and elderly populations are defined as follows:

- **Minority Population:** Minority populations are defined as members of the following population groups: Black or African American, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, and multi race that includes one of the aforementioned races; and Hispanic or Latino (CEQ 1997, USAF 2014c). The U.S. Census Bureau considers race and Hispanic or Latino origin (ethnicity) as two separate concepts, and these data are recorded separately:
- **Low-income Population:** Low-income populations are defined as individuals whose income is below the federal poverty threshold based on income data collected in the 2019 American Community Survey. In 2019, the federal poverty threshold for an individual was \$13,011 (U.S. Census Bureau 2019).
- **Child Population:** Children are defined as all people 5 years of age and under.
- **Elderly Population:** Elderly persons are defined as all people 65 years of age and over.

For the purpose of this analysis, the environmental justice and sensitive receptors within the region of influence (ROI) include the areas near MacDill AFB within which potential impacts from the MacDill AFB Alternative would occur (see Figure 3-5). The proposed activity most likely to disproportionately affect environmental justice populations and adversely affect sensitive receptor populations would be the operation of the power plant. Therefore, the ROI includes the census tracts within one mile of the planned location of the power plant that might contain people that could be affected by the MacDill AFB

Alternative. Demographic data for the ROI provides key insights into environmental justice and sensitive receptor populations. The community of comparison for the ROI is the smallest set of U.S. census tracts.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

The effects of the Proposed Action on the affected environment are considered and discussed in this section.

4.1 AIR QUALITY

4.1.1 Proposed Action

Air emissions from project construction would result from land clearing, grading and construction of the project site as well as along the natural gas pipeline and transmission line routes, operation of construction equipment internal combustion engines, and construction worker vehicle traffic and equipment deliveries. Although the overall area of the project site located on MacDill AFB property is approximately 4.5 acres, only approximately 3.3 acres would be disturbed during actual construction. Therefore, there would be minimal land clearing and grading, which could potentially emit fugitive dust emissions that could potentially result in a nuisance. The overall construction schedule is relatively short, anticipated to be approximately 12 months or less, and most equipment would arrive onsite pre-assembled. It is anticipated that only approximately 0.7 acre of land would be disturbed off MacDill AFB property for installation of the natural gas pipeline and transmission line and no land clearing or grading would be required.

Air emissions from construction activities would be minor, generated within a relatively small geographic area, and temporary in duration. Reasonable precautions would be employed to minimize fugitive dust emissions during project construction that could potentially result in a nuisance. Air emissions from construction activities have been estimated based on the area of disturbed land and the anticipated type and duration of the construction activities.

Air emissions during construction activities have been estimated based on previously accepted methods consistent with United States Air Force air emission methodologies, guidance and emission factors, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District emission factors and procedures and the EPA. Air emissions from construction activities as calculated by ACAM have been summarized in Table 4-1. The detailed ACAM report of the construction emissions is provided in Appendix C.

Table 4-1. Potential Source of Non-stationary Air Emissions from Construction Activities

Construction Activity	NO_x (tons)	VOC (tons)	CO (tons)	SO₂ (tons)	PM₁₀ (tons)	PM_{2.5} (tons)	CO₂ (tons)
Combustion	5.1	0.4	2.2	0.4	0.4	0.3	577.2
Fugitive dust	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.8	0.4	N/A
Haul truck on-road	1.3	0.9	3.8	0.1	1.5	0.4	328.2
Commuter	0.1	0.1	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	98.6
TOTAL	6.4	1.4	6.8	0.5	5.7	1.1	1,004.0

Sources: TECO, 2020; MacDill AFB, 2020; ECT, 2020.

Potential air emissions from project operations would primarily result from operation of the engine-generators and, to a lesser degree, the two emergency generators, one emergency fire water pump engine, and the natural gas heater. The engine-generators would combust pipeline-quality natural gas exclusively to limit PM and SO₂ air emissions. Each engine-generator would also be equipped with an SCR system to minimize NO_x emissions, an oxidation catalyst to minimize CO and VOC emissions, and an air-to-fuel control system to promote efficient combustion. Lastly, each engine generator will be limited to an annual operating schedule of 3,500 hours per year, thus minimizing annual air emissions. The two emergency generators and the emergency fire water pump engine would be limited to 100 hours per year for non-emergency operation and would combust pipeline quality natural gas and ultra-low sulfur diesel, respectively. The natural gas heater can operate 8,760 hours per year and combusts pipeline quality natural gas.

Table 4-2 provides potential annual air emission estimates for the engine-generators, the two emergency generators, the fire water pump engine, and the fuel gas heater. This table also compares these potential air emissions to the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) preconstruction and the Title V operating permit major source thresholds. As shown, the Proposed Action does not trigger major source permitting for either the PSD or Title V permitting programs. From an air regulatory perspective, the Proposed Action would be subject to minor source air construction permitting and minor source air operation permitting. TEC will be responsible for obtaining and ensuring compliance with the minor source air construction permit and minor source air operation permit. These air permits would be issued to separate owner/operator, and thus would be under separate control than any air construction or air operation permit issued to MacDill AFB.

Table 4-2. Potential Source of Stationary Air Emissions from Operations

Pollutant	Proposed Action PTE (tpy)	PSD Major Source Threshold (tpy)	Title V/HAPs Major Source Threshold (tpy)	PSD Applicability (Yes/No)	Title V Applicability (Yes/No)
NO _x	25.6	250	100	No	No
CO	42.4	250	100		
VOC	38.0	250	100		
SO ₂	6.3	250	100		
PM	24.4	250	100		
PM ₁₀	24.4	250	100		
PM _{2.5}	24.4	250	100		
Formaldehyde	6.1	N/A	10		
Total HAPs	22.8	N/A	25		

Note: HAP = hazardous air pollutant.

PM_{2.5} = particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 2.5 micrometers.

tpy = ton per year.

VOC = volatile organic compound.

The General Conformity Rule is designed to ensure that any federal action or activities do not in any way cause or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS or would delay the attainment status of a nonattainment area. Obtaining all require air construction and air operation permits, reviewed by and issued through the state regulatory agency or their delegated representative authority, would ensure compliance with the NAAQS and the General Conformity Rule.

The federal PSD regulatory program is designed to protect air quality under EPA's New Source Review permitting program. Major stationary sources under the PSD program are subject to PSD regulatory requirements to ensure air quality is protected. The proposed action is not a major stationary source under the PSD program. In addition, the proposed action is not a major source under the federal Title V air operation permitting program. Based on this assessment, the project would have minor adverse impacts to the short- and long-term air quality in the immediate vicinity of the project.

4.1.2 No-action Alternative

Under the no-action alternative, the TEC distributed generation facilities would not be constructed. Air quality resources, as described in Section 3.1, would remain unchanged. Therefore, implementation of the no-action alternative would result in no significant impact to air quality.

4.2 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

This section focuses on vegetation types or wildlife that are important to the function of the ecosystem or are protected under federal or state law. Impacts to biological resources would be considered significant if the Proposed Action resulted in a permanent loss of high value habitat for fish and wildlife, or reduction in the population of a special status species.

4.2.1 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action takes place in a previously disturbed area with no sensitive resources.

Implementation of the Proposed Action would not adversely affect known biological resources as there are no known protected species or critical habitat located within or adjacent to the proposed locations that would be impacted.⁽²⁾

No federal- or state-listed species or their habitat are present at the Proposed Action location, nor would any be impacted. Although Wood storks will opportunistically forage in any shallow water body and have been observed foraging in water features in the area but outside the project location, there is no suitable nesting substrate found onsite. There would be no direct impact from the Proposed Action to those water features and the species is habituated to activity and noise levels associated with on-going and proposed demolition, construction, and vehicle activity at MacDill AFB. Noise associated with construction activities of the Proposed Action would be temporary and confined to regular working hours.

No gopher tortoise burrows have been observed within the proposed project area, and presence is considered unlikely due to poor habitat and the site being heavily disturbed. However, a formal burrow survey within tortoise suitable habitat would be conducted prior to development. If necessary, tortoises that may be affected by the project would be relocated from harm's way to an onsite recipient area.

Similarly, the eastern indigo snake is considered unlikely to be present due to the heavily disturbed nature of the site and lack of refugia.

Based on the analysis completed during preparation of the draft EA and in compliance with Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, MacDill AFB notified the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding the

² U.S. Air Force. 2020b. Final Environmental Baseline Survey, Energy Assurance Project Proposed Tampa Electric Company Site, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.

Proposed Action, and USFWS concurred on August 20, 2020, that the Proposed Action may affect but is not likely to adversely affect the wood stork and eastern indigo snake and would have no effect on any other federally listed species in the area of potential effect.

4.2.2 No-Action Alternative

Under the no-action alternative, the TEC distributed generation facilities would not be constructed. Biological resources, as described in Section 3.2, would remain unchanged. Therefore, implementation of the no-action alternative would result in no significant impact to biological resources.

4.3 CULTURAL RESOURCES

4.3.1 Proposed Action

With regard to archaeological resources, the project area of potential effect (APE) is defined as the area where grading, trenching, or similar land-disturbing activities would occur. The APE was defined as the primary project footprint shown in yellow on Figure 2-2, as well as a 30-foot-wide swath along the two linear corridors proposed for utility installation. These utility corridors include the underground transmission interconnection represented by the purple line on Figure 2-3 and the natural gas line depicted on Figure 2-4. Ground-disturbing activities associated with construction of the Proposed Action would primarily occur in previously disturbed areas. Although the archaeological site and the Port Tampa Cemetery are both located in the vicinity to the proposed project area, construction of the proposed power generation facility is not expected to adversely affect either site (see also Figure 3-2).

MacDill AFB received concurrence on September 9, 2020, from the SHPO that the proposed project is unlikely to adversely affect historic properties listed, or eligible for listing, in the NRHP or otherwise of historical, architectural, or archaeological value within the area of potential effect (Appendix B).

MacDill AFB has consulted with four Native American tribes (Seminole Tribe of Florida, Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida, and Seminole Nation of Oklahoma and the Muscogee [Creek] Nation) with an expressed interest in activities at MacDill AFB. In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (CFR Title 36, Part 800) MacDill AFB requested feedback from the tribes on the project related to Traditional Cultural Properties that may be present within the APE (Appendix B). Initial consultation letters were mailed to tribes on 28 August 2020 and also submitted electronically via e-mail to the tribes on 31 August 2020. Follow-up attempts to contact the tribes were made including e-mails

sent 13 November 2020, and phone calls in January 2021. Documentation from the tribal consultation process including response from the Seminole Tribe of Florida and memorandums summarizing the communication with each tribe are provided in Appendix B.

4.3.2 No-action Alternative

Under the no-action alternative, the TEC distributing generation facilities would not be constructed, and existing facilities would not be relocated. Cultural resources, as described in Section 3.7, would remain unchanged. Therefore, implementation of the no-action alternative would result in no significant impact to cultural resources.

4.4 NOISE

4.4.1 Proposed Action

Project construction can generally be divided into several phases, with the noise level varying with the construction phase (based on Barnes *et al.*, 1977):

- Site preparation and excavation;
- Concrete pouring;
- Steel erection;
- Mechanical and electrical;
- Clean up; and
- Startup and testing.

Potential noise impacts during construction on MacDill AFB property are expected to be minimal and mitigated by the distance between the construction area of the engines/battery storage area and the nearest off-site receptors. Noise receptors in close proximity to the project site would likely experience some impacts from construction and/or construction-related vehicle noise. Noise generated from construction activities would include construction equipment internal combustion engines and the actual construction activities and would generally be limited to daytime hours (i.e., 7 a.m. to 6 p.m.). Noise impacts from construction-related activities are expected to be relatively minor, intermittent, and temporary based on the relatively short duration of construction.

During the initial site preparation and foundation excavation phase, the major source of noise is expected to be heavy diesel-powered earth-moving equipment, such as bulldozers, graders, sheepsfoot roller compactors, dump trucks, backhoes, and front-end loaders. Typical noise levels emanating from this equipment can approach 90 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. For example, at a 50-foot distance, a bulldozer produces 90 dBA, and a tractor scraper produces 87 dBA (EPA, 1971).

Equipment used during the concrete pouring stage typically includes concrete trucks, concrete pump truck cranes, and equipment for backfilling foundations. Pile drivers (102 dBA at 50 feet [EPA, 1971]) and augers may also be used. The steel erection phase typically requires the use of cranes in varying sizes, air compressors, welders, material delivery trucks, concrete trucks, and front-end loaders. The machinery installation phase requires the same types of equipment as the steel erection phase. The final phase, consisting generally of site cleanup and plant startup activities, is typically 10 dBA quieter than the other phases (Barnes *et al.*, 1977.)

During construction, noise related to truck traffic is normally the highest contributor due to noise levels generated (91 dBA at 50 feet [EPA, 1971]) and frequency. However, such impacts would be temporary since they would be limited to the construction phase.

A construction equipment inventory was developed for a typical construction project, with the high noise level equipment identified for evaluation. Table 4-3 presents the loudest equipment types that would generally be operating during each construction phase. The composite average or equivalent site noise level, representing noise from all equipment averaged over the workday, is also presented.

Table 4-3. Construction Equipment and Composite Site Noise Levels

Construction Phase	Loudest Construction Equipment	Maximum Equipment Noise Level at 50 ft (dBA)	Composite Site Noise Level for Construction Phase at 50 ft (dBA)
Site clearing and excavation	Bulldozer	90	89
	Truck	82	
	Backhoe	84	
	Grader	85	
	Tractor scraper	87	
	Compactor	83	
Concrete pouring	Ready-mix truck	84	87
	Mobile crane	85	
	Concrete pump	82	
	Pile driver	102	
Steel erection	Pneumatic tools	90	90
	Air compressor	76	
	Mobile crane	85	
	Cherry picker	80	
Mechanical	Pneumatic tools	90	89
	Air compressor	76	

Construction Phase	Loudest Construction Equipment	Maximum Equipment Noise Level at 50 ft (dBA)	Composite Site Noise Level for Construction Phase at 50 ft (dBA)
	Mobile crane	85	
Cleanup	Truck	84	86
	Front-end loader	87	

Sources: Barnes *et al.*, 1977.
ECT, 2020.

The nearest off-property receptor is located approximately 425 feet west of the construction area. Table 4-4 presents average or equivalent construction noise levels projected at the closest off-site receptor, i.e., residences on the western property boundary. Average noise levels during the loudest construction activities are projected to be between 68 and 72 dBA at the western property boundary. Noise levels from construction activities would be lower at all other property boundaries. These noise levels from construction activities would not be continuous but rather would be intermittent and would only occur during daytime hours. Since the overall duration of each construction phase would be relatively short, noise impacts during construction would be minor.

Table 4-4. Projected Average Construction Noise Levels at Nearest (Western) Property Boundary Based on Composite Noise Levels

Construction Phase	Noise Level at Western Property Boundary (dBA)
Site clearing and construction	71
Concrete pouring	69
Steel erection	72
Mechanical	71
Cleanup	68

Source: ECT, 2020.

The project may operate during both daytime and nighttime hours, so Tampa's nighttime sound level limit would be used as design goals for project mitigation scenarios. The Tampa noise limits for residential noise receptors is 60 dBA during the daytime (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.) and 55 dBA during nighttime (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.). [ref: City of Tampa Code of Ordinances, Section 27-28.7] These noise limits are applicable to project sound levels only and are not inclusive of the ambient environment.

Ambient noise readings were obtained at several potential off-site noise-sensitive receptors in the general area of the Project. These receptors were considered to be residential noise receptors. The measured daytime sound levels ranged from 50 to 66 dBA and the measured nighttime sound levels ranged from 42 to 54 dBA. [ref: MacDill Air Force Base Sound Study, Burns & McDonnell, Revision 1, March 12, 2020]

Predictive noise modeling was performed for the proposed distributed generation engines using noise data obtained from the engine manufacturer and state-of-the-art noise predictive modeling software. Five off-site residential noise receptors were selected in the general vicinity of the Project. The predictive results of the noise modeling for all four engine-generators at the off-site residential receptors range from 46 to 55 dBA. The noise study is appended as Appendix D. [ref: MacDill Air Force Base Sound Study, Burns & McDonnell, Revision 1, March 12, 2020]. Additionally, an acoustic enclosure would be used around the emergency generators if necessary, to meet applicable sound limitations.

Based on this assessment, the project would have minor adverse noise impacts on a short-term basis during construction and no adverse noise impacts on a long-term basis during operation in the immediate vicinity of the project.

4.4.2 No-action Alternative

Under the no-action alternative, the TEC distributed generation facilities would not be constructed. The noise environment, as described in Section 3.1, would remain unchanged. Therefore, implementation of the no-action alternative would result in no significant impact to the noise environment.

4.5 TRANSPORTATION

4.5.1 Proposed Action

An increase in traffic in the north-central portion of the base would result during implementation of the Proposed Action because of the increase in construction-related activities. These negative impacts are considered minor and short-term. Similarly, some traffic disruptions would occur along the pipeline route during construction. These impacts would be temporary and isolated. The Project shall conform to all applicable local regulations, and TEC would work cooperatively with the City of Tampa during construction.

Upon completion, the Proposed Action would result in a slight increase in the number of vehicles entering the base, as a result of the additional personnel for occasional operations and maintenance activities. The transportation infrastructure, including entry and exit gates, would be able to accommodate the slight increase in traffic. Implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in a significant impact on base transportation of conflict with current base activities.

4.5.2 No-action Alternative

Under the no-action alternative no changes to transportation would be incurred by construction or operation of the Proposed Action.

4.6 WASTES, HAZARDOUS MATERIAL, AND STORED FUEL

The following section describes sanitary wastewater treatment, solid waste collection and disposal, hazardous material and waste management, and stored fuels management.

4.6.1 Proposed Action

A short-term increase in the generation of solid waste would occur during construction activities for the Proposed Action. A long-term increase in the generation of solid waste would occur after construction because of the additional activity. The base has sufficient resources to manage the short term and long-term increase in solid waste and the local landfills have sufficient capacity to accept the solid waste in the short term and long term.

The construction of restroom facilities is included in the Proposed Action. Implementation of the Proposed Action is not anticipated to result in a significant change in the total volume of wastewater to the AFB septic system. A 300- to 500-gallon holding tank of high-density polyethylene would be used to receive the high chloride regeneration wastewaters. All fittings, valves, piping should be of such a material to resist chloride corrosion. The holding tank should be vented and may be provided with a means to add a small amount of peroxide or chloride periodically to control biologic growths and odors. There should not be any significant additions of organics to support biological growth. Any suspected source of offensive odors would be eliminated at the onset. The size of the holding tank will be sufficient to accommodate the number of regeneration cycles per month, the total quantity of water that is generated from each cycle, and the anticipated pump out schedule.

Hazardous wastes/materials, such as paint, adhesives, and solvents, may be onsite during the construction work for 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. Oils, greases, lubricants, adhesives, batteries, and other hazardous wastes/materials would be used to maintain the generation engines. Used oil and filters, greases, lubricants, and adhesive wastes may be generated during operation of the facility. Waste batteries would be generated. Minor adverse impacts from hazardous materials or waste are anticipated from completion and operation of the project.

ERP sites are located in the vicinity of the Proposed Action, including one ERP site (SWMU-28) partially located on Site A. Entomology Wash Shop (SWMU-28) is located adjacent to the western/southwestern portion of Site A. The property is listed within the Division of Waste Management contaminated sites database, which is a listing of active or known sites. Following environmental restoration activities, a no-further-action (NFA) determination was granted for SWMU-28.

ERP Site DA568 is located at the proposed action site. Site DA568 has soil contamination that exceed Commercial/Industrial soil clean-up criteria and must be properly managed to ensure health, safety and environmental compliance. Contaminated soil source removal activities within the area of the proposed action would be conducted in general accordance with Chapter 62-780.525(5), F.A.C. to address the potential for impact to the health of construction workers for those soils that exceed the Chapter 62-777, F.A.C. C/I SCTLs. The volume of impacted soil is estimated to be 305 cubic yards (430 tons). The source removal would involve the following:

- Preparation of a site-specific health and safety plan for subcontractors and Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc. personnel,
- Preparation of a waste generation profile,
- Demarcation of the area to be excavated,
- Excavation and stockpiling of the soil,
- Offsite transportation and offsite disposal of the impacted soil,
- Backfilling and grading of the excavation with clean fill,
- Oversight of the onsite activities by qualified personnel, and
- Preparation of a source removal report with documentation of the transport and disposal of the impacted soil.

Those soils that exceed only the residential soil cleanup target levels would be left on-site since this is an industrial facility that would not be used for any residential purposes. Additionally, the remaining soil contamination left within the proposed action area and any outside the proposed action will be investigated and managed by the Air Force ERP. By removing and properly disposing of soils that exceed the commercial/Industrial soil cleanup target levels, implementation of the proposed action would result in no significant impact to wastes, hazardous materials, and stored fuels.

A 200-gallon tank would be stored onsite to supply diesel fuel for the emergency fire water pump during an event. Other storage tanks located onsite may include a 7,000-gallon new lubricating oil tank, a second separate 7,000-gallon service lubricating oil tank, and a 26,650-gallon urea storage tank, subject to final basis of design.

Waste, hazardous material and stored fuel associated with the construction and operation of the proposed facility would be stored or removed and disposed of according to base procedures, as well as applicable state and federal regulations. All tanks would be constructed, registered, and maintained in accordance with all applicable FDEP and Hillsborough County EPC requirements. It is unlikely the additional amounts of hazardous materials and hazardous wastes would exceed any new reporting threshold. Therefore, any new impacts would be insignificant. Hazardous materials and waste would continue to be managed in accordance with State of Florida and federal regulations, and through MacDill AFB's hazardous waste management plan.

4.6.2 No-action Alternative

Under the no-action alternative, the TEC distributed generation facilities would not be constructed, and existing facilities would not be relocated. Wastes, hazardous materials, and stored fuels, as described in Section 3.4, would remain unchanged. Therefore, implementation of the no-action alternative would result in no significant impact to wastes, hazardous materials, and stored fuels.

4.7 WATER RESOURCES

The analysis of potential impacts to water resources considers the potential impacts on groundwater, surface water, and wetlands.

4.7.1 Proposed Action

No impacts to wetlands are expected to occur as a result of the Proposed Action. Impacts to wetlands during construction would be avoided through the use of specialized construction techniques (such as horizontal directional drill) and BMPs. Some soil erosion would occur during construction activities; however, implementation of a sediment and erosion control plan, including use of BMPs such as silt fencing and hay bales, would dramatically reduce erosion and avoid potential storm water impacts. Any short-term, minor, adverse impacts on the MacDill AFB storm water system resulting from construction associated with the Proposed Action Soil disturbance from construction activities has the potential to temporarily disrupt existing man-made storm water drainage systems and natural drainage patterns through soil erosion and sediment production. Because construction would disturb more than one acre, discharge of storm water runoff from construction activities must be covered under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit (CGP) and authorized by FDEP. The CGP would require development of a site-specific storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) that includes soil erosion and sediment controls, and construction site waste control components.

Under the Proposed Action, there are no direct and only minimal indirect discharges to groundwater. Construction of the new impervious surfaces would include appropriately sized storm water treatment/attenuation areas. The storm water retention areas would collect surface water runoff from the impervious surfaces and allow it to infiltrate into the ground, recharging the groundwater in the surficial aquifer. Design of the storm water management system would be permitted by the Southwest Florida Water Management District and would, therefore, be required to demonstrate a no-net increase in the post-development discharge of pollutants to receiving surface waters.

Wastewater generated under the Proposed Action includes a minimal amount of water softener discharge associated with the makeup water system. A review of disposal options concluded that a connection to the AFB wastewater treatment system would be cost-prohibitive, and the City of Tampa would not provide a service connection, since this facility would be located inside the AFB. Under the Proposed Action, the water softener discharge would be directed to an onsite holding tank. Due to the small volume of discharge generated, it is anticipated that the capacity of this holding tank would be between 300 and 500 gallons that would be contracted for pumping out on yearly basis or more frequently as needed. Any wastewater associated with the fire suppression system would collect in the storm water attenuation areas, in the occasion of a fire event.

Additionally, the construction of restroom facilities is included in the Proposed Action. Implementation of the Proposed Action is not anticipated to result in a significant change in the total volume of wastewater to the AFB septic system.

Implementation of the Proposed Action would result in additional activity onsite, which would be accompanied by a slight increase in potable water usage.

Short-term impacts to water resources resulting from construction of the Proposed Action are expected to be minor and managed through the implementation of BMPs. Long-term minor impacts to water resources are not expected to be significant and would be managed through design controls.

4.7.2 No-action Alternative

Under the no-action alternative, the TEC distributed generation facilities would not be constructed, and existing facilities would not be relocated. Water resources, as described in Section 3.5, would remain unchanged. Therefore, implementation of the no-action alternative would result in no significant impact to water resources.

4.8 FLOODPLAINS

4.8.1 Proposed Action

In accordance with the requirements of EO 11988, CZMA, and Air Force Manual 32-7003, USAF must demonstrate there is no practicable alternative to carrying out the Proposed Action within the floodplain. A portion of the Proposed Action on the base property is within the 100-year coastal floodplain including the battery units and a portion of the generation units. It should be noted that both the battery units and the generation units will be constructed at an elevation above the 100-year coastal floodplain. Additionally, the proposed underground transmission line connecting the generation units, battery units, and the Interbay substation are located partially within the 100-year floodplain (Figure 3-3).

Similarly, off base features, including the underground transmission interconnection and a proposed natural gas pipeline, are located within the floodplain (Figure 3-4). The impacts would be avoided by using specialized construction methods such as horizontal directional drilling. Both features would be designed with the expectation of being regularly submerged by groundwater. Any additional impacts to

these components due to floodwater levels up to the 100-year floodplain would be accounted for during the detailed design.

There are no long-term direct impacts to the floodplain associated with the development. These features would be constructed underground and should not impact floodplain hydrology once constructed. Hence, implementation of the Proposed Action would result short-term minor direct impacts and long-term indirect impacts to the floodplains. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed action would result in no significant impacts to floodplains.

4.8.2 No-action Alternative

Under the no-action alternative, the TEC distributed generation facilities would not be constructed, and existing facilities would not be relocated. Floodplains, as described in Section 3.6, would remain unchanged. Therefore, implementation of the no-action alternative would result in no significant impact to floodplains.

4.9 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 OSHA requirements to ensure the protection of workers and the general public during construction. The contaminated soil that lies beneath the proposed improvements would be excavated, disposed offsite, and replaced with clean fill material prior to initiating construction of facilities. Completion of source removal activities in accordance with the applicable direct exposure scenario would adequately reduce the potential for exposure to site workers during facility construction.

4.10 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

4.10.1 Proposed Action

Approximately 39 percent (38.8 percent) of the population in the ROI identifies as minority (i.e., those classified as not white and not Hispanic or Latino), which is lower than both Tampa (55

percent) and Florida (45 percent). Table 4-5 provides information on race, ethnicity, and poverty characteristics across all geographic areas. Low-income residents make up 31.5 percent of the ROI, which is lower than Tampa (41 percent) and Florida (36 percent) (EJ Screen).

Table 4-5. Determination of Minority and Low-Income Populations

Geographic Area	Total Population	Percent Minority	Disproportionate	Percent Low-Income	Disproportionate	Minority Population	Low-Income Population
Florida	21,477,737	45	—	36	—	—	—
Tampa	366,082	55	—	41	—	—	—
ROI	29,123	38.8	No	31.5	No	No	No

*For which Minority Population is calculated.

Source: EJ Screen, 2020.

Table 4-6 provides the age distribution in the ROI, Tampa, and Florida. The population in the ROI has a slighter higher percentage of children under 5 (7.6 percent) compared to Tampa (6 percent) and Florida (5 percent). The percentage of elderly persons is lower in the ROI (10.5 percent) than in Tampa (12 percent) and Florida (19 percent).

Table 4-6. Determination of Age Populations (Percent)

Geographic Area	ROI	Tampa	Florida
Under 5	7.6	6	5
Over 65	10.5	12	19

While the population density of children within one mile of the proposed site may be higher, we look for “disproportionate impacts,” which is defined as the “differences in impacts or risks that are extensive enough that they may merit Agency action.” (EPA, 2016; AF Guide for EJ Analysis under the EIAP, September 2020). There is a day care facility located approximately 2,000 feet to the north-northwest and an elementary school located approximately 3,000 feet to the west. Children would be participating in outdoor activities during the day. The available census data allows for determining the population of children under 5-years age at the census tract level.

As noted in the discussion of air quality impacts describing potential sources of air emissions, the types of equipment to be used, the number of hours of operation, the use of selective catalytic reduction

technology, and other factors would limit the potential impact to air quality even in the immediate vicinity of the project.

The Proposed Action would cost approximately \$105 million to complete, based on 2020 cost estimates, and approximately \$1.2 million in fuel costs per year to operate. Minority or low-income populations are not disproportionately represented in the area around the Proposed Action; therefore, no adverse effects on minority and low-income populations would occur with implementation of the Proposed Action at MacDill AFB.

Minority and low-income populations are not disproportionately represented in the likely area that would be impacted by the Proposed Action. Therefore, no adverse effects on minority and low-income populations are anticipated with implementation of the Proposed Action at the selected location at MacDill AFB.

4.10.2 No-action Alternative

Under the no-action alternative, no expenditure would occur. Therefore, there would be no additional economic impact to the local region. Impacts on environmental justice and sensitive receptor populations would not transpire under the no-action alternative. Facility construction would not occur, and there would be no increases in support personnel or aircraft operations. Environmental justice and sensitive receptor conditions at and surrounding MacDill AFB would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions.

4.11 OTHER ITEMS WITH NO POTENTIAL IMPACTS

In addition to the resources discussed in the previous sections, the potential impacts to geology and soils on the MacDill AFB were evaluated along with socioeconomics and airspace and airfield operations. Based on this evaluation, there are no potential impacts likely to any of these resources resulting from implementation of the Proposed Action or any of the alternatives considered to be resources on the base.

4.12 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

4.12.1 No-action Alternative

Evaluation of the no-action alternative is a requirement of NEPA and its associated implementing regulations (40 CFR 1502.14[d]) to allow federal decision-makers to compare the impacts of the proposed project and its alternatives with the impacts of not constructing the project. The no-action alternative considers the environmental impacts if the proposed project was not accomplished. Under the no-action alternative, the generation facility would not be constructed on AFB property. The project would either not be constructed or an alternative location offsite would be utilized; in either case, the environmental conditions on base would remain at baseline.

4.12.2 Proposed Action

Table 4-7 presents a summary comparison of the potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Action and the no-action alternative.

Table 4-7. Comparison of Environmental Consequences

Environmental Resources	Proposed Action		No-action Alternative	
Air quality	Short-term	<i>minor adverse</i>	Short-term	no impact
	Long-term	<i>minor adverse</i>	Long-term	no impact
	Cumulative	no impact	Cumulative	no impact
Noise	Short-term	<i>minor adverse</i>	Short-term	no impact
	Long-term	no impact	Long-term	no impact
	Cumulative	no impact	Cumulative	no impact
Hazardous materials	Short-term	<i>minor adverse</i>	Short-term	no impact
	Long-term	<i>minor adverse</i>	Long-term	no impact
	Cumulative	no impact	Cumulative	no impact
Water resources	Short-term	<i>minor adverse</i>	Short-term	no impact
	Long-term	<i>minor adverse</i>	Long-term	no impact
	Cumulative	no impact	Cumulative	no impact
Floodplains	Short-term	<i>minor adverse</i>	Short-term	no impact
	Long-term	no impact	Long-term	no impact
	Cumulative	no impact	Cumulative	no impact
Cultural resources	Short-term	no impact	Short-term	no impact
	Long-term	no impact	Long-term	no impact
	Cumulative	no impact	Cumulative	no impact
Transportation	Short-term	<i>minor adverse</i>	Short-term	no impact
	Long-term	no impact	Long-term	no impact
	Cumulative	no impact	Cumulative	no impact
Safety and occupational health	Short-term	no impact	Short-term	no impact
	Long-term	no impact	Long-term	no impact
	Cumulative	no impact	Cumulative	no impact
Socioeconomics	Short-term	<i>minor beneficial</i>	Short-term	no impact
	Long-term	no impact	Long-term	no impact
	Cumulative	no impact	Cumulative	no impact
Biological resources	Short-term	no impact	Short-term	no impact
	Long-term	no impact	Long-term	no impact
	Cumulative	no impact	Cumulative	no impact
Geology and soils	Short-term	no impact	Short-term	no impact
	Long-term	no impact	Long-term	no impact
	Cumulative	no impact	Cumulative	no impact
Environmental justice	Short-term	no impact	Short-term	no impact
	Long-term	no impact	Long-term	no impact
	Cumulative	no impact	Cumulative	no impact
Airspace and airfield operations	Short-term	<i>minor adverse</i>	Short-term	no impact
	Long-term	no impact	Long-term	no impact
	Cumulative	no impact	Cumulative	no impact

As indicated in Table 4-7, the Proposed Action would result in minor, short-term beneficial impacts to socioeconomics. The Proposed Action would minimize new impacts to wetlands and floodplains through

the use of collocation opportunities and through the use of specialized construction techniques and best management practices during construction.

When considered as a portion of the total proposed and/or ongoing construction projects on MacDill AFB⁽³⁾, the Proposed Action would have no significant cumulative impacts to air quality, noise, waste management, water resources, transportation, safety and occupational health, biological resources, geology and soils, cultural resources, environmental justice, or airspace and airfield operations, as outlined in Table 4-7. The Proposed Action, when combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would similarly not result in cumulatively significant effects on any resource area. Non-significant potential cumulative effects for each resource area identified in the previous sections are discussed in Section 4.13.

4.13 REASONABLY FORESEEABLE FUTURE PROJECTS / CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

CEQ regulations for NEPA implementation require that the cumulative impacts of a Proposed Action be assessed (40 CFR §§ 1500–1508). A cumulative effect is defined as the following (40 CFR § 1508.1): The impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.

CEQ's guidance for considering cumulative effects states that NEPA documents "should compare the cumulative effects of multiple actions with appropriate national, regional, state, or community goals to determine whether the total effect is significant." Assessing cumulative effects involves identifying and defining the scope of other actions and their interrelationship with a Proposed Action or alternatives. The scope must consider other projects that coincide with the location and timeline of a Proposed Action and other actions. Table 4-8 lists planned MacDill AFB Installation Development Projects FY21-FY25, which have been considered with evaluation of the significance of cumulative effects related to the proposed action.

³ 2018 Final Environmental Assessment for SOCCENT Operations Facility MacDill AFB, Florida.

Table 4-8. Reasonably Foreseeable/Cumulative Projects

Project Number	Project Title	Estimated Total Area Impacted (SF)	Project Description
NVZR153713	ADAL Fuel Cell Maintenance Dock Building 1071	30,500	Renovate approximately 17,000 SF of Building 1071 and construct a new 13,500 SF addition to improve KC-135 Fuel Maintenance.
NVR173702	Construct MARCENT HQ Facility	59,700	Construct an approximately 60,000 SF facility within the existing CENTCOM Complex and demolish Buildings 535 and 548 to support MARCENT Command functions.
NVZR153704	Construct CENTCOM Support Facility	134,400	Construct a multi-story CENTCOM Support Facility and demolish Buildings 529, 530, 531, 550, 1047, 3070, 3071, 3072, and 3541. Needed to accommodate personnel for command and control functions.
NVZR133713	Construct Youth Center	44,000	Construct a Youth Activity Center to consolidate functions currently operating in Building 307.
NVZR18-0070	Construct Alert Facility/Alert Ramp Improvements	86,000	Construct a 2-story 30,000 SF building with an additional alert ramp to house alert crews and to support operational readiness and administrative functions.
NVZR160038 & NVZR160034	Construct Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Administration Building and Storage Facility	40,000	Construct an administration building and adjacent warehouse along the shoreline at the WWTP for administrative and operational functions. Install new electrical utilities to upgrade service to the WWTP.
NVZR080003	Construct FAM Camp Annex	800,000	Clear wooded areas to add RV parking pads, a centralized activity center, and other amenities for the FAM Camp.
NVZR173708	Construct New Fire Station	10,000	Construct a new fire station with larger bays and drive-thru access near the Base Theater to house modern fire-fighting equipment.
NVZR053706	Construct Fuels Management Facility	10,500	Demolish Building 1062 and construct a new adequately sized and properly configured Fuel Management Facility, including a laboratory, resource control center, and offices.

Project Number	Project Title	Estimated Total Area Impacted (SF)	Project Description
NVZR093705	Extend Great Egret Avenue	60,000	Extend Great Egret Ave to S. Boundary Blvd to alleviate traffic congestion and improve traffic flow and promote pedestrian safety.
NVZR173706	Construct LRS Vehicle Maintenance Complex	32,000 (Building)/ 293,000 (Parking/ Roadway)	Demolish Buildings 119, 175, 178, 500, 510, and 3175 to clear site for new construction. New construction would consist of multiple buildings and a parking lot to support Logistics Readiness, Maintenance and Operations Squadron. Approximately 975 feet of Marina Bay Drive would be realigned, and two box culverts would be added.
Unknown/IDP	SOCOM Main HQ Replacement Facility (Building 501)	210,000	Construct a new secure SOCOM HQ facility to accommodate approximately 5,000 personnel needed to perform command and control functions.
Unknown / IDP	Construct SOCOM Parking Lot	43,500	Construct a new parking lot with approximately 400 parking spaces near the SOCOM facility to correct deficiency in parking availability.
NVZR143705	Add COCOM Essential Power Upgrade	Unknown	Upgrade to electrical system to provide reliable continuous power without voltage fluctuations.
Unknown / IDP	Construct Multi-Use Access Trails	30	Survey, design, and permit a series of access trails to provide established, maintained access points for accomplishing invasive species control work, provide maintained fire breaks for access and prescribed burn preparation and to provide for recreational opportunities.
Unknown / IDP	Dredge Hole Fill & Seagrass Restoration	10	Survey, design, model, and obtain permits for the placement of fill material in two historic dredge holes to restore historic bay bottom elevations in order to support the growth of seagrass beds and prevent further erosion as part of MacDill's Shoreline Stabilization effort.

4.13.1 Air Quality

Taking into account the effects of all past, present, and reasonably foreseeable emissions, potential air emissions generated by construction and operation of the Proposed Action would be minor. It is understood that construction activities from the Proposed Action would be temporary and of relatively short duration. Air emissions during operation of the Proposed Action would be minor due to the limited size and nature and would not contribute appreciably to adverse cumulative effects to air quality. No planned project has been identified that when combined with the Proposed Action would have greater than significant effects to air quality. These effects would be minor.

4.13.2 Noise

Short-term minor, adverse effects from the Proposed Action during construction would occur and add cumulatively to noise generated from other proposed construction projects, temporarily resulting in a minor increase in overall noise impacts. The noise affecting the immediate area surrounding MacDill AFB would continue to be dominated by aircraft takeoff and landing operations. Additionally, the best available noise data were used as a comparative baseline to determine the level of effects. The Proposed Action would not contribute to long-term impacts to noise levels at receptors located off the air force base property.

4.13.3 Water Resources

Short-term adverse, cumulative impacts on water resources, although not significant, would be expected from implementation of the Proposed Action and along with other cumulative projects involving ground disturbance. Soil disturbance from construction would temporarily result in erosion, sedimentation, and degraded water quality in the local area. The cumulative increase in impacts resulting from the Proposed Action and cumulative projects would be considered a minor contribution in the context of the whole watershed.

Because some of the Proposed Action takes place within the 100-year coastal floodplain, construction activities when considered in conjunction with some of the other cumulative projects may contribute to a net increase of impacts within the floodplain. In accordance with federal and state storm water regulations, the post-development hydrologic conditions of project areas must be maintained as they were during predevelopment. For these project areas, preservation of pre-development hydrologic conditions would be ensured through utilization of new and existing storm water management systems and

adherence to SWPPPs and incorporation of other BMPs. Appropriate low-impact development strategies would also be expected to attenuate potentially long-term, adverse impacts on water resources.

While long-term adverse impacts are not expected, there would be short-term, adverse, cumulative impacts on wetlands and waters of the United States. The Proposed Action would not result in direct impacts on wetlands, although it is possible that cumulative projects would result in direct or indirect impacts on wetlands. Design, siting, use of specialized construction techniques and the proper implementation of construction BMPs would minimize potential cumulative impacts.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

Based on the analyses presented in this EA, it is expected that the Proposed Action would not have a significant effect on the quality of the environment and would have the added benefit of providing the area with increased energy security capability.

6.0 MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS

6.1 AIR QUALITY

Minor source air construction and air operation permits would be required for the distributed generation units. Reasonable precautions would be implemented to control emissions of unconfined particulate matter during construction activities in accordance with Rule 62-296.320(4)(c), F.A.C. All hazardous materials used during construction must comply with the MacDill AFB Hazardous Materials Management Program's requirements for low volatile organic compound content.

6.2 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/WASTES

Characterization and disposal of any hazardous or special waste must be coordinated with MacDill AFB's Environmental Compliance Program. Permitting through the Hillsborough County Environmental Protection Commission would be required for large storage tanks (over 550 gallons).

6.3 WATER RESOURCES

Appropriate water quality permit applications for active construction sites and post construction storm water management systems must be submitted for the distributed generation units, including USACE permitting and an Environmental Resource Permit from FDEP. Depending on design level details not yet determined, the project may meet the threshold for a General Permit for a Storm Water Management System in uplands serving less than 10 acres of total project area and less than 2 acres of impervious surface under Section 403.814(12) F.S.[HB 589 2016]. Additionally, BMPs, such as silt screens and placement of hay bales, must be employed during construction to prevent erosion and storm water violations during all construction activities. New construction must comply with applicable water and energy conservation requirements.

6.4 SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

Construction activities must be compliant with current OSHA standards or more stringent standards if applicable. A site-specific health and safety plan must be prepared prior to initiating construction. Workers completing excavation or dirt-moving activities must have completed 40-hour hazardous waste operations and emergency response training and the annual 8-hour refresher course.

6.5 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Ground surface areas disturbed during construction must be reseeded or revegetated with native flora.

7.0 PERSONS CONTACTED

Andrew Rider
6 CES/CENPO
7621 Hillsborough Loop Drive
MacDill AFB, Florida 33621
(813) 828-2718

Jason Aldridge
Division of Historical Resources
Compliance Review Section
500 South Bronough Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0250
(800) 245-6300

Jay Harrington
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
7915 Baymeadows Way, Suite 200
Jacksonville, Florida 32256

8.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

This EA was prepared under the direction of MacDill AFB by Tampa Electric Company and the Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc., team.

Members of the staff include:

MacDill AFB

Andrew Rider, PE, GS-12, DAF
6 CES/CEIE
Chief, Environmental Element

Jason Kirkpatrick, Contractor, PAE Inc.
6 CES/CEIE
Environmental Element Manager

Tampa Electric Company

Byron Burrows, P.E.
Director, Environmental Services Department

Amy Butler, P.E.
Senior Consulting Engineer

Robert Velasco, P.E.
Engineer Consulting Senior

Jordan Ekhlassi, P.E.
Engineer Senior

Adriano Alcoz
EHS Consulting Specialist

Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.

William F. Karl, P.E.
Senior Engineer

Darren L. Stowe, AICP
Principal Scientist

Jude Dawson
Senior Scientist

Ursula Nash, GISP
Senior GIS Analyst

9.0 REFERENCES

- AMEC. 2012. Threatened and Endangered Species Study, MacDill Air Force Base, U.S. Air Force, Florida.
- City of Tampa Code of Ordinances, Section 27-28.7.
- Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). 1997.
- MacDill Air Force Base Sound Study, Burns & McDonnell, Revision 1, March 12, 2020.
- U.S. Air Force. 2010. Transportation Study: Future Conditions Technical Memorandum, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
- U.S. Air Force. 2014c.
- U.S. Air Force. 2012. Economic Resource Impact Statement, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
- U.S. Air Force. 2016. Multi-Sector Generic Permit for Stormwater Discharge Associated with Industrial Activity #FLR05E128-004
- U.S. Air Force. 2017a. Final Environmental Assessment for KC-135 Aircraft, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
- U.S. Air Force. 2017b. Hazardous Waste Management Plan, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
- U.S. Air Force. 2017c. Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
- U.S. Air Force. 2017d. Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
- U.S. Air Force. 2017e. Non-Title V Synthetic Minor Air Operation Permit #0570141-020-AO, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
- U.S. Air Force. 2018a. Final Environmental Assessment for SOCCENT Operations Facility MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
- U.S. Air Force. 2018b. Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
- U.S. Air Force. 2019a. Facility Response Plan, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
- U.S. Air Force. 2019b. Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.
- U.S. Air Force. 2020a. Phase I Archaeological Survey of 2,236.79 Acres Within MacDill Air Force Base, Hillsborough County, Florida.
- U.S. Air Force. 2020b. Final Environmental Baseline Survey, Energy Assurance Project Proposed Tampa Electric Company Site, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.

- U.S. Air Force. 2022a. Phase II Environmental Baseline Survey, Energy Assurance Project Proposed Tampa Electric Company Site, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida, 10 January 2022
- U.S. Air Force. 2022b. Soil Management Plan. Energy Assurance Project Proposed Tampa Electric Company Site, MacDill Air Force Base. Florida, 10 January 2022
- U.S. Air Force. 2022c. Addendum to Final Environmental Baseline Survey, MacDill Air Force Base Energy Assurance Project, Proposed Tampa Electric Company Site, 12 January 2022
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2016a.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2014b.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2017. Air Emissions Inventories. <https://www.epa.gov/air-emissions-inventories>. Accessed June 2020.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) Table. <https://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants/naaqs-table>.

APPENDIX A

AIR FORCE FORM AF 813

REQUEST FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

Report Control Symbol
RCS:

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 - PROPONENT INFORMATION

1. TO (Environmental Planning Function) 6 CES/CEIEC	2. FROM (Proponent organization and functional address symbol) 6 CES/CEP	2a. TELEPHONE NO.
3. TITLE OF PROPOSED ACTION MacDill Distributed Generation Facility		
4. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION (Identify decision to be made and need date) MacDill AFB seeks to improve the installation's energy resilience through establishment of alternative and/or redundant electrical power generation facilities. Redundant electrical power systems are needed to improve mission sustainability.		
5. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES (DOPAA) (Provide sufficient details for evaluation of the total action.) Construct and operate natural gas-fired distributed generation facilities. The project includes a battery storage component and offsite underground transmission and pipeline for natural gas supply to the four proposed Wartsila units.		
6. PROPONENT APPROVAL (Name and Grade)	6a. SIGNATURE	6b. DATE

SECTION II - PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL SURVEY (Check appropriate box and describe potential environmental effects including cumulative effects.) (+ = positive effect, 0 = no effect, - = adverse effect, U = unknown effect)

	+	0	-	U
7. AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBLE USE ZONE/LAND USE (Noise, accident potential, encroachment, etc.)	☐	☒	☐	☐
8. AIR QUALITY (Emissions, attainment status, state implementation plan, etc.)	☐	☐	☒	☐
9. WATER RESOURCES (Quality, quantity, source, etc.)	☐	☒	☐	☐
10. SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH (Asbestos/radiation/chemical exposure, explosives safety quantity-distance, bird/wildlife aircraft hazard, etc.)	☐	☐	☒	☐
11. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/WASTE (Use/storage/generation, solid waste, etc.)	☐	☐	☒	☐
12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (Wetlands/floodplains, threatened or endangered species, etc.)	☐	☒	☐	☐
13. CULTURAL RESOURCES (Native American burial sites, archaeological, historical, etc.)	☐	☒	☐	☐
14. GEOLOGY AND SOILS (Topography, minerals, geothermal, Installation Restoration Program, seismicity, etc.)	☐	☒	☐	☐
15. SOCIOECONOMIC (Employment/population projections, school and local fiscal impacts, etc.)	☒	☐	☐	☐
16. OTHER (Potential impacts not addressed above.)	☐	☐	☐	☐

SECTION III - ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS DETERMINATION

17. ☐ PROPOSED ACTION QUALIFIES FOR CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION (CATEX) # _____ ; OR ☒ PROPOSED ACTION DOES NOT QUALIFY FOR A CATEX; FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS IS REQUIRED.
18. REMARKS
19. ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING FUNCTION CERTIFICATION (Name and Grade)
19a. SIGNATURE
19b. DATE

APPENDIX B

PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER LIST AND COMMUNICATIONS AND OTHER AGENCY CONSULTATIONS

APPENDIX B

PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER LIST AND COMMUNICATIONS

Federal Agency Contacts

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Southeast Region, Regional Director

State Agency Contacts

Florida Coastal Management Program, Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Florida Division of Historical Resources

Florida Office of Intergovernmental Programs; Florida State Clearinghouse

Tribal Contacts

Seminole Tribe of Florida

Seminole Nation of Oklahoma

Miccosukee Tribe of Florida

Muscogee (Creek) Nation

Tampa Bay Times

SUPPORT THE TAMPA BAY TIMES

We offer two tax-deductible ways to support the Tampa Bay Times.

Contributions to the Tampa Bay Times Journalism Fund help sustain our newsroom – including our coverage of government, health, business, education and politics, sports and entertainment.

Contributions to the Tampa Bay Times Investigative Fund directly support watchdog journalism – our newsroom’s efforts to uncover wrongdoing, hold the powerful accountable and bring voice to the voiceless.

• • •

Donations to either fund can be made at tampabay.com/donate

• • •

You also can donate by check, made out to the Poynter Institute, our nonprofit owner. Please put the name of the fund you’d like to support in the check’s subject line. Mail to: Tampa Bay Times Journalism Fund/ Investigative Fund C/O Poynter Institute, 801 Third St. S St. Petersburg, FL 33701

• • •

For more information, contact Annica Keeler, development and community relations director, at akeeler@tampabay.com or 727-892-2264.

BRIEFLY

UNITED STATES

FACEBOOK SAYS IT STOPPED THREE NETWORKS USING FAKE ACCOUNTS

Facebook said it took down three small, separate networks using fake accounts to try to mislead people on its social media sites, including at least one account sowing misinformation about the election. Two of the networks were targeting audiences in the United States, and one fake account was trying to convince people of unsubstantiated claims that voting systems have been compromised. Facebook took down the three networks under its coordinated inauthentic behavior policy, which removes fake accounts that work together to try to mislead people about who they are and their intentions. The company used the same policy this summer to take down a network of more than 100 pages and accounts affiliated with felon and former Republican operative Roger Stone. Facebook said it stopped three networks using fake accounts to try to mislead people on its social media sites, including at least one account sowing misinformation about the election. Two of the networks were targeting audiences in the United States, and one fake account was trying to convince people of unsubstantiated claims that voting systems have been compromised. Facebook took down the three networks under its coordinated inauthentic behavior policy, which removes fake accounts that work together to try to mislead people about who they are and their intentions. The company used the same policy this summer to take down a network of more than 100 pages and accounts affiliated with felon and former Republican operative Roger Stone. Facebook said it stopped three networks using fake accounts to try to mislead people on its social media sites, including at least one account sowing misinformation about the election. Two of the networks were targeting audiences in the United States, and one fake account was trying to convince people of unsubstantiated claims that voting systems have been compromised. Facebook took down the three networks under its coordinated inauthentic behavior policy, which removes fake accounts that work together to try to mislead people about who they are and their intentions. The company used the same policy this summer to take down a network of more than 100 pages and accounts affiliated with felon and former Republican operative Roger Stone.

UNITED STATES

Google to ban political ads after election

Google said Tuesday it will ban all ads related to the U.S. election after polls close Nov. 3, adding it expects the ban to last at least a week. The company, based in Mountain View, Calif., cited its “sensitive events” policy, which seeks to stop brands from profiting off fast-moving, critical events. Election results will probably take longer to confirm this year as more people vote by mail, and Google said in a blog post Tuesday that the ban is necessary “to limit the potential for ads to increase confusion post-election.” The ban will cover any ad that mentions a candidate, a political party, or an election, among other election-related content. Google used to same policy to halt political ads when protests



JAE C. HONG | Associated Press

CALIFORNIA

Winds a risk as wildfires force thousands to evacuate

Firefighter Raymond Vasquez battles the Silverado Fire on Monday in Irvine, where residents had to evacuate and two firefighters were critically injured. A few miles away, another blaze sent people fleeing from Yorba Linda. More than 90,000 people were under evacuation orders in Southern California on Tuesday. Forecasts call for Santa Ana winds, with some of the strongest gusts howling through Orange County.

FAITH IN ELECTIONS

1,000

broke out following the election in Belarus in August. The move follows similar ones by other tech giants. Facebook and Twitter have announced similar bans on political advertising in the days after the election

EUROPE

Virus restrictions spark new protests

Italy faced more nationwide protests Tuesday against virus-fighting measures like regional curfews, evening shutdowns for restaurants and bars and the closures of gyms, swimming pools and theaters — a sign of growing discontent across Europe with renewed coronavirus restrictions. But it wasn’t just Italy. All of Europe is grappling with how to halt a fall resurgence of the virus before its hospitals become

CANADA

Virus spike follows holiday gatherings

As the holiday season approaches amid a surge in coronavirus cases across the country, a Thanksgiving-related spike in Canada may serve as a cautionary tale for the United States. Canadians celebrate Thanksgiving on the second Monday of October, and both provincial and federal officials have pointed to the holiday as a culprit as case counts in much of Canada climb. In Ontario, officials logged a record-high number of daily cases over the weekend, and the province of British Columbia announced new restrictions on private gatherings after a weekend of record new cases.

Times news services

The Florida Orchestra is back

5 Concerts in 1 Weekend

We need music now more than ever in these difficult times. Choose from five performances, all following CDC guidelines for safety.

Tampa Bay Times Masterworks

Beethoven's Symphony No. 7

Michael Francis returns to the stage with Beethoven's triumphant masterpiece. Also: Jessie Montgomery's Strum and Zoltan Kodaly's Dances from Galanta.

Sat, Oct 31, 2 pm, Mahaffey Theater

Sat, Oct 31, 8 pm, Mahaffey Theater

Sun, Nov 1, 2 pm, Mahaffey Theater

Masterworks: Soundwavers

Legends from the Americas

Celebrate groundbreaking composers from North and South America, from Piazzolla to Copland. Michael Francis conducts, with a twist you don't want to miss.

Sat, Oct 31, 5 pm, Mahaffey Theater

Sun, Nov 1, 5 pm, Mahaffey Theater

Limited tickets available

Tickets start at \$23, all fees included

All concerts about 1 hour, no intermission

New! Free live-stream video

Not ready for the concert hall? Watch streaming video of Beethoven's Symphony No. 7 at 8 pm Oct. 31, live from the Mahaffey Theater. Details at FloridaOrchestra.org

FloridaOrchestra.org

727.892.3337 or 1.800.662.7286

LEGAL NOTICE

NOTICE FOR EARLY PUBLIC REVIEW OF A PROPOSED ACTIVITY WITHIN THE 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN – UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The United States Air Force (USAF) is inviting public input on any practicable alternatives for a proposed activity within the 100-year floodplain at MacDill Air Force Base (AFB). The proposed action would include construction and operation of a distributed power generation facility, which includes four natural gas reciprocating internal combustion engines capable of producing 75 megawatts (MW), a battery energy storage system capable of 20-MW output, an offsite underground transmission line, and a pipeline for natural gas supply to the facility.

This notice is required by Executive Order 11988 and has been prepared and made available to the public by the USAF in accordance with 32 CFR 989 and Air Force Manual 32-7003 for actions proposed within the 100-year floodplain. The USAF invites the public to provide comments on the proposal, including any practicable alternatives to constructing in the floodplain.

The public comment period ends 30 days after the date of this notice. Address written comments to the 6 ARW Public Affairs, 8209 Hangar Loop Drive, Suite 14, MacDill AFB, Florida 33621-5502 or via email to 6.ARW.pa@us.af.mil. The telephone number is (813) 828-2215.

10/28/2020 0000117833-01

COOL SAVINGS WITH AWARD-WINNING SERVICE

BAY AREA HEATING & COOLING, INC.

Customer Service Is Our 1st Priority

FREE Diagnostic Service Call

With Paid Repair During Regular Business Hours. Diagnostic Service Call Fee Applies without Repair.

SAVE \$69.95!

Call for details

Not valid with any other offer

Expires 11/15/20. TBTIMES

\$59.95 Complete A/C System Tune-Up

All Point Inspection and Service. Must be Scheduled 24 Hours in Advance.

SAVE \$30.00!

Call for details

Not valid with any other offer

Expires 11/15/20. TBTIMES

Serving Pinellas, West Hillsborough & Southwest Pasco • Lic# CAC 1813515

24/7 Emergency Service Available

877.813.1648

Expect more from your independent Trane Dealer.

Lottery results (For late drawings, go to tampabay.com/lottery.)

2, 3, 4, 5

Tu., Oct. 27, midday: 280 0322 26321

Mon., Oct. 26, evening: 013 6112 49119

Fantasy 5

Tu., Oct. 27: Not available

Mon., Oct. 26: 12-13-16-21-36

Direct Winners Payout

5 0 \$0

5 224 \$555.00

5 7,579 \$21.00

4Life

Tu., Oct. 27: Not available

Lotto

Estimated jackpot for Wednesday: \$10.25 million

Sat., Oct. 24: 12-15-32-35-41-53

Powerball

Estimated jackpot for Wednesday: \$116 million

Sat., Oct. 24: 18-20-27-45-65

Powerball: 6 Power Play: 2

Mega Millions

Today's estimated jackpot: \$109 million

Tampa Bay Times

Subscriber Perks

As a Times home delivery subscriber, you have unlimited access to tampabay.com. You can also enjoy the Times app and e-Newspaper at no additional cost.

To take advantage, you first must activate your account. Here are three easy ways to do so:

Visit tampabay.com/activate

Call 800-888-7012

We'll quickly set your account up for you.

Email custserv@tampabay.com

Customer Service

Current subscribers

Manage your account for renewal payments, vacation holds, account info and delivery issues at: myaccount.tampabay.com

800-888-7012; help@tampabay.com

New subscribers

Subscribe now at: subscribe.tampabay.com

Hours of operation:

Monday-Friday, 8 a.m. - 5 p.m.

Saturday, closed

Sunday/Holiday, 8-11 a.m.

TDD: 727-893-8929

Weekly subscription rate: \$7.95

Sales tax included

Print+Digital or Digital Only

News tips/feedback

St. Petersburg: 727-893-8215

Tampa: 813-226-3303

South Shore/Brandon: 813-642-7390

North Pinellas: 727-445-4163

Pasco West: 727-869-6301

Pasco Central/East: 813-909-4600

Hernando: 352-754-6100

Reprints

Photos & pages:

tampabay.com/photosales

photosales@tampabay.com

Reprint permission:

PARS International: 212-221-9595

TV Weekly

Subscribe: 1-855-545-8468

Headquarters

490 First Ave. S, St. Petersburg, FL 33701

727-893-8111

1000 N Ashley Dr. Suite 700, Tampa, FL 33602

813-226-3300

Advertising

Classifieds: 1-877-321-7355

tampabay.com/classifieds

Retail: 1-800-333-7505

The Tampa Bay Times is published daily by Times Publishing Co., 490 First Ave S, St. Petersburg, FL 33701. Periodicals postage (USPS 12-480) paid at St. Petersburg, FL, and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Tampa Bay Times, P.O. Box 1121, St. Petersburg, FL, 33731. Subscription rates are based on Pinellas County sales tax rate. We strive to deliver the newspaper by 6 a.m. Monday through Friday, by 7 a.m. Saturday and by 8 a.m. Sunday and holidays.

PUBLIC NOTICE
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
Notice of Availability

**Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Distributed Energy
Generation Facility at MacDill Air Force Base (AFB), Florida**

The United States Air Force (USAF) invites public review and comment on a USAF Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) document for the following project at MacDill AFB: construction and operation of a distributed power generation facility, which includes four natural gas reciprocating internal combustion engines capable of producing 75 megawatts (MW), a battery energy storage system capable of 20-MW output, an offsite underground transmission line, and a pipeline for natural gas supply to the facility.

The USAF invites public participation through the solicitation of comments on the Draft EA and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)/Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA). Comments are invited and will be accepted for 30 days from the publication of this notice. The Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA is available on the MacDill AFB public website, <http://macdill.af.mil/>, and a hard copy is available at the following local library:

John F. Germany Public Library
900 North Ashley Drive
Tampa, Florida 33606

Provide written comments to 6 ARW Public Affairs, 8209 Hangar Loop Drive, Suite 14, MacDill AFB, Florida 33621-5502 or via email to 6.arw.pa@us.af.mil, no later than 30 days from publication of this notice. The contact telephone number is (813) 828-2215.

Tampa Bay Times
Published Daily

STATE OF FLORIDA

COUNTY OF Pinellas, Hillsborough, Pasco,
Hernando Citrus

} ss

Before the undersigned authority personally appeared **Deirdre Almeida** who on oath says that he/she is **Legal Advertising Representative** of the **Tampa Bay Times** a daily newspaper printed in St. Petersburg, in Pinellas County, Florida; that the attached copy of advertisement, being a Legal Notice in the matter **RE: MacDill AFB** was published in **Tampa Bay Times: 2/21/21** in said newspaper in the issues of **Tampa Bay Times\Main News\Full Run**

Affiant further says the said **Tampa Bay Times** is a newspaper published in Pinellas, Hillsborough, Pasco, Hernando Citrus County, Florida and that the said newspaper has heretofore been continuously published in said Pinellas, Hillsborough, Pasco, Hernando Citrus County, Florida each day and has been entered as a second class mail matter at the post office in said Pinellas, Hillsborough, Pasco, Hernando Citrus County, Florida for a period of one year next preceding the first publication of the attached copy of advertisement, and affiant further says that he/she neither paid nor promised any person, firm or corporation any discount, rebate, commission or refund for the purpose of securing this advertisement for publication in the said newspaper.




Signature Affiant

Sworn to and subscribed before me this **02/21/2021**


Signature of Notary Public

Personally known ☒ or produced identification

Type of identification produced _____



PUBLIC NOTICE
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
Notice of Availability

**Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the
Distributed Energy Generation Facility at
MacDill Air Force Base (AFB), Florida**

The United States Air Force (USAF) invites public review and comment on a USAF Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) document for the following project at MacDill AFB: construction and operation of a distributed power generation facility, which includes four natural gas reciprocating internal combustion engines capable of producing 75 megawatts (MW), a battery energy storage system capable of 20MW output, an offsite underground transmission line, and a pipeline for natural gas supply to the facility.

The USAF invites public participation through the solicitation of comments on the Draft EA and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)/Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA). Comments are invited and will be accepted for 30 days from the publication of this notice. The Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA is available on the MacDill AFB public website, <http://macdill.af.mil/>, and a hard copy is available at the following local library:

John F. Germany Public Library
900 North Ashley Drive
Tampa, Florida 33606

Provide written comments to 6 ARW Public Affairs, 8209 Hangar Loop Drive, Suite 14, MacDill AFB, Florida 33621-5502 or via email to 6.arw.pa@us.af.mil, no later than 30 days from publication of this notice. The contact telephone number is (813) 828-2215.

2/21/21

0000141215-01

PANDEMIC

In pandemic, more people choose to die at home

BY HEATHER HOLLINGSWORTH
Associated Press

MISSION, Kan. — Mortuary owner Brian Simmons has been making more trips to homes to pick up bodies to be cremated and embalmed since the pandemic hit.

With COVID-19 devastating communities in Missouri, his two-person crews regularly arrive at homes in the Springfield area and remove bodies of people who decided to die at home rather than spend their final days in a nursing home or hospital where family visitations were prohibited during the pandemic.

He understands all too well why people are choosing to die at home: His own 49-year-old daughter succumbed to the coronavirus just before Christmas at a Springfield hospital, where the family only got phone updates as her condition deteriorated.

“The separation part is really rough, rough rough,” said Simmons. “My daughter went to the hospital and we saw her once through the glass when they put her on the ventilator, and then we never saw her again until after she died.”

Across the country, terminally ill patients — both with COVID-19 and other diseases — are making similar decisions and dying at home rather than face the terrifying scenario of saying farewell to loved ones behind glass or during video calls.

“What we are seeing with COVID is certainly patients want to stay at home,” said Judi Lund Person, the vice president for regulatory compliance at the National Hospice and Palliative Care Organization. “They don’t want to go to the hospital. They don’t want to go to a nursing home.”



Photos by CHARLIE RIEDEL | Associated Press

Mortuary owner Brian Simmons and mortician Triston McAuliff talk Jan. 28 in a cooler holding deceased people in Springfield, Mo.

tions are reporting that facilities are seeing double-digit percentage increases in the number of patients being cared for at home.

The phenomenon has played out Carroll Hospice in Westminster, Md., which has seen a 30 percent to 40 percent spike in demand for home-based care, said executive director Regina Bodnar. She said avoiding nursing homes and coronavirus risks are the biggest factor behind the increase.

Lisa Kossoudji, who supervises nurses at Ohio’s Hospice of Dayton, pulled her own mother, now 95, out of assisted living and brought her home to live with her after the pandemic hit. She had gone weeks without seeing her mother and was worried that her condition was deteriorating because she was being restricted to her room as the facility sought to limit the potential for the virus to spread.

Her mother, who has a condition that causes thickening and hardening of the walls of



Simmons holds a photo of his daughter, Rhonda Ketchum, who died before Christmas of COVID-19 in Springfield, Mo.

the arteries in her brain, is now receiving hospice services. Kossoudji is seeing the families she serves make similar choices.

“Lots of people are bringing folks home that physically, they have a lot physical issues, whether it is they have a feeding tube or a trachea, things that an everyday lay person would look at and say, ‘Oh my gosh, I can’t do this,’” she said. “But yet they are willing to bring them home

because we want to be able to be with them and see them.”

Before the pandemic, hospice workers cared for patients dying of heart disease, cancer, dementia and other terminal illnesses in long-term care facilities and, to a lesser extent, home settings. Many families hesitated to go the die-at-home route because of the many logistical challenges, including work schedules and complicated medical needs.

But the pandemic changed things. People were suddenly working from home and had more time, and they were more comfortable with home hospice knowing the alternative with lack of visitation at nursing homes.

“What happened with COVID is everything was on steroids so to speak. Everything happened so quickly that all of a sudden family members were prepared to care for their loved ones at home,” said Carole Fisher, president of the National Partnership for Healthcare and Hospice Innovation.

“Everything accelerated.” “I have heard families say, ‘I can care for my aged mother now very differently than I could before because I am working from home,’” she added. “And so there is more of a togetherness in the family unit because of COVID.”

Dying at home isn’t for everyone, however. Caring for the needs of a critically ill relative can mean sleepless nights and added stress as the pandemic rages.

Karen Rubel recalled that she didn’t want to take her own 81-year-old mother to the hospital when she had a stroke in September and then pushed hard to bring her home as soon as possible.

She is president and CEO of Nathan Adelson Hospice in Las Vegas, which has designated one of its in-patient facilities for COVID-19 patients.

“I get where people are coming from,” she said. “They are afraid.”

LEGAL NOTICE

PUBLIC NOTICE

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Notice of Availability

Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Distributed Energy Generation Facility at MacDill Air Force Base (AFB), Florida

The United States Air Force (USAF) invites public review and comment on a USAF Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) document for the following project at MacDill AFB: construction and operation of a distributed power generation facility, which includes four natural gas reciprocating internal combustion engines capable of producing 75 megawatts (MW), a battery energy storage system capable of 20MW output, an offsite underground transmission line, and a pipeline for natural gas supply to the facility.

The USAF invites public participation through the solicitation of comments on the Draft EA and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)/Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA). Comments are invited and will be accepted for 30 days from the publication of this notice. The Draft EA and FONSI/FONPA is available on the MacDill AFB public website, <http://macdill.af.mil/>, and a hard copy is available at the following local library:

John F. Germany Public Library
900 North Ashley Drive
Tampa, Florida 33606

Provide written comments to 6ARW Public Affairs, 8209 Hangar Loop Drive, Suite 14, MacDill AFB, Florida 33621-5502 or via email to 6.arw.pa@us.af.mil, no later than 30 days from publication of this notice. The contact telephone number is (813) 828-2215.

2/21/21 0000141215-01

Militaria Needed

for our military watch & instrument auction

We have been consigned a large militaria watch & instrument collection from a NY collector. **We have 30 additional spots to fill.**

We are taking consignments or buying for cash military watches, military clocks, and instruments for our upcoming auction. We can take your items in for consignment and include them in our international auction for you to reach a massive audience.

Or we can make you a cash offer and buy it on the spot. Stop by today.

HESS FINE ART

St. Petersburg ~ 1131 4th St. N ~ 727-896-0622 ~ HessFineArt.com

KOHLER Walk-In Bath *Fall in Love With Your Walk-In Bath*

Sweetheart Special **50% OFF Professional Installation!**

No Payments for 18 MONTHS

Call today for your **FREE** in-home or virtual quote! **(813) 816-2412**

*Walk-In Bath installed in as little as a day. Limited time offer. Valid through February 28, 2021, at participating dealers only. Not available in AK, HI, Nassau City, NY; Suffolk City, NY; Westchester City, NY; and Buffalo City, NY. Also may not be available in other areas. 50% off installation labor applies to the installation of the Walk-In Bath and may exclude costs associated with plumbing and electrical. Cannot be combined with any other advertised offer. *Subject to credit approval. Interest is billed during the promotional period but all interest is waived if the purchase amount is paid before the expiration of the promotional period. There is no minimum monthly payment required during the promotional period. Financing for GreenSky® consumer loan programs is provided by federally insured, equal opportunity lender banks. NML-S #1416362. GreenSky® Program is a program name for certain consumer credit plans extended by participating lenders to borrowers for the purchase of goods and/or services from participating merchants. Participating lenders are federally insured, equal opportunity lender banks. GreenSky® is a registered trademark of GreenSky, LLC. GreenSky Servicing, LLC services the loans on behalf of participating lenders. NML-S #1416362. GreenSky® financing offers available at participating dealers only.

Get your Championship Shirts

Show your love for the Bucs and Bolts with a historic front page t-shirt commemorating Tampa’s big wins!

Unisex Front Page T-Shirt
Lightweight, classic fit, double-needle sleeve and bottom hem.
\$19.99
Limited Time Offer

New Throwback T-shirt

Proudly designed and made in Tampa.
To order go to **championshipshirts.com**

CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION

Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) section 307 provides that federal agency activities shall be carried out in a manner which is consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of approved state management programs. Section 307 applies to federal agency activity in a state's coastal zone and also to federal agency activity outside the coastal zone if the activity affects a land or water use in or natural resources of the coastal zone. Federal agency activity includes activity performed by a federal agency, approved by a federal agency, or for which a federal agency provides financial assistance. Such activity, whether direct, indirect, or cumulative, must be demonstrated to be consistent with the enforceable policies of the state's coastal management program, unless full consistency is otherwise prohibited by federal law (per 15 CFR part 930.32, "consistent to the maximum extent practicable").

The State of Florida developed the Florida Coastal Management Program (FCMP), which was approved by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in 1981. The FCMP consists of a network of 24 Florida statutes, administered by multiple state agencies and water management districts. The FCMP includes enforceable policies that ensure the wise use and protection of the state's water, cultural, historic, and biological resources; minimize the state's vulnerability to coastal hazards; ensure compliance with the state's growth management laws; protect the state transportation system; and protect the state's proprietary interest as the owner of sovereignty submerged lands.

This document provides the State of Florida with the U.S. Air Force's (USAF's) Consistency Determination under the CZMA for the Proposed Action as analyzed in the accompanying Environmental Assessment (EA). This statement examines the potential environmental consequences of the Proposed Action and ascertains the extent to which the Proposed Action would be consistent with the objectives and enforceable policies of the FCMP as presented in the 2018 FCMP Guide (Florida Department of Environmental Protection 2018).

Upon review of the FCMP, it was determined which policies may be applicable to the Proposed Action and then an "effects test" was conducted to determine whether the Proposed Action would have a reasonably foreseeable direct, indirect, or cumulative effect on the state's coastal uses or resources. After conducting the effects test, the USAF determined whether the Proposed Action would result in reasonably foreseeable direct, indirect, or cumulative effects on Florida's coastal uses or resources.

Of the Florida Statutory Authorities included in the FCMP, the potential for impacts in the following areas are addressed in the EA: historic preservation (Chapter 267), water resources (Chapter 373), pollutant discharge prevention and removal (Chapter 376), fish and wildlife conservation (Chapter 379), environmental control (Chapter 403), and soil and water conservation (Chapter 582).

This consistency determination statement discusses how the Proposed Action may meet the FCMP objectives.

Table B-1. Florida Coastal Management Program Policy Review

Florida Statute	Legal Scope	Consistency Evaluation
Chapter 161: Beach and Shore Preservation Program	Authorizes the Bureau of Beaches and Coastal Systems within Department of Environmental Protection to regulate construction on or seaward of the state's beaches.	The Proposed Action would not include construction within or adjacent to any beach or shoreline and would not affect beach and shore management, specifically as it pertains to: • Coastal Construction Permit Program • Coastal Construction Control Line Program • Coastal Zone Protection

Florida Statute	Legal Scope	Consistency Evaluation
Chapter 163: Growth Policy; County and Municipal Planning; Land Development Regulation	Chapter 163, Part II 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.	The Proposed Action would not affect local (municipal or county) government comprehensive plans and would not affect public health, safety, comfort, good order, appearance, convenience, law enforcement, fire prevention, general welfare, concentration of population on the land, public facilities and services, or natural resources.
Chapter 186: State and Regional Planning	Details state-level planning requirements. Requires the development of special statewide plans governing water use, land development, and transportation.	The Proposed Action is consistent with state statutes and would not affect Florida state- or regional-level planning requirements or have a negative effect on state plans for water use, land development, or transportation.
Chapter 252: Emergency Management	Provides for planning and implementation of the state's response to, efforts to recover from, and mitigation of natural and man-made disasters.	The Proposed Action would not have an effect on the ability of the state to respond to or recover from natural or man-made disasters and would not affect evacuation procedures. The Proposed Action would have the additional benefit of being able to provide electrical power at MacDill Air Force Base (AFB) when the primary source of electricity is disrupted, or a state or national emergency is declared.
Chapter 253: State Lands	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.	No state lands would be disturbed during the construction or operations of the proposed facilities. Therefore, the Proposed Action is consistent with the state's administration of public lands.
Chapter 258: State Parks and Preserves	Addresses administration and management of state parks and preserves.	The Proposed Action would not impact the administration or management of state parks and preserves.
Chapter 259: Land Acquisitions for Conservation or Recreation	Authorizes acquisition of environmentally endangered lands and outdoor recreation lands.	The Proposed Action would not have an effect on the acquisition of environmentally endangered and outdoor recreation lands.
Chapter 260: Florida Greenways and Trails Act	Authorizes acquisition of land, planning, and management of a statewide system of greenways and trails for recreational and conservation purposes.	The Proposed Action would not have an impact on the acquisition of land, planning or management of the statewide greenways and trails system.
Chapter 267: Historical Resources	Addresses management and preservation of the state's archaeological and historical resources.	Potential impacts to cultural and historical resources are evaluated in Section 4.3 of the EA. The Florida State Historic Preservation Office concurred on September 9, 2020, with MacDill AFB's finding that the action is "unlikely to adversely affect historic properties listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register of Historic Places, or otherwise of historical, architectural, or archaeological value within the area of potential effect. Therefore, the Proposed Action would be consistent with the management and preservation of the state's archaeological and historical resources.

Florida Statute	Legal Scope	Consistency Evaluation
Chapter 288: Commercial Development and Capital Improvements	Promotes and develops general business, trade and tourism components of the state economy.	The Proposed Action would not have significant adverse effects on any key Florida industries or economic diversification efforts. There would be a slight positive impact to the local economy associated with the construction activity.
Chapter 334: Transportation Administration	Addresses the state's policy concerning transportation administration.	The Proposed Action would not affect the state's administration of transportation.
Chapter 339: Transportation Finance and Planning	Addresses the finance and planning needs of the state's transportation system.	The Proposed Action would not affect the finance and planning needs of the state's transportation system.
Chapter 373: Water Resources	This statute addresses sustainable water management; the conservation of surface and ground waters for full beneficial use; the preservation of natural resources, fish, and wildlife; protecting public land; and promoting the health and general welfare of Floridians. The state's policy manages and conserves water and related natural resources by determining whether activities will unreasonably consume water; degrade water quality; or adversely affect environmental values (such as protected species habitat, recreational pursuits, and marine productivity).	The Proposed Action would be conducted in a manner consistent with Chapter 373. Potential impacts on water resources are evaluated in Sections 4.7 and 4.8 of the EA. The Proposed Action would not unreasonably consume water, degrade water quality, or adversely affect environmental values. The Proposed Action does not involve the use of groundwater. There are no wetlands impacted within or adjacent to the project area where facility development would occur. Potential impacts on nearby surface waters from sedimentation associated with construction activities would be minimized by the use of specialized construction techniques (i.e., horizontal directional drilling), appropriate best management practices (BMPs), and all applicable regulatory requirements and stormwater permits (e.g., Environmental Resources Permit) would be obtained prior to any construction activities. The Proposed Action would be fully consistent with Florida's Water Resources policy. Therefore, the Proposed Action would be consistent with the state's statutes and regulations regarding water resources.

Florida Statute	Legal Scope	Consistency Evaluation
Chapter 376: Pollution Discharge Prevention and Removal	This statute provides a framework for the protection of the state’s coastline from spills, discharges, and releases of pollutants. The discharge of pollutants into or upon any coastal waters, estuaries, tidal flats, beaches, and lands adjoining the seacoast of the state is prohibited. The statute: • Provides for hazards & threats of danger and damages resulting from any pollutant discharge to be evaluated. • Requires the prompt containment and removal of pollution; provides penalties for violations. • Ensures the prompt payment of reasonable damages from a discharge.	Management of hazardous materials and wastes is addressed in Section 4.6 of the EA. All required permits would be procured for the Proposed Action, and established procedures for transport, storage, and handling of hazardous materials would be followed. USAF does not anticipate the discharge of any pollutants upon surface or ground waters. In the event of a spill, a written Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan would be followed. BMPs would be incorporated to avoid impacts to water quality. The Proposed Action would be fully consistent with Florida’s Pollutant Discharge Prevention and Removal policy. Therefore, the Proposed Action would be consistent with the state’s statutes regarding the transfer, storage or transportation of pollutants.
Chapter 377: Energy Resources	Addresses regulation, planning and development of oil and gas resources of the state.	The Proposed Action would not affect oil and gas resources of the state.
Chapter 379: Fish and Wildlife Conservation	This statute establishes the framework for the management and protection of Florida’s wide diversity of fish and wildlife resources. It is Florida’s policy to conserve and wisely manage these resources. Particular attention is given to those species defined as being endangered or threatened.	Potential impacts to fish and wildlife are evaluated in Section 4.2 of the EA. On August 20, 2020, USFWS concurred with MacDill AFB’s effect determination that the proposed action may affect but is not likely to adversely affect the wood stork and eastern indigo snake and that the Proposed Action would have no effect on any other federally listed species. Likewise, the EA determined the Proposed Action would not result in a significant impact to state-listed species. Therefore, the Proposed Action would be consistent with the state’s policies concerning the protection of fish and wildlife resources.
Chapter 380: Land and Water Management	Establishes land and water management policies to guide and coordinate local decisions relating to growth and development.	The Proposed Action would not affect state management of land or water.
Chapter 381: Public Health, General Provisions	Establishes public policy concerning the state’s public health system.	The Proposed Action would not affect the state’s policy concerning the public health system.
Chapter 388: Mosquito Control	Addresses mosquito control efforts in the state.	The Proposed Action would not affect mosquito control efforts.

Florida Statute	Legal Scope	Consistency Evaluation
Chapter 403: Environmental Control	The statute establishes public policy concerning environmental control in the state. Those policies most relevant to the Proposed Action include air and water pollution, pollution prevention, and ecosystem management.	The EA addresses the issues of protection of air quality (Section 4.1); conservation and protection of environmentally sensitive living resources and the protection of endangered or listed species (Section 4.2); solid, sanitary, and hazardous waste disposal (Section 4.6); protection of groundwater and surface water quality and quantity (Section 4.7); potable water supply (Section 4.7); and the protection of floodplains and wetlands (Section 4.8). Based on the evaluation, the Proposed Action would not have significant impacts on air quality, hazardous materials/wastes, floodplains or water quality. The Proposed Action would not significantly affect fish, wildlife, or critical habitats. Surface waters of the state would not be significantly affected by the project. The AFB has determined that the Proposed Action would be consistent to the maximum extent practicable with Florida's Fish and Wildlife Conservation policy. Therefore, the Proposed Action would be consistent with the state's statutes concerning environmental control efforts.
Chapter 553: Building Construction Standards	Provides a mechanism for the uniform adoption, updating, amendment, interpretation, and enforcement of a single, unified state building code, to be called the Florida Building Code. Obtain a permit from the appropriate enforcing agency.	The Proposed Action would be consistent with the state's regulations and standards pertaining to building construction.
Chapter 582: Soil and Water Conservation	Provides for the control and prevention of soil erosion.	The EA addresses the potential of the Proposed Action and alternatives to disturb soil and presents possible measures to prevent or minimize soil erosion in Section 4.7. Impacts to groundwater and surface water resources also are discussed in Section 4.7 of the EA.
Chapter 597: Aquaculture	Establishes public policy concerning the cultivation of aquatic organisms.	The Proposed Action would not affect the state's policy regarding aquaculture.

CONCLUSION

Based on the aforementioned, USAF finds implementation of the Proposed Action as presented in the EA is consistent with Florida's CMP.

April 9, 2021

Jude Dawson
Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.
3701 NW 98th Street
Gainesville, Florida 32606

RE: Department of Defense, U.S. Air Force, Environmental Assessment for Macdill Air Force Base Land Leasing Project to Site, Construct, and Operate a Tampa Electric Company-Owned Distributed Generation Facility, Macdill Air Force Base, Hillsborough, County, Florida
SAI # FL202102159135C

Dear Jude:

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.

If prehistoric or historic artifacts, such as pottery or ceramics, projectile points, dugout canoes, metal implements, historic building materials, or any other physical remains that could be associated with Native American, early European, or American settlement are encountered at any time within the project site area, the permitted project shall cease all activities involving subsurface disturbance in the vicinity of the discovery. The applicant shall contact the Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources, Compliance Review Section at (850)-245-6333. Project activities shall not resume without verbal and/or written authorization. In the event that unmarked human remains are encountered during permitted activities, all work shall stop immediately and the proper authorities notified in accordance with Section 872.05, Florida Statutes. If you have any questions, please contact Rachel Thompson, Historic Sites Specialist, by email at Rachel.Thompson@dos.myflorida.com, or by telephone at 850.245.6453 or 800.847.7278.

Based on the information submitted and minimal project impacts, the state has no objections to the subject project and, therefore, it is consistent with the Florida Coastal Management Program (FCMP). 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.

Sincerely,

Chris Stahl

Chris Stahl, Coordinator
Florida State Clearinghouse
Florida Department of Environmental Protection
3800 Commonwealth Blvd., M.S. 47
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2400
ph. (850) 717-9076
State.Clearinghouse@floridadep.gov



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

29 July 2020

MEMORANDUM FOR U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE (USFWS)
MR. JAY HERRINGTON
7915 BAYMEADOWS WAY, SUITE 200
JACKSONVILLE, FL 32256

FROM: 6 CES/CL
7621 HILLSBOROUGH LOOP DRIVE
MACDILL AFB, FL 33261-5207

SUBJECT: Proposed Distributed Energy Generation Facility at MacDill Air Force Base

1. The United States Air Force (USAF), in conjunction with Tampa Electric Company, is proposing to construct and operate a natural gas-fired distributed generation facility at the MacDill Air Force Base (AFB) (Proposed Action). The proposed facility will include natural gas-fired reciprocating internal combustion engine-generator(s), battery storage, and offsite underground transmission and pipeline for natural gas supply to the proposed facility.
2. In accordance with the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 32, Part 989 – Environmental Impact Analysis Process and the National Environmental Policy Act, the USAF is evaluating the potential environmental impacts of the project. We are preparing an environmental assessment (EA) to evaluate potential environmental impacts of a proposed natural gas-fired distributed generation facility. The preferred location for the Proposed Action is a previously disturbed area with no known sensitive resources, based on prior surveys and existing biological resource data.
3. The Proposed Action would occur within a core foraging area for the wood stork (*Mycteria Americana*), and wood storks have been observed on MacDill AFB in water features, including drainage swales and ditches. Storm water features and drainage swales are located in the vicinity of the proposed construction site; however, there would be no direct impact to these water features. In addition, the species is habituated to activity and noise levels associated with ongoing activity at MacDill AFB, and noise from construction activities for the Proposed Action would be temporary.
4. There are two active bald eagle nests (HL024 and HL982) on the AFB property; however, both are located more than a mile away from the Proposed Action area. Activity associated with construction of the new facility is not expected to impact the species.
5. The eastern indigo snake (*Drymarchon corais couperi*) can occur in suitable habitat throughout Florida. It has a wide range of habitat preferences and requires large tracts of land for survival. Often considered a gopher tortoise commensal, it can be found in xeric habitats but also uses more mesic or wetland habitat for foraging. Due to the heavily disturbed nature of the site and lack of refugia, eastern indigo snakes are unlikely to be present. No eastern indigo

snakes and no gopher tortoise burrows were observed during the field assessments of the proposed project area.

6. Gopher tortoises (*Gopherus polyphemus*) are currently a candidate species for listing by USFWS. They are typically found within upland habitats with well-drained, sandy soils. Gopher tortoise burrows are used by several other listed and non-listed wildlife species. No gopher tortoise burrows were observed within the proposed project area during field assessments, and much of the available upland habitat has been previously developed or is heavily disturbed. As such, there is only a low probability of this species occurring within the project area. Nonetheless, Tampa Electric Company proposes to conduct a formal burrow survey within tortoise-suitable habitat prior to site development. If necessary, tortoises that may be affected by the project will be relocated from harm's way to an onsite recipient area in accordance with the 2012 Gopher Tortoise Candidate Conservation Agreement that MacDill AFB is part of.

7. During the initial stages of the environmental impact analysis process, a survey of the site was performed, and the results of prior protected species surveys were evaluated. Based on the analysis completed during preparation of the draft EA and in compliance with Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA), the USAF has determined that implementation of the project may affect but is not likely to adversely affect the wood stork and eastern indigo snake and would have no effect on any other federally listed species in the area of potential affect.

8. If you have any questions or require additional information on the Proposed Action, please contact Jason Kirkpatrick, 6 CES/CEIE at (813) 828 0459.

WYNN.ROBER

Digitally signed by
WYNN.ROBERT.T.1103491670

T.T.1103491670

Date: 2020.07.29 08:21:21

ROBERT T. WYNN, GS-15, DAF
Director, 6th Civil Engineer Squadron

2 Attachments:

1. Site Map
2. Listed Species Map



FWS Log No 04EF1000-2020-I-1039

The Service concurs with your effect determination(s) for 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.

Acting for Jay B. Herrington
Field Supervisor

Date



FIGURE 3.
LISTED SPECIES MAP
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION PROJECT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources: FDOT, 2017; USFWS, 2017; FWC, 2017; FDOT, 2017; ECT, 2020.



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

MEMORANDUM FOR DIVISION OF HISTORIC RESOURCES
MR. JASON ALDRIDGE
R.A. GRAY BUILDING
500 SOUTH BRONOUGH STREET
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0250

FROM: 6 CES/CEIE
7621 HILLSBOROUGH LOOP DRIVE
MACDILL AFB, FL 33261-5702

SUBJECT: Section 106 Consultation for Proposed Distributed Generation Project, MacDill Air Force Base

1. The United States Air Force (USAF), in conjunction with Tampa Electric Company, is preparing an environmental assessment under the National Environmental Policy Act to evaluate potential environmental impacts of a proposed natural gas-fired distributed generation facility. The proposed facility will be located in a previously disturbed area of the MacDill Air Force Base (AFB). The proposed facility will include natural gas-fired reciprocating internal combustion engine-generator(s), battery storage, an underground transmission line for offsite transmission of power, and an underground pipeline for natural gas supply to the power generation facility.
2. As a federal undertaking, this proposed action is also subject to the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations at Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Title 36, Part 800. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.3(c), this letter initiates our Section 106 consultation for this undertaking and requests your input on the proposal.
3. A Phase I archaeological survey of the western portion of MacDill AFB was recently completed. No archaeological properties were identified within the footprint of the proposed project area; however archaeological site 8HI14612 was discovered approximately 250 feet east of the project site. Site 8HI14612 is a low-density precontact lithic scatter and was determined ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Additional information on Site 8HI14612 can be found in final survey report entitled *Phase I Archaeological Survey of 2,236.79 Acres Within MacDill Air Force Base, Hillsborough County, Florida* (dated 20 February 2020) submitted to your office in April 2020.
4. MacDill also recently completed an investigation for the lost Port Tampa Cemetery. Although the location of the cemetery could not be conclusively determined, the preponderance of information gathered during the survey determined the location of the Port Tampa Cemetery to be approximately 400 feet due east of the proposed project area.
5. Although Site 8HI14612 and the Port Tampa Cemetery are both located in close vicinity to the proposed project area, construction of the proposed power generation facility is not expected to adversely affect either site.
6. MacDill AFB seeks feedback from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on these findings and concurrence that the proposed project will not affect historic properties listed or eligible for listing in the NRHP.

7. If you would like to inspect the proposed distributed generation project site, or if you have any questions on the project, please contact me at (352) 536-5634 or Mr. Jason Kirkpatrick 813-614-5729, or by email to jason.kirkpatrick.2.ctr@us.af.mil.

RIDER.ANDREW.WARRICK.153194676
Digitally signed by
RIDER.ANDREW.WARRICK.153194676
CK.1153194676
Date: 2020.07.08
11:28:35 -04'00'
ANDREW W. RIDER, GS-12, DAF
Chief, Environmental Element

Attachments:
Figures 1 through 3

ATTACHMENTS



FIGURE 2.
PROJECT SITE LAYOUT MAP
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION PROJECT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources: FDOT, 2019; ECT, 2020.



FIGURE 3.
LISTED SPECIES MAP
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION PROJECT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources: FDOT, 2017; USFWS, 2017; FWC, 2017; FDOT, 2017; ECT, 2020.



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT of STATE

RON DESANTIS
Governor

LAUREL M. LEE
Secretary of State

Department of the Air Force
Andrew W. Rider
Chief, Environmental Element
6 CES/CEIE
7621 Hillsborough Loop Drive
MacDill Air Force Base, FL 33621-5207

September 9, 2020

RE: DHR Project File No.: 2020-4558, Received by DHR: July 8, 2020
Project: *Section 106 Consultation for Proposed Distributed Generation Project, MacDill Air Force Base*
County: Hillsborough

Mr. Rider:

Our office 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 (NRHP), as amended, and its implementing regulations in 36 CFR Part 800: *Protection of Historic Properties*.

In a consultation letter sent to our office on 07/08/20, MacDill Air Force Base (AFB) stated they are preparing an environmental assessment under the National Environmental Policy Act to evaluate potential impacts of a proposed natural gas-fired distributed generation facility within a previously disturbed area of the MacDill AFB. MacDill AFB noted the project area was previously surveyed, *Phase I Archaeological Survey of 2,236.79 Acres Within MacDill Air Force Base, Hillsborough County, Florida*, and no archaeological resources were recorded within the project footprint. MacDill AFB concluded that although Site 8HI14612 and the Port Tampa Cemetery are both located in close vicinity to the proposed project area, construction of the proposed power generation facility is not expected to adversely affect either resource.

Based upon the information provided, our office concurs that the proposed project is unlikely to adversely affect historic properties listed, or eligible for listing, in the NRHP, or otherwise of historical, architectural or archaeological value within the APE. However, unexpected finds may occur during ground disturbing activities, and we request that the following special condition regarding inadvertent discoveries be followed:

- If prehistoric or historic artifacts, such as pottery or ceramics, projectile points, dugout canoes, metal implements, historic building materials, or any other physical remains that could be associated with Native American, early European, or American settlement are encountered at any time within the project site area, the permitted project shall cease all activities involving subsurface disturbance in the vicinity of the discovery. The applicant shall contact the Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources, Compliance Review Section at (850)-245-

Division of Historical Resources
R.A. Gray Building • 500 South Bronough Street • Tallahassee, Florida 32399
850.245.6300 • 850.245.6436 (Fax) flheritage.com




USAF
9/9/20
Pg. 2

6333. Project activities shall not resume without verbal and/or written authorization. In the event that unmarked human remains are encountered during permitted activities, all work shall stop immediately and the proper authorities shall be notified in accordance with Section 872.05, *Florida Statutes*.

If you have any questions, please contact Kelly L. Chase, Historic Preservationist, by email at Kelly.Chase@dos.myflorida.com, or by telephone at 850.245.6341 or 800.847.7278.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jason Aldridge" with "For" written below it.

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

Table B-1. MacDill Tribal Consultation Information
(Page 1 of 2)

Agency	Date and Type of Correspondence	MacDill Consultation Notes
Seminole Tribe of Florida, Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida, and Seminole Nation of Oklahoma and the Muscogee [Creek] Nation	Initial Letter Mailed and Electronically Submitted 31 August 2020	Initial consultation letters mailed to tribes on 31 August 2020 and also submitted electronically via e-mail to the tribes on 31 August 2020. No responses were received from any of the tribes in response to the initial consultation letter.
USAF AMC Jason Kirkpatrick	Follow up e-mail to Miccosukee Tribe of Indians, Seminole Tribe of Florida, Seminole Nation of Oklahoma, and the Muscogee [Creek] Nation on 13 November 2020	Follow up e-mail of receipt of consultation letter and figures with a second letter and figures attached. Asking for a response.
	On 4 December 2020 follow-up phone calls were made to the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians, the Muscogee Creek Nation, and the Seminole Nation of Oklahoma.	
USAF AMC Jason Kirkpatrick	4 December 2020 Memorandum for Record	Consultation with the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida, Mr. Kevin Donaldson. Three points on record: (1) no reply on initial consultation letter; (2) a follow up phone call was placed; and (3) the tribe may be comments or requests at any time during the process or when final.
Miccosukee Tribe		We were able to reach Mr. Donaldson with the Miccosukee tribe and he stated that the Miccosukee will respond to consultation letters within 30-60 days if they are interested in a project, if no response is received the Air Force should assume that the tribe has no objections to the action. This was documented in the Memorandum for Record (MFR).
Muscogee Creek Nation		We were able to reach an unidentified person at the Muscogee Creek Nation on 4 December 2020. He stated that Robin Soweka was the appropriate person to speak with but he was not in the office and he would pass my contact information on to Robin and Robin will call me back. No call back has been received from Robin as of 28 December but will wait until 6 January to call back since it is a holiday period. The consultation effort with Muscogee Tribe to date has been documented in the MFR.
Seminole Nation of Oklahoma		We were able to reach Ms. Brigetta Leader with the Seminole Nation of Oklahoma on 4 December 2020. She stated that the THPO position at the SNO has been vacant but a new THPO is inbound (Mr. Edwin Marshal) and he will deal with all consultation moving forward. She took down my e-mail address and said she would send me Mr. Marshal's contact information).
USAF AMC Jason Kirkpatrick	Follow-up email 7 December 2020	A follow-up e-mail was sent to Ms. Leader 7 December 2020 to see if she had the contact information yet, but no response was received from Ms. Leader. This course of events was documented in the MFR.

Table B-1. MacDill Tribal Consultation Information
(Page 2 of 2)

Agency	Date and Type of Correspondence	MacDill Consultation Notes
USAF AMC Jason Kirkpatrick	29 December 2020 E-mail correspondence to Seminole Tribe of Florida	E-mail asking for a response regarding the project.
Seminole Tribe of Florida	Received emailed letter response on 30 December 2020	E-mail letter received from THPO Danielle Simon requesting information regarding definition of Area of Potential Interest and requesting a copy of the draft EA. Consultation ongoing.
USAF AMC Jason Kirkpatrick	12 January 2021 Memorandum for Record	Memorandum for Record with the Muscogee [Creek] Nation regarding effort to make contact to no avail.
	Follow-up phone conversation 26 January 2021	THPO called. Followed-up with email response to phone call, awaiting response.
Department of the Air Force – Robert Wynn	Letter correspondence dated 1 February 2021	Letter to Dr. Paul N. Backhouse, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Seminole Tribe of Florida giving him additional requested information regarding project.
USAF AMC Jason Kirkpatrick	4 March 2021 Memorandum for Record	Memorandum for Record with the Seminole Nation of Oklahoma documenting dates of contact with contact made or no response.



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

AUG 27 2020

Colonel Benjamin R. Jonsson
6th Air Refueling Wing Commander
8208 Hangar Loop Drive, Suite 1
MacDill Air Force Base, Florida 33621-5407

Mr. Marcellus W. Osceola Jr., Chairman
Seminole Tribe of Florida
30290 Josie Billie Hwy, PMB 1004
Clewiston, FL 33440

Dear Mr. Osceola

The United States Air Force (USAF), in conjunction with Tampa Electric Company, is preparing an environmental assessment under the National Environmental Policy Act to evaluate potential environmental impacts of a proposed natural gas-fired distributed generation facility. The proposed facility will be located in a previously disturbed area of the MacDill Air Force Base (AFB). The proposed facility will include natural gas-fired reciprocating internal combustion engine-generator(s), battery storage, and an offsite underground transmission and pipeline to supply natural gas to the facility.

In accordance with Executive Order 13175, Consultation with Indian Tribal Governments, USAF would like to initiate government-to-government consultation regarding this proposed project. USAF desires to discuss this proposed project in detail with you so we may understand and consider any comments, concerns, or suggestions you may have. This letter also initiates our consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) (Code of Federal Regulations [CFR], Title 36, Part 800) and requests your input.

A Phase I archaeological survey of the western portion of MacDill AFB was recently completed. No archaeological properties were identified within the footprint of the proposed project area; however, archaeological site 8HI14612 was discovered approximately 250 feet east of the project site. Site 8HI14612 is a low-density precontact lithic scatter and was determined ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Additional information on Site 8HI14612 can be found in final survey report entitled *Phase I Archaeological Survey of 2,236.79 Acres Within MacDill Air Force Base, Hillsborough County, Florida* (dated 20 February 2020) submitted to your office in April 2020.

Please let us know when you would be available to discuss this proposed project and your expectations on how to proceed with consultation. Please contact me at (813) 828-4444 to discuss dates and times for consultation.

Sincerely

BENJAMIN R. JONSSON, Colonel, USAF
Commander

Attachment:
Figures 1 through 3 PDF, 20 July 2020

cc:
Dr. Paul Backhouse



FIGURE 1.
SITE LOCATION MAP
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION PROJECT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources: ESRI, 2018; ECT, 2020.



FIGURE 2.
PROJECT SITE LAYOUT MAP
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION PROJECT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources: FDOT, 2019; ECT, 2020.

From: [Danielle Simon](#)
To: [KIRKPATRICK, JASON W CTR USAF AMC 6 CES/CEIE](#)
Cc: [THPO Compliance](#); [Bradley Mueller](#); [Kad Henderson](#); [Paul Backhouse](#); [RIDER, ANDREW W GS-12 USAF AMC 6 CES/CEIE](#); [LYKENS, ANDREW S CTR USAF AMC 6 CES/CEIE](#)
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Re: TECO Distributed Generation - MacDill AFB - Consultation
Date: Wednesday, December 30, 2020 3:06:13 PM
Attachments: [image.png](#)



December 30, 2020

Mr. Jason W. Kirkpatrick, Contractor, PAE Inc.
6th Civil Engineer Squadron
7621 Hillsborough Loop Dr.
MacDill AFB, FL 33621
DSN 968-0459

Subject: MacDill AFB - TECO Distributed Generation
THPO Compliance Tracking Number: 0032629

In order to expedite the THPO review process:

1. Please correspond via email and provide documents as attachments (a THPO FTP site is available for large files),
2. Please send all emails to THPOCompliance@semtribe.com,
3. Please reference the THPO Compliance Tracking Number if one has been assigned.

Dear Mr. Kirkpatrick,

Thank you for contacting the Seminole Tribe of Florida – Tribal Historic Preservation Office (STOF-THPO) Compliance Section regarding the MacDill AFB - TECO Distributed Generation.

The proposed undertaking does fall within the STOF Area of Interest. We have reviewed the documents that you provided pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing authority, 36 CFR 800. In order for us to complete our review we would like to request the following additional information.

- Please provide the dimensions of the project APE.
- While we understand an Environmental Impact Analysis Process is still underway, if possible, please

provide a concise description of the proposed undertaking including the number, location(s), extent, and types of impacts (grading, trenching, etc.).

We would greatly appreciate receiving a copy of the Draft Environmental Assessment once your internal review is complete. Please continue to consult with us as the project develops and feel free to contact us with any questions or concerns.

Respectfully,
Danielle A. Simon, MA, RPA, Compliance Review Specialist
STOF-THPO, Compliance Review Section
30290 Josie Billie Hwy, PMB 1004
Clewiston, FL 33440
Email: daniellesimon@semtribe.com

From: KIRKPATRICK, JASON W CTR USAF AMC 6 CES/CEIE
Sent: Tuesday, December 29, 2020 2:26 PM
To: Paul Backhouse; Bradley Mueller
Cc: RIDER, ANDREW W GS-12 USAF AMC 6 CES/CEIE; LYKENS, ANDREW S CTR USAF AMC 6 CES/CEIE
Subject: RE: TECO Distributed Generation - MacDill AFB - Consultation

Good Afternoon;

We are working our way through the Environmental Impact Analysis Process for the proposed TECO Distributed Generation facility project. We have not received any input from the Seminole Tribe of Florida at this time and I wanted to follow-up to make sure you received a copy of the attached consultation letter with figures. We are currently completing our internal review of the preliminary draft Environmental Assessment for the project but would be happy to provide a copy of the Draft EA once it is available for public comment.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me via e-mail or at the phone number listed below. We look forward to hearing back from the Seminole Tribe of Florida.

Thank you

JasonK

JASON W. KIRKPATRICK, Contractor, PAE Inc.
Environmental Flight Manager
Cell 813-614-5729

From: KIRKPATRICK, JASON W CTR USAF AMC 6 CES/CEIE
Sent: Monday, August 31, 2020 11:31 AM
To: paulbackhouse@semtribe.com; bradleymueller@semtribe.com



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

February 1, 2021

Mr. Robert T. Wynn
Installation Tribal Liaison Officer
6th Civil Engineer Squadron
7621 Hillsborough Loop Drive
MacDill Air Force Base, Florida 33621-5407

Dr. Paul N. Backhouse
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Seminole Tribe of Florida
30290 Josie Billie Hwy, PMB 1004
Clewiston, FL 33440

Dear Dr. Backhouse,

Thank you for your 30 December 2020 response to our initial consultation regarding the Tampa Electric Company Distributed Generation facility on MacDill Air Force Base (*STOF THPO Compliance Tracking Number 0032629*). As requested, a copy of the Draft Environmental Assessment for the project is attached for your review.

In your letter you requested that we provide the dimensions of the project's Area of Potential Effect (APE) and that we provide a concise description of the undertaking including the number, location(s), extent, and types of impacts (grading, trenching, etc.). A description of the undertaking is provided in Section 2.1 of the attached Draft Environmental Assessment. With regard to archaeological resources, we believe the project APE is defined as areas where grading, trenching or similar land disturbing activities would occur. As such, we have defined the APE as the primary project footprint shown in yellow in Figure 2-2, as well as, a 30-foot wide swath along the two linear corridors proposed for utility installation. These utility corridors include the underground transmission interconnection represented by the purple line in Figure 2-3 and the natural gas line represented by the green line in Figure 2-4 of the attached Draft Environmental Assessment.

We hope that the information provided above and in the Draft Environmental Assessment provide enough detail about the proposed Tampa Electric Company Distributed Generation project to address any concerns that the Seminole Tribe of Florida may have. If you would like additional information, please contact Mr. Jason Kirkpatrick at 813-614-5729 or by e-mail at jason.kirkpatrick.2.ctr@us.af.mil.

Sincerely

WYNN.ROBER
T.T.1103491670
ROBERT T. WYNN, GS-15, DAF
Director, 6th Civil Engineer Squadron

Digitally signed by
WYNN.ROBERT.T.1103491670
Date: 2021.02.01 21:08:35
-05'00'

Attachment
Draft Environmental Assessment for Tampa Electric Company Distributed Generation Facility

cc:
Ms. Danielle Simon

MISSION FOCUSED...VALUED AIRMEN



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

AUG 27 2020

Colonel Benjamin R. Jonsson
6th Air Refueling Wing Commander
8208 Hangar Loop Drive, Suite 1
MacDill Air Force Base, Florida 33621-5407

Mr. Billy Cypress, Chairman
Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida
Tamiami Station
PO Box 440021
Miami, FL 33144

Dear Mr. Cypress

The United States Air Force (USAF), in conjunction with Tampa Electric Company, is preparing an environmental assessment under the National Environmental Policy Act to evaluate potential environmental impacts of a proposed natural gas-fired distributed generation facility. The proposed facility will be located in a previously disturbed area of the MacDill Air Force Base (AFB). The proposed facility will include natural gas-fired reciprocating internal combustion engine-generator(s), battery storage, and offsite underground transmission and pipeline for natural gas supply to the proposed facility.

In accordance with Executive Order 13175, Consultation with Indian Tribal Governments, USAF would like to initiate government-to-government consultation regarding this proposed project. USAF desires to discuss this proposed project in detail with you so we may understand and consider any comments, concerns, or suggestions you may have. This letter also initiates our consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) (Code of Federal Regulations [CFR], Title 36, Part 800) and requests your input.

A Phase I archaeological survey of the western portion of MacDill AFB was recently completed. No archaeological properties were identified within the footprint of the proposed project area; however, archaeological site 8HI14612 was discovered approximately 250 feet east of the project site. Site 8HI14612 is a low-density precontact lithic scatter and was determined ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Additional information on Site 8HI14612 can be found in final survey report entitled *Phase I Archaeological Survey of 2,236.79 Acres Within MacDill Air Force Base, Hillsborough County, Florida* (dated 20 February 2020) submitted to your office in April 2020.

Please let us know when you would be available to discuss this proposed project and your expectations on how to proceed with consultation. Please contact me at (813) 828-4444 to discuss dates and times for consultation.

Sincerely

BENJAMIN R. JONSSON, Colonel, USAF
Commander

Attachment:
Figures 1 through 3 PDF, 20 July 2020

cc:
Mr. Kevin Donaldson



FIGURE 2.
PROJECT SITE LAYOUT MAP
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION PROJECT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources: FDOT, 2019; ECT, 2020.



MacDill Air Force Base Environmental
6 CES/CEIEC
7621 Hillsborough Loop Dr.
MacDill AFB, FL 33621

4 December 2020

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

FROM: 6 CES/CEIEC

SUBJECT: Consultation with the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida Regarding Tampa Electric Company Distributed Generation Project at MacDill AFB

1. A hard copy consultation letter for the subject project was mailed to the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida on 28 August 2020. In addition, an electronic version of the letter was e-mailed to Mr. Kevin Donaldson with the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida on 31 August 2020. A follow-up e-mail was sent to Mr. Donaldson on 13 November 2020 to confirm that the initial consultation letter was received and to request feedback from the Miccosukee Tribe. To date, no reply has been received from Mr. Donaldson on our requests for input on the Tampa Electric Company Distributed Generation project.
2. On 4 December 2020, I placed a call to Mr. Donaldson to follow-up. I was able to reach Mr. Donaldson on the phone and he confirmed that he had received the initial consultation letter via e-mail as well as the 13 November follow-up e-mail. Mr. Donaldson explained that they are frequently inundated with consultation requests, and that they only respond to those that they feel are a concern to the tribe. Mr. Donaldson stated that if no responses or phone calls are received by the Air Force within 30-60 days of submittal, we can assume the tribe has no objection to the project. In many years of consultation with the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida, the base has never received a written response from a project consultation letter.
3. The final NEPA documents will be executed, but it is understood that the tribe may provide comments or requests at any time and those requests will be considered accordingly.

Jason Kirkpatrick

JASON W. KIRKPATRICK, Contractor
Environmental Manager, 6th Civil Engineer Squadron



Commit to Serve, Commit to Conserve





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

AUG 27 2020

Colonel Benjamin R. Jonsson
6th Air Refueling Wing Commander
8208 Hangar Loop Drive, Suite 1
MacDill Air Force Base, Florida 33621-5407

Mr. Greg Chilcoat, Principal Chief
Seminole Nation of Oklahoma
PO Box 1498
Wewoka, Oklahoma 74884

Dear Mr. Chilcoat

The United States Air Force (USAF), in conjunction with Tampa Electric Company, is preparing an environmental assessment under the National Environmental Policy Act to evaluate potential environmental impacts of a proposed natural gas-fired distributed generation facility. The proposed facility will be located in a previously disturbed area of the MacDill Air Force Base (AFB). The proposed facility will include natural gas-fired reciprocating internal combustion engine-generator(s), battery storage, and offsite underground transmission and pipeline for natural gas supply to the proposed facility.

In accordance with Executive Order 13175, Consultation with Indian Tribal Governments, USAF would like to initiate government-to-government consultation regarding this proposed project. USAF desires to discuss this proposed project in detail with you so we may understand and consider any comments, concerns, or suggestions you may have. This letter also initiates our consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) (Code of Federal Regulations [CFR], Title 36, Part 800) and requests your input.

A Phase I archaeological survey of the western portion of MacDill AFB was recently completed. No archaeological properties were identified within the footprint of the proposed project area; however, archaeological site 8HI14612 was discovered approximately 250 feet east of the project site. Site 8HI14612 is a low-density precontact lithic scatter and was determined ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Additional information on Site 8HI14612 can be found in final survey report entitled *Phase I Archaeological Survey of 2,236.79 Acres Within MacDill Air Force Base, Hillsborough County, Florida* (dated 20 February 2020) submitted to your office in April 2020.

Please let us know when you would be available to discuss this proposed project and your expectations on how to proceed with consultation. Please contact me at (813) 828-4444 to discuss dates and times for consultation.

Sincerely

BENJAMIN R. JONSSON, Colonel, USAF
Commander

Attachment:
Figures 1 through 3 PDF, 20 July 2020

cc:
Ms. Brigita Leader



FIGURE 2.
PROJECT SITE LAYOUT MAP
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION PROJECT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources: FDOT, 2019; ECT, 2020.



MacDill Air Force Base Environmental
6 CES/CEIEC
7621 Hillsborough Loop Dr.
MacDill AFB, FL 33621

4 March 2021

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

FROM: 6 CES/CEIEC

SUBJECT: Consultation with the Seminole Nation of Oklahoma Regarding Tampa Electric Company Distributed Generation Project at MacDill AFB

1. A hard copy consultation letter for the subject project was mailed to the Seminole Nation of Oklahoma on 28 August 2020. In addition, an electronic version of the letter was e-mailed to Ms. Brigita Leader with the Seminole Nation of Oklahoma on 31 August 2020. A follow-up e-mail was sent to Ms. Leader on 13 November 2020 to confirm that the initial consultation letter was received and to request feedback from the Seminole Nation of Oklahoma. To date, there has been no reply from Ms. Leader on our requests for input on the Tampa Electric Company Distributed Generation project.
2. On 4 December 2020, I placed a call to the Historic Preservation Office for the Seminole Nation of Oklahoma to check-in and follow-up. I was able to reach Ms. Leader, who indicated that she is not the preferred point of contact for Section 106 consultation. The Historic Preservation Office would prefer that all Section 106 consultation be submitted directly to the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO). She noted that, unfortunately, the THPO position has been vacant for a period recently, but a new THPO (Mr. Edwin Marshall) is inbound. Ms. Leader took down my e-mail address and said she would send me contact information for the new THPO when she has it. Ms. Leader indicated that the Seminole Nation of Oklahoma had no concerns about the TECO Distributed Generation project.
3. I never received a follow-up e-mail from Ms. Leader. My follow-up e-mail to her I received an "Undeliverable" return receipt notification. On 12 January 2021, I called the Historic Preservation Office to make another attempt to reach Ms. Leader or Mr. Marshall, but no one answered and I left a voicemail message. On 22 January 2021, I called the Historic Preservation Office one final time, but no one answered and I again left a voicemail message with my name, phone number and the reason for my call.
4. On 26 January 2021, I received a phone call from Mr. Marshall, and we discussed his new assignment to the position of THPO and his expectations for future consultation on projects. We briefly discussed the TECO Distributed Generation project, and he did not express any initial concerns. I followed up the phone call with an e-mail to Mr. Marshall requesting feedback or any concerns that the Seminole Nation of Oklahoma may have about the project. The 26 January e-mail included a copy of our initial consultation letter, some figures showing the TECO project, and a brief description of the project. No response to the 26 January e-mail was received at the time of signature on the memorandum for record.



Commit to Serve, Commit to Conserve





5. The final NEPA documents will be executed, but it is understood that the tribe may provide comments or requests at any time and those requests will be considered accordingly.

Jason Kirkpatrick

JASON W. KIRKPATRICK, Contractor
Environmental Manager, 6th Civil Engineer Squadron



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

AUG 27 2020

Colonel Benjamin R. Jonsson
6th Air Refueling Wing Commander
8208 Hangar Loop Drive, Suite 1
MacDill Air Force Base, Florida 33621-5407

Mr. David Hill, Principal Chief
Muscogee (Creek) Nation
P.O. Box 580
Okmulgee, Oklahoma 74447

Dear Mr. Hill

The United States Air Force (USAF), in conjunction with Tampa Electric Company, is preparing an environmental assessment under the National Environmental Policy Act to evaluate potential environmental impacts of a proposed natural gas-fired distributed generation facility. The proposed facility will be located in a previously disturbed area of the MacDill Air Force Base (AFB). The proposed facility will include natural gas-fired reciprocating internal combustion engine-generator(s), battery storage, and offsite underground transmission and pipeline for natural gas supply to the proposed facility.

In accordance with Executive Order 13175, Consultation with Indian Tribal Governments, USAF would like to initiate government-to-government consultation regarding this proposed project. USAF desires to discuss this proposed project in detail with you so we may understand and consider any comments, concerns, or suggestions you may have. This letter also initiates our consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) (Code of Federal Regulations [CFR], Title 36, Part 800) and requests your input.

A Phase I archaeological survey of the western portion of MacDill AFB was recently completed. No archaeological properties were identified within the footprint of the proposed project area; however, archaeological site 8HI14612 was discovered approximately 250 feet east of the project site. Site 8HI14612 is a low-density precontact lithic scatter and was determined ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Additional information on Site 8HI14612 can be found in final survey report entitled *Phase I Archaeological Survey of 2,236.79 Acres Within MacDill Air Force Base, Hillsborough County, Florida* (dated 20 February 2020) submitted to your office in April 2020.

Please let us know when you would be available to discuss this proposed project and your expectations on how to proceed with consultation. Please contact me at (813) 828-4444 to discuss dates and times for consultation.

Sincerely

BENJAMIN R. JONSSON, Colonel, USAF
Commander

Attachment:
Figures 1 through 3 PDF, 20 July 2020

cc:
Ms. RaeLynn Butler



FIGURE 2.
PROJECT SITE LAYOUT MAP
MACDILL DISTRIBUTED GENERATION PROJECT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Sources: FDOT, 2019; ECT, 2020.



MacDill Air Force Base Environmental
6 CES/CEIEC
7621 Hillsborough Loop Dr.
MacDill AFB, FL 33621

12 January 2021

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

FROM: 6 CES/CEIE

SUBJECT: Consultation with the Muscogee (Creek) Nation Regarding Tampa Electric Company Distributed Generation Project at MacDill AFB

1. A hard copy consultation letter for the subject project was mailed to the Muscogee (Creek) Nation on 28 August 2020. In addition, an electronic version of the letter was e-mailed to Ms. RaeLynn Butler with the Muscogee (Creek) Nation on 31 August 2020. A follow-up e-mail was sent to Ms. Butler on 13 November 2020 to confirm that the initial consultation letter was received and to request feedback from the Muscogee (Creek) Nation. To date, no reply has been received from Ms. Butler on our requests for input on the Tampa Electric Company Distributed Generation project.
2. On 4 December 2020, I placed a call to the Historic and Cultural Preservation Department for the Muscogee (Creek) Nation to check-in and follow-up. On the third attempt, I was able to get through the automated system and someone answered. The individual stated that Robin Soweka would be the appropriate person to talk to but that no one besides himself was in the office today. He collected my cell phone number and said he'd pass the information on to Mr. Soweka. We chatted for a bit about COVID and how that has affected office/home life for tribe members.
3. Additional follow-up phone calls were made on 11 January 2021. Using the automated directory (the only option) the name 'Robin Soweka' was not recognized, and I reached Ms. Sabon who is the Social Service Coordinator. She was unable to help with the Section 106 consultation, and was not familiar with the name Robin Soweka, but did forward me to Ms. RaeLynn Butler. Ms. Butler did not pick up the call, so I left a voicemail. I then called back and worked through the automated staff directory process to find Mr. David Proctor's (Section 106 Coordinator) extension. Mr. Proctor did not pick up the call and I left a voicemail message.
4. I feel we have made a strong effort to make contact with the Muscogee tribe and solicit their input on the Tampa Electric Company Distributed Generation project. To date, my phone calls and voicemail have not been returned. I will update this Memorandum for Record if additional feedback from the Muscogee tribe is received. The final NEPA documents will be executed, but it is understood that the tribe may provide comments or requests at any time and those requests will be considered accordingly.

Jason Kirkpatrick

JASON W. KIRKPATRICK, Contractor
Environmental Manager, 6th Civil Engineer Squadron



Commit to Serve, Commit to Conserve



APPENDIX C

CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS

AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

RECORD OF CONFORMITY ANALYSIS (ROCA)

1. General Information: The Air Force's Air Conformity Applicability Model (ACAM) was used to perform an analysis to assess the potential air quality impact/s associated with the action in accordance with the Air Force Manual 32-7002, Environmental Compliance and Pollution Prevention; the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP, 32 CFR 989); and the General Conformity Rule (GCR, 40 CFR 93 Subpart B). This report provides a summary of the ACAM analysis.

a. Action Location:

Base: MACDILL AFB
State: Florida
County(s): Hillsborough
Regulatory Area(s): Hillsborough County, FL

b. Action Title: MacDill Air Force Base Land Leasing Project to Site, Construct, and Operate a Tampa Electric Company-Owned Distributed Generation Facility

c. Project Number/s (if applicable): TEC Project No. A2688688-0003

d. Projected Action Start Date: 6 / 2023

e. Action Description:

TEC plans to construct a distributed generation facility that will include one, single-story, approximately 55 feet tall building to house the generators/engines, battery storage, electrical room, IT room, bathrooms, and control room), paved and gravel-covered exterior improvements, underground electric transmission line, and natural gas lateral pipeline. The project includes the installation of four natural gas-fired prime power generators, two natural gas-fired emergency generators, a diesel fuel-fired emergency fire water pump with fuel tank, and supporting auxiliary equipment. The distributed generation facility development includes connections to an existing electrical substation located north of the MacDill AFB via an underground transmission line and to an offsite lateral natural gas pipeline to provide fuel for the natural gas engines.

The Battery Storage Area portion of the project will be used to house metal containers used to store the lithium-ion batteries and will include one small, metal shed/building for the associated electric components. These items are pre-fabricated and delivered to the site and, therefore, are not included as part of the construction and demolition activities.

f. Point of Contact:

Name: Mike Harrison
Title: Air Program Manager
Organization: 6 CES/CEIE
Email: michael.harrison.19.ctr@us.af.mil
Phone Number: 813-828-0462

2. Analysis: Total combined direct and indirect emissions associated with the action were estimated through ACAM on a calendar-year basis for the "worst-case" and "steady state" (net gain/loss upon action fully implemented) emissions. General Conformity under the Clean Air Act, Section 1.76 has been evaluated for the action described above according to the requirements of 40 CFR 93, Subpart B.

Based on the analysis, the requirements of this rule are: applicable
 X not applicable

Conformity Analysis Summary:

2023

AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

RECORD OF CONFORMITY ANALYSIS (ROCA)

Pollutant	Action Emissions (ton/yr)	GENERAL CONFORMITY	
		Threshold (ton/yr)	Exceedance (Yes or No)
Hillsborough County, FL			
VOC	0.220		
NOx	1.241		
CO	1.504		
SOx	0.004	100	No
PM 10	5.811		
PM 2.5	0.049		
Pb	0.000		
NH3	0.001		
CO2e	380.4		

2024

Pollutant	Action Emissions (ton/yr)	GENERAL CONFORMITY	
		Threshold (ton/yr)	Exceedance (Yes or No)
Hillsborough County, FL			
VOC	43.691		
NOx	313.445		
CO	206.788		
SOx	0.243	100	No
PM 10	0.460		
PM 2.5	0.085		
Pb	0.000		
NH3	0.001		
CO2e	43568.5		

2025 - (Steady State)

Pollutant	Action Emissions (ton/yr)	GENERAL CONFORMITY	
		Threshold (ton/yr)	Exceedance (Yes or No)
Hillsborough County, FL			
VOC	174.175		
NOx	1250.668		
CO	822.485		
SOx	0.961	100	No
PM 10	0.227		
PM 2.5	0.227		
Pb	0.000		
NH3	0.000		
CO2e	173140.4		

None of estimated emissions associated with this action are above the conformity threshold values established at 40 CFR 93.153 (b); Therefore, the requirements of the General Conformity Rule are not applicable.

Mike Harrison, Air Program Manager

DATE

DETAIL AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

1. General Information

- Action Location

Base: MACDILL AFB
State: Florida
County(s): Hillsborough
Regulatory Area(s): Hillsborough County, FL

- Action Title: MacDill Air Force Base Land Leasing Project to Site, Construct, and Operate a Tampa Electric Company-Owned Distributed Generation Facility

- Project Number/s (if applicable): TEC Project No. A2688688-0003

- Projected Action Start Date: 6 / 2023

- Action Purpose and Need:

The United States Air Force plans to enter into an Energy Assurance Lease with Tampa Electric Company (TEC, the Lessee) for the purpose of siting, constructing, owning and operating a distributed generation facility, battery storage, and underground transmission (the Lessee Improvements) on 4.5 acres of property on MacDill Air Force Base. The Lessee Improvements will augment the existing power grid for South Tampa and provide energy resiliency for MacDill AFB so that it can meet its mission requirements during a grid outage or emergency.

- Action Description:

TEC plans to construct a distributed generation facility that will include one, single-story, approximately 55 feet tall building to house the generators/engines, battery storage, electrical room, IT room, bathrooms, and control room), paved and gravel-covered exterior improvements, underground electric transmission line, and natural gas lateral pipeline. The project includes the installation of four natural gas-fired prime power generators, two natural gas-fired emergency generators, a diesel fuel-fired emergency fire water pump with fuel tank, and supporting auxiliary equipment. The distributed generation facility development includes connections to an existing electrical substation located north of the MacDill AFB via an underground transmission line and to an offsite lateral natural gas pipeline to provide fuel for the natural gas engines.

The Battery Storage Area portion of the project will be used to house metal containers used to store the lithium-ion batteries and will include one small, metal shed/building for the associated electric components. These items are pre-fabricated and delivered to the site and, therefore, are not included as part of the construction and demolition activities.

- Point of Contact

Name: Mike Harrison
Title: Air Program Manager
Organization: 6 CES/CEIE
Email: michael.harrison.19.ctr@us.af.mil
Phone Number: 813-828-0462

- Activity List:

Activity Type		Activity Title
2.	Emergency Generator	Four Prime Power Generators - Wärtsilä, Model No. 18V50SG-B
3.	Emergency Generator	Two Emergency Generators, Caterpillar Model No. G3512
4.	Emergency Generator	One, Emergency Fire Pump Engine - Cummins Model No. CFP7E-F10
5.	Tanks	200-Gallon Diesel Fuel Tank
6.	Construction / Demolition	Construct TEC Distributed Generation Facility Buildings, Grounds, and Utilities
7.	Heating	Fuel Gas Heater for Natural Gas-Fired Generators

DETAIL AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

Emission factors and air emission estimating methods come from the United States Air Force's Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Stationary Sources, Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Mobile Sources, and Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Transitory Sources.

2. Emergency Generator

2.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

- Add or Remove Activity from Baseline? Add

- Activity Location

County: Hillsborough

Regulatory Area(s): Hillsborough County, FL

- Activity Title: Four Prime Power Generators - Wärtsilä, Model No. 18V50SG-B

- Activity Description:

Install and Operate Four Prime Power Generators, 26,820 HP, natural gas fired. Operate for 3,500 hours per year.

- Activity Start Date

Start Month: 10

Start Year: 2024

- Activity End Date

Indefinite: Yes

End Month: N/A

End Year: N/A

- Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	174.034980
SO _x	0.938700
NO _x	1249.597440
CO	821.737980
PM 10	0.187740

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.187740
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO _{2e}	172750.1

2.2 Emergency Generator Assumptions

- Emergency Generator

Type of Fuel used in Emergency Generator: Natural Gas - 4 Stroke Lean Burn

Number of Emergency Generators: 4

- Default Settings Used: No

- Emergency Generators Consumption

Emergency Generator's Horsepower: 26820

Average Operating Hours Per Year (hours): 3500

2.3 Emergency Generator Emission Factor(s)

- Emergency Generators Emission Factor (lb/hp-hr)

VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	Pb	NH ₃	CO _{2e}
-----	-----------------	-----------------	----	-------	--------	----	-----------------	------------------

DETAIL AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

0.000927	0.000005	0.006656	0.004377	0.000001	0.000001			0.920156
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	--	--	----------

2.4 Emergency Generator Formula(s)

- Emergency Generator Emissions per Year

$$AE_{POL} = (NGEN * HP * OT * EF_{POL}) / 2000$$

AE_{POL} : Activity Emissions (TONs per Year)

NGEN: Number of Emergency Generators

HP: Emergency Generator's Horsepower (hp)

OT: Average Operating Hours Per Year (hours)

EF_{POL} : Emission Factor for Pollutant (lb/hp-hr)

3. Emergency Generator

3.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

- Add or Remove Activity from Baseline? Add

- Activity Location

County: Hillsborough

Regulatory Area(s): Hillsborough County, FL

- Activity Title: Two Emergency Generators, Caterpillar Model No. G3512

- Activity Description:

Install two, 1,114 HP, natural gas-fired emergency generators, 100 hours per year

- Activity Start Date

Start Month: 10

Start Year: 2024

- Activity End Date

Indefinite: Yes

End Month: N/A

End Year: N/A

- Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	0.103268
SO _x	0.000557
NO _x	0.741478
CO	0.487598
PM 10	0.000111

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.000111
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO ₂ e	102.5

3.2 Emergency Generator Assumptions

- Emergency Generator

Type of Fuel used in Emergency Generator:

Natural Gas - 4 Stroke Lean Burn

Number of Emergency Generators:

2

- Default Settings Used: No

DETAIL AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

- Emergency Generators Consumption

Emergency Generator's Horsepower: 1114
Average Operating Hours Per Year (hours): 100

3.3 Emergency Generator Emission Factor(s)

- Emergency Generators Emission Factor (lb/hp-hr)

VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	Pb	NH ₃	CO _{2e}
0.000927	0.000005	0.006656	0.004377	0.000001	0.000001			0.920156

3.4 Emergency Generator Formula(s)

- Emergency Generator Emissions per Year

$$AE_{POL} = (NGEN * HP * OT * EF_{POL}) / 2000$$

AE_{POL}: Activity Emissions (TONs per Year)

NGEN: Number of Emergency Generators

HP: Emergency Generator's Horsepower (hp)

OT: Average Operating Hours Per Year (hours)

EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (lb/hp-hr)

4. Emergency Generator

4.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

- Add or Remove Activity from Baseline? Add

- Activity Location

County: Hillsborough

Regulatory Area(s): Hillsborough County, FL

- Activity Title: One, Emergency Fire Pump Engine - Cummins Model No. CFP7E-F10

- Activity Description:

Install one new emergency fire pump/engine, 174 HP, ultra low sulfur diesel fuel fired, 100 hours per year.

- Activity Start Date

Start Month: 10

Start Year: 2024

- Activity End Date

Indefinite: Yes

End Month: N/A

End Year: N/A

- Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	0.024273
SO _x	0.020445
NO _x	0.100050
CO	0.066816
PM 10	0.021837

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.021837
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO _{2e}	11.6

DETAIL AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

4.2 Emergency Generator Assumptions

- Emergency Generator

Type of Fuel used in Emergency Generator: Diesel
Number of Emergency Generators: 1

- Default Settings Used: No

- Emergency Generators Consumption

Emergency Generator's Horsepower: 174
Average Operating Hours Per Year (hours): 100

4.3 Emergency Generator Emission Factor(s)

- Emergency Generators Emission Factor (lb/hp-hr)

VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	Pb	NH ₃	CO ₂ e
0.00279	0.00235	0.0115	0.00768	0.00251	0.00251			1.33

4.4 Emergency Generator Formula(s)

- Emergency Generator Emissions per Year

$$AE_{POL} = (NGEN * HP * OT * EF_{POL}) / 2000$$

AE_{POL}: Activity Emissions (TONs per Year)

NGEN: Number of Emergency Generators

HP: Emergency Generator's Horsepower (hp)

OT: Average Operating Hours Per Year (hours)

EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (lb/hp-hr)

5. Tanks

5.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

- Add or Remove Activity from Baseline? Add

- Activity Location

County: Hillsborough

Regulatory Area(s): Hillsborough County, FL

- Activity Title: 200-Gallon Diesel Fuel Tank

- Activity Description:

Ultra-low diesel fuel for the Cummins Model No. CFP7E-F10 emergency fire pump

- Activity Start Date

Start Month: 10

Start Year: 2024

- Activity End Date

Indefinite: Yes

End Month: N/A

End Year: N/A

DETAIL AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

- Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	0.000249
SO _x	0.000000
NO _x	0.000000
CO	0.000000
PM 10	0.000000

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.000000
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO ₂ e	0.0

5.2 Tanks Assumptions

- Chemical

Chemical Name:	Fuel oil no. 2
Chemical Category:	Petroleum Distillates
Chemical Density:	7.1
Vapor Molecular Weight (lb/lb-mole):	130
Stock Vapor Density (lb/ft ³):	0.000129553551395334
Vapor Pressure:	0.0055
Vapor Space Expansion Factor (dimensionless):	0.068

- Tank

Type of Tank:	Horizontal Tank
Tank Length (ft):	6
Tank Diameter (ft):	4
Annual Net Throughput (gallon/year):	2400

5.3 Tank Formula(s)

- Vapor Space Volume

$$VSV = (PI / 4) * D^2 * L / 2$$

VSV: Vapor Space Volume (ft³)

PI: PI Math Constant

D²: Tank Diameter (ft)

L: Tank Length (ft)

2: Conversion Factor (Vapor Space Volume is assumed to be one-half of the tank volume)

- Vented Vapor Saturation Factor

$$VVSF = 1 / (1 + (0.053 * VP * L / 2))$$

VVSF: Vented Vapor Saturation Factor (dimensionless)

0.053: Constant

VP: Vapor Pressure (psia)

L: Tank Length (ft)

- Standing Storage Loss per Year

$$SSL_{VOC} = 365 * VSV * SVD * VSEF * VVSF / 2000$$

SSL_{VOC}: Standing Storage Loss Emissions (TONs)

365: Number of Daily Events in a Year (Constant)

VSV: Vapor Space Volume (ft³)

SVD: Stock Vapor Density (lb/ft³)

VSEF: Vapor Space Expansion Factor (dimensionless)

VVSF: Vented Vapor Saturation Factor (dimensionless)

2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

DETAIL AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

- Number of Turnovers per Year

$$NT = (7.48 * ANT) / ((PI / 4.0) * D * L)$$

NT: Number of Turnovers per Year

7.48: Constant

ANT: Annual Net Throughput

PI: PI Math Constant

D²: Tank Diameter (ft)

L: Tank Length (ft)

- Working Loss Turnover (Saturation) Factor per Year

$$WLSF = (18 + NT) / (6 * NT)$$

WLSF: Working Loss Turnover (Saturation) Factor per Year

18: Constant

NT: Number of Turnovers per Year

6: Constant

- Working Loss per Year

$$WL_{VOC} = 0.0010 * VMW * VP * ANT * WLSF / 2000$$

0.0010: Constant

VMW: Vapor Molecular Weight (lb/lb-mole)

VP: Vapor Pressure (psia)

ANT: Annual Net Throughput

WLSF: Working Loss Turnover (Saturation) Factor

2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

6. Construction / Demolition

6.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

- Activity Location

County: Hillsborough

Regulatory Area(s): Hillsborough County, FL

- Activity Title: Construct TEC Distributed Generation Facility Buildings, Grounds, and Utilities

- Activity Description:

Construct one, single-story, approximately 55 feet tall building to house the generators/engines, battery storage, electrical room, IT room, bathrooms, and control room), paved and gravel-covered exterior improvements, underground electric transmission line, and natural gas lateral pipeline.

The Battery Storage Area portion of the project will be used to house metal containers used to store the lithium-ion batteries and will include one small, metal shed/building for the associated electric components. These items are pre-fabricated and delivered to the site and, therefore, are not included as part of the construction and demolition activities.

- Activity Start Date

Start Month: 6

Start Month: 2023

- Activity End Date

Indefinite: False

DETAIL AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

End Month: 9
End Month: 2024

- Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Total Emissions (TONs)
VOC	0.366453
SO _x	0.006835
NO _x	2.019226
CO	2.670567
PM 10	6.213768

Pollutant	Total Emissions (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.077562
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.001668
CO ₂ e	663.7

6.1 Site Grading Phase

6.1.1 Site Grading Phase Timeline Assumptions

- Phase Start Date

Start Month: 6
Start Quarter: 1
Start Year: 2023

- Phase Duration

Number of Month: 4
Number of Days: 0

6.1.2 Site Grading Phase Assumptions

- General Site Grading Information

Area of Site to be Graded (ft²): 126000
Amount of Material to be Hauled On-Site (yd³): 200
Amount of Material to be Hauled Off-Site (yd³): 200

- Site Grading Default Settings

Default Settings Used: Yes
Average Day(s) worked per week: 5 (default)

- Construction Exhaust (default)

Equipment Name	Number Of Equipment	Hours Per Day
Graders Composite	1	8
Other Construction Equipment Composite	1	8
Rubber Tired Dozers Composite	1	8
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite	2	7

- Vehicle Exhaust

Average Hauling Truck Capacity (yd³): 20 (default)
Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile): 20 (default)

- Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0

- Worker Trips

Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile): 20 (default)

- Worker Trips Vehicle Mixture (%)

DETAIL AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	50.00	50.00	0	0	0	0	0

6.1.3 Site Grading Phase Emission Factor(s)

- Construction Exhaust Emission Factors (lb/hour) (default)

Graders Composite								
	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO _{2e}
Emission Factors	0.0757	0.0014	0.4155	0.5717	0.0191	0.0191	0.0068	132.91
Other Construction Equipment Composite								
	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO _{2e}
Emission Factors	0.0483	0.0012	0.2497	0.3481	0.0091	0.0091	0.0043	122.61
Rubber Tired Dozers Composite								
	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO _{2e}
Emission Factors	0.1830	0.0024	1.2623	0.7077	0.0494	0.0494	0.0165	239.49
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite								
	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO _{2e}
Emission Factors	0.0364	0.0007	0.2127	0.3593	0.0080	0.0080	0.0032	66.879

- Vehicle Exhaust & Worker Trips Emission Factors (grams/mile)

	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	Pb	NH ₃	CO _{2e}
LDGV	000.282	000.002	000.207	003.392	000.006	000.005		000.023	00341.791
LDGT	000.376	000.003	000.373	004.889	000.007	000.006		000.024	00439.705
HDGV	000.832	000.005	000.964	016.217	000.016	000.014		000.046	00814.851
LDDV	000.084	000.003	000.127	002.822	000.004	000.004		000.008	00334.379
LDDT	000.227	000.004	000.365	004.850	000.007	000.006		000.008	00473.628
HDDV	000.423	000.014	004.175	001.653	000.176	000.162		000.028	01559.331
MC	003.040	000.003	000.626	013.017	000.026	000.023		000.052	00392.775

6.1.4 Site Grading Phase Formula(s)

- Fugitive Dust Emissions per Phase

$$PM10_{FD} = (20 * ACRE * WD) / 2000$$

PM10_{FD}: Fugitive Dust PM 10 Emissions (TONs)

20: Conversion Factor Acre Day to pounds (20 lb / 1 Acre Day)

ACRE: Total acres (acres)

WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)

2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Construction Exhaust Emissions per Phase

$$CEE_{POL} = (NE * WD * H * EF_{POL}) / 2000$$

CEE_{POL}: Construction Exhaust Emissions (TONs)

NE: Number of Equipment

WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)

H: Hours Worked per Day (hours)

EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (lb/hour)

2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Vehicle Exhaust Emissions per Phase

$$VMT_{VE} = (HA_{OnSite} + HA_{OffSite}) * (1 / HC) * HT$$

VMT_{VE}: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)

DETAIL AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

HA_{OnSite}: Amount of Material to be Hauled On-Site (yd³)
HA_{OffSite}: Amount of Material to be Hauled Off-Site (yd³)
HC: Average Hauling Truck Capacity (yd³)
(1 / HC): Conversion Factor cubic yards to trips (1 trip / HC yd³)
HT: Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile/trip)

$$V_{POL} = (VMT_{VE} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$$

V_{POL}: Vehicle Emissions (TONs)
VMT_{VE}: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds
EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile)
VM: Vehicle Exhaust On Road Vehicle Mixture (%)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Worker Trips Emissions per Phase

$$VMT_{WT} = WD * WT * 1.25 * NE$$

VMT_{WT}: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
WT: Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile)
1.25: Conversion Factor Number of Construction Equipment to Number of Works
NE: Number of Construction Equipment

$$V_{POL} = (VMT_{WT} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$$

V_{POL}: Vehicle Emissions (TONs)
VMT_{WT}: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds
EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile)
VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

6.2 Trenching/Excavating Phase

6.2.1 Trenching / Excavating Phase Timeline Assumptions

- Phase Start Date

Start Month: 9
Start Quarter: 1
Start Year: 2023

- Phase Duration

Number of Month: 6
Number of Days: 0

6.2.2 Trenching / Excavating Phase Assumptions

- General Trenching/Excavating Information

Area of Site to be Trenched/Excavated (ft²): 18800
Amount of Material to be Hauled On-Site (yd³): 35
Amount of Material to be Hauled Off-Site (yd³): 35

- Trenching Default Settings

Default Settings Used: Yes

DETAIL AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

Average Day(s) worked per week: 5 (default)

- Construction Exhaust (default)

Equipment Name	Number Of Equipment	Hours Per Day
Excavators Composite	2	8
Other General Industrial Equipmen Composite	1	8
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite	1	8

- Vehicle Exhaust

Average Hauling Truck Capacity (yd³): 20 (default)

Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile): 20 (default)

- Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0

- Worker Trips

Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile): 20 (default)

- Worker Trips Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	50.00	50.00	0	0	0	0	0

6.2.3 Trenching / Excavating Phase Emission Factor(s)

- Construction Exhaust Emission Factors (lb/hour) (default)

Graders Composite								
	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO _{2e}
Emission Factors	0.0757	0.0014	0.4155	0.5717	0.0191	0.0191	0.0068	132.91
Other Construction Equipment Composite								
	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO _{2e}
Emission Factors	0.0483	0.0012	0.2497	0.3481	0.0091	0.0091	0.0043	122.61
Rubber Tired Dozers Composite								
	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO _{2e}
Emission Factors	0.1830	0.0024	1.2623	0.7077	0.0494	0.0494	0.0165	239.49
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite								
	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO _{2e}
Emission Factors	0.0364	0.0007	0.2127	0.3593	0.0080	0.0080	0.0032	66.879

- Vehicle Exhaust & Worker Trips Emission Factors (grams/mile)

	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	Pb	NH ₃	CO _{2e}
LDGV	000.282	000.002	000.207	003.392	000.006	000.005		000.023	00341.791
LDGT	000.376	000.003	000.373	004.889	000.007	000.006		000.024	00439.705
HDGV	000.832	000.005	000.964	016.217	000.016	000.014		000.046	00814.851
LDDV	000.084	000.003	000.127	002.822	000.004	000.004		000.008	00334.379
LDDT	000.227	000.004	000.365	004.850	000.007	000.006		000.008	00473.628
HDDV	000.423	000.014	004.175	001.653	000.176	000.162		000.028	01559.331
MC	003.040	000.003	000.626	013.017	000.026	000.023		000.052	00392.775

6.2.4 Trenching / Excavating Phase Formula(s)

- Fugitive Dust Emissions per Phase

$$PM_{10FD} = (20 * ACRE * WD) / 2000$$

DETAIL AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

PM10_{FD}: Fugitive Dust PM 10 Emissions (TONs)
20: Conversion Factor Acre Day to pounds (20 lb / 1 Acre Day)
ACRE: Total acres (acres)
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Construction Exhaust Emissions per Phase

$$CEE_{POL} = (NE * WD * H * EF_{POL}) / 2000$$

CEE_{POL}: Construction Exhaust Emissions (TONs)
NE: Number of Equipment
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
H: Hours Worked per Day (hours)
EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (lb/hour)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Vehicle Exhaust Emissions per Phase

$$VMT_{VE} = (HA_{OnSite} + HA_{OffSite}) * (1 / HC) * HT$$

VMT_{VE}: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
HA_{OnSite}: Amount of Material to be Hauled On-Site (yd³)
HA_{OffSite}: Amount of Material to be Hauled Off-Site (yd³)
HC: Average Hauling Truck Capacity (yd³)
(1 / HC): Conversion Factor cubic yards to trips (1 trip / HC yd³)
HT: Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile/trip)

$$V_{POL} = (VMT_{VE} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$$

V_{POL}: Vehicle Emissions (TONs)
VMT_{VE}: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds
EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile)
VM: Vehicle Exhaust On Road Vehicle Mixture (%)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Worker Trips Emissions per Phase

$$VMT_{WT} = WD * WT * 1.25 * NE$$

VMT_{WT}: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
WT: Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile)
1.25: Conversion Factor Number of Construction Equipment to Number of Works
NE: Number of Construction Equipment

$$V_{POL} = (VMT_{WT} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$$

V_{POL}: Vehicle Emissions (TONs)
VMT_{VE}: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds
EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile)
VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

6.3 Building Construction Phase

DETAIL AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

6.3.1 Building Construction Phase Timeline Assumptions

- Phase Start Date

Start Month: 2
Start Quarter: 1
Start Year: 2024

- Phase Duration

Number of Month: 8
Number of Days: 0

6.3.2 Building Construction Phase Assumptions

- General Building Construction Information

Building Category: Office or Industrial
Area of Building (ft²): 18000
Height of Building (ft): 55
Number of Units: N/A

- Building Construction Default Settings

Default Settings Used: Yes
Average Day(s) worked per week: 5 (default)

- Construction Exhaust (default)

Equipment Name	Number Of Equipment	Hours Per Day
Cranes Composite	1	4
Forklifts Composite	2	6
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite	1	8

- Vehicle Exhaust

Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile): 20 (default)

- Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0

- Worker Trips

Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile): 20 (default)

- Worker Trips Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	50.00	50.00	0	0	0	0	0

- Vendor Trips

Average Vendor Round Trip Commute (mile): 40 (default)

- Vendor Trips Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0

6.3.3 Building Construction Phase Emission Factor(s)

- Construction Exhaust Emission Factors (lb/hour) (default)

DETAIL AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

Cranes Composite								
	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO _{2e}
Emission Factors	0.0715	0.0013	0.4600	0.3758	0.0161	0.0161	0.0064	128.78
Forklifts Composite								
	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO _{2e}
Emission Factors	0.0246	0.0006	0.0973	0.2146	0.0029	0.0029	0.0022	54.451
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite								
	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO _{2e}
Emission Factors	0.0348	0.0007	0.1980	0.3589	0.0068	0.0068	0.0031	66.875

- Vehicle Exhaust & Worker Trips Emission Factors (grams/mile)

	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	Pb	NH ₃	CO _{2e}
LDGV	000.282	000.002	000.207	003.392	000.006	000.005		000.023	00341.791
LDGT	000.376	000.003	000.373	004.889	000.007	000.006		000.024	00439.705
HDGV	000.832	000.005	000.964	016.217	000.016	000.014		000.046	00814.851
LDDV	000.084	000.003	000.127	002.822	000.004	000.004		000.008	00334.379
LDDT	000.227	000.004	000.365	004.850	000.007	000.006		000.008	00473.628
HDDV	000.423	000.014	004.175	001.653	000.176	000.162		000.028	01559.331
MC	003.040	000.003	000.626	013.017	000.026	000.023		000.052	00392.775

6.3.4 Building Construction Phase Formula(s)

- Construction Exhaust Emissions per Phase

$$CEE_{POL} = (NE * WD * H * EF_{POL}) / 2000$$

CEE_{POL}: Construction Exhaust Emissions (TONs)

NE: Number of Equipment

WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)

H: Hours Worked per Day (hours)

EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (lb/hour)

2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Vehicle Exhaust Emissions per Phase

$$VMT_{VE} = BA * BH * (0.42 / 1000) * HT$$

VMT_{VE}: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)

BA: Area of Building (ft²)

BH: Height of Building (ft)

(0.42 / 1000): Conversion Factor ft³ to trips (0.42 trip / 1000 ft³)

HT: Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile/trip)

$$V_{POL} = (VMT_{VE} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$$

V_{POL}: Vehicle Emissions (TONs)

VMT_{VE}: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)

0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds

EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile)

VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%)

2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Worker Trips Emissions per Phase

$$VMT_{WT} = WD * WT * 1.25 * NE$$

VMT_{WT}: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)

WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)

DETAIL AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

WT: Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile)
1.25: Conversion Factor Number of Construction Equipment to Number of Works
NE: Number of Construction Equipment

$$V_{POL} = (VMT_{WT} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$$

V_{POL} : Vehicle Emissions (TONs)
 VMT_{WT} : Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds
 EF_{POL} : Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile)
VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Vender Trips Emissions per Phase

$$VMT_{VT} = BA * BH * (0.38 / 1000) * HT$$

VMT_{VT} : Vender Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
BA: Area of Building (ft²)
BH: Height of Building (ft)
(0.38 / 1000): Conversion Factor ft³ to trips (0.38 trip / 1000 ft³)
HT: Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile/trip)

$$V_{POL} = (VMT_{VT} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$$

V_{POL} : Vehicle Emissions (TONs)
 VMT_{VT} : Vender Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds
 EF_{POL} : Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile)
VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

6.4 Paving Phase

6.4.1 Paving Phase Timeline Assumptions

- Phase Start Date

Start Month: 9
Start Quarter: 1
Start Year: 2024

- Phase Duration

Number of Month: 1
Number of Days: 0

6.4.2 Paving Phase Assumptions

- General Paving Information

Paving Area (ft²): 500

- Paving Default Settings

Default Settings Used: Yes
Average Day(s) worked per week: 5 (default)

- Construction Exhaust (default)

Equipment Name	Number Of	Hours Per Day
----------------	-----------	---------------

DETAIL AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

	Equipment	
Cement and Mortar Mixers Composite	4	6
Pavers Composite	1	7
Rollers Composite	1	7
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite	1	7

- Vehicle Exhaust

Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile): 20 (default)

- Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0

- Worker Trips

Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile): 20 (default)

- Worker Trips Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	50.00	50.00	0	0	0	0	0

6.4.3 Paving Phase Emission Factor(s)

- Construction Exhaust Emission Factors (lb/hour) (default)

Graders Composite								
	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO _{2e}
Emission Factors	0.0757	0.0014	0.4155	0.5717	0.0191	0.0191	0.0068	132.91
Other Construction Equipment Composite								
	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO _{2e}
Emission Factors	0.0483	0.0012	0.2497	0.3481	0.0091	0.0091	0.0043	122.61
Rubber Tired Dozers Composite								
	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO _{2e}
Emission Factors	0.1830	0.0024	1.2623	0.7077	0.0494	0.0494	0.0165	239.49
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite								
	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO _{2e}
Emission Factors	0.0364	0.0007	0.2127	0.3593	0.0080	0.0080	0.0032	66.879

- Vehicle Exhaust & Worker Trips Emission Factors (grams/mile)

	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	Pb	NH ₃	CO _{2e}
LDGV	000.282	000.002	000.207	003.392	000.006	000.005		000.023	00341.791
LDGT	000.376	000.003	000.373	004.889	000.007	000.006		000.024	00439.705
HDGV	000.832	000.005	000.964	016.217	000.016	000.014		000.046	00814.851
LDDV	000.084	000.003	000.127	002.822	000.004	000.004		000.008	00334.379
LDDT	000.227	000.004	000.365	004.850	000.007	000.006		000.008	00473.628
HDDV	000.423	000.014	004.175	001.653	000.176	000.162		000.028	01559.331
MC	003.040	000.003	000.626	013.017	000.026	000.023		000.052	00392.775

6.4.4 Paving Phase Formula(s)

- Construction Exhaust Emissions per Phase

$$CEE_{POL} = (NE * WD * H * EF_{POL}) / 2000$$

CEE_{POL}: Construction Exhaust Emissions (TONs)

NE: Number of Equipment

WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)

DETAIL AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

H: Hours Worked per Day (hours)
EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (lb/hour)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Vehicle Exhaust Emissions per Phase

$$VMT_{VE} = PA * 0.25 * (1 / 27) * (1 / HC) * HT$$

VMT_{VE}: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
PA: Paving Area (ft²)
0.25: Thickness of Paving Area (ft)
(1 / 27): Conversion Factor cubic feet to cubic yards (1 yd³ / 27 ft³)
HC: Average Hauling Truck Capacity (yd³)
(1 / HC): Conversion Factor cubic yards to trips (1 trip / HC yd³)
HT: Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile/trip)

$$V_{POL} = (VMT_{VE} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$$

V_{POL}: Vehicle Emissions (TONs)
VMT_{VE}: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds
EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile)
VM: Vehicle Exhaust On Road Vehicle Mixture (%)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Worker Trips Emissions per Phase

$$VMT_{WT} = WD * WT * 1.25 * NE$$

VMT_{WT}: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
WT: Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile)
1.25: Conversion Factor Number of Construction Equipment to Number of Works
NE: Number of Construction Equipment

$$V_{POL} = (VMT_{WT} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$$

V_{POL}: Vehicle Emissions (TONs)
VMT_{VE}: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds
EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile)
VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Off-Gassing Emissions per Phase

$$VOC_P = (2.62 * PA) / 43560$$

VOC_P: Paving VOC Emissions (TONs)
2.62: Emission Factor (lb/acre)
PA: Paving Area (ft²)
43560: Conversion Factor square feet to acre (43560 ft² / acre)² / acre)

7. Heating

7.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

DETAIL AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

- Add or Remove Activity from Baseline? Add

- Activity Location

County: Hillsborough

Regulatory Area(s): Hillsborough County, FL

- Activity Title: Fuel Gas Heater for Natural Gas-Fired Generators

- Activity Description:

A fuel gas heater will be used to condition the natural gas used to fire the generators. Assumed to operate 8760 hours per year.

- Activity Start Date

Start Month: 10

Start Year: 2024

- Activity End Date

Indefinite: Yes

End Month: N/A

End Year: N/A

- Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	0.012619
SO _x	0.001377
NO _x	0.229429
CO	0.192720
PM 10	0.017437

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.017437
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO _{2e}	276.2

7.2 Heating Assumptions

- Heating

Heating Calculation Type: Rated Capacity Method

- Rated Capacity Method

Rated Capacity of boiler/furnance (MM Btu): 0.55

Type of fuel: Natural Gas

Type of boiler/furnance: Commercial/Institutional (0.3 - 9.9 MMBtu/hr)

Heat Value (MMBtu/ft³): 0.00105

- Default Settings Used: No

- Boiler/Furnace Usage

Operating Time Per Year (hours): 8760

7.3 Heating Emission Factor(s)

- Heating Emission Factors (lb/1000000 scf)

VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	Pb	NH ₃	CO _{2e}
5.5	0.6	100	84	7.6	7.6			120390

7.4 Heating Formula(s)

- Heating Fuel Consumption ft³ per Year

$$FC_{RC} = OT * RC / HV / 1000000$$

DETAIL AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT

FC_{RC}: Fuel Consumption for Rated Capacity Method

OT: Operating Time Per Year (hours)

RC: Rated Capacity of boiler/furnance (MM Btu)

HV: Heat Value (MMBTU/ft³)

1000000: Conversion Factor

- Heating Emissions per Year

HE_{POL} = FC * EF_{POL} / 2000

HE_{POL}: Heating Emission Emissions (TONs)

FC: Fuel Consumption

EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant

2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

APPENDIX D

NOISE SURVEY

MacDill Air Force Base Sound Study



Tampa Electric Company

MacDill Air Force Base
Project No. 119465

Revision 1
3/12/2020

MacDill Air Force Base Sound Study

prepared for

**Tampa Electric Company
MacDill Air Force Base
Tampa, Florida**

Project No. 119465

**Revision 1
3/12/2020**

prepared by

**Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc.
Chicago, IL**

COPYRIGHT © 2020 BURNS & McDONNELL ENGINEERING COMPANY, INC.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1-1
2.0 ACOUSTICAL TERMINOLOGY	2-1
3.0 APPLICABLE REGULATIONS.....	3-1
4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING.....	4-1
4.1 Project Area	4-1
4.2 Noise-Sensitive Receivers	4-1
4.3 Existing Sound Environment	4-4
4.3.1 Sound Survey Methodology	4-4
4.3.2 Short-Term Measurements.....	4-4
4.3.3 Long-Term Measurement	4-5
5.0 PREDICTIVE MODELING.....	5-1
5.1 Methodology	5-1
5.2 Balance of Plant Equipment.....	5-2
5.3 Wartsila Equipment Analysis	5-2
5.3.1 Wartsila Supplied Equipment	5-2
5.3.2 Wartsila Model Results.....	5-4
5.4 MAN Equipment Analysis.....	5-6
5.4.1 MAN Supplied Equipment	5-6
5.4.2 MAN Model Results.....	5-7
6.0 CONCLUSION	6-1
 APPENDIX A - MEASUREMENT DATA	
APPENDIX B - LONG-TERM SOUND LEVEL DATA	
APPENDIX C - MODELED SOUND POWER LEVELS	
APPENDIX D - SITE LAYOUT	
APPENDIX E - SOUND LEVEL CONTOURS	

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page No.</u>
Table 2-1: Typical Sound Pressure Levels Associated with Common Sound Sources.....	2-2
Table 3-1: City of Tampa District Sound Level Limits.....	3-1
Table 3-2: City of Tampa Industrial Sound Level Limits.....	3-1
Table 3-3: UFC Sound Level Limits	3-2
Table 4-1: Noise-Sensitive Receiver Information	4-2
Table 4-2: Short-Term Far-Field Measurement Data	4-4
Table 5-1: Sound Modeling Parameters	5-2
Table 5-2: Wartsila Provided Sound Power Levels.....	5-3
Table 5-3: Modeled Wartsila Sound Level Reduction	5-4
Table 5-4: Wartsila Base Scenario Modeled Sound Levels from Project	5-5
Table 5-5: Wartsila Mitigation 1 Scenario Modeled Sound Levels from Project	5-5
Table 5-6: Wartsila Mitigation 2 Scenario Modeled Sound Levels from Project	5-6
Table 5-7: MAN Provided Sound Power Levels	5-6
Table 5-8: Modeled MAN Sound Level Reduction.....	5-7
Table 5-9: MAN Base Scenario Modeled Sound Levels from Project.....	5-8
Table 5-10: MAN Mitigation Scenario 1 Modeled Sound Levels from Project.....	5-8
Table 5-11: MAN Mitigation Scenario 2 Modeled Sound Levels from Project.....	5-9

LIST OF FIGURES**Page No.**

Figure 4-1: Receiver and Measurement Locations	4-3
--	-----

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<u>Abbreviation</u>	<u>Term/Phrase/Name</u>
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
Burns & McDonnell	Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc.
CadnaA	Computer Aided Noise Abatement
dB	decibels
dBA	A-weighted decibels
dB(C	C-weighted decibels
Hz	Hertz
ISO	International Organization of Standardization
L _{eq}	equivalent sound level
MP	measurement point
Project	proposed reciprocating engine power plant at the MacDill Air Force Base
Rec	noise-sensitive receiver
Tampa Ordinance	City of Tampa Code of Ordinances
TECO	Tampa Electric Company
UFC	Unified Facilities Criteria

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. (Burns & McDonnell) conducted an environmental sound study for the proposed reciprocating engine power plant at the MacDill Air Force Base (Project) for Tampa Electric Company (TECO).

Burns & McDonnell reviewed the appropriate applicable regulations for the City of Tampa and the Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC). Both regulations have daytime and nighttime sound level limits applicable at residential properties. The City of Tampa restricts noise at residential property to 60 A-weighted decibels (dBA) during daytime hours and 55 dBA during nighttime hours while the UFC restricts continuous sound levels at residential properties to 57 dBA during daytime hours and 47 dBA during nighttime hours. This analysis used various scenarios to design the Project to meet either of the most restrictive nighttime regulations.

Burns & McDonnell personnel conducted an ambient sound level survey at potential noise-sensitive receptors in the surrounding area of the Project. Onsite the base, the airstrip is active with aircrafts during daytime hours. The surrounding area contains busy roadways, a fire station, heavy morning truck traffic, and other fluctuating daily sound levels. Measured residential daytime sound levels ranged from 50 dBA to 66 dBA and nighttime sound levels ranged from 42 dBA to 54 dBA.

A sound model was developed to estimate the Project sound levels onto surrounding noise-sensitive property. Multiple scenarios were developed using varying vendors, design goals, and mitigation equipment. The reductions modeled in the mitigation phases were based off the 55 dBA and 47 dBA design goals and may be challenging to achieve.

2.0 ACOUSTICAL TERMINOLOGY

The terms “noise level” and “sound level” are often used interchangeably to describe two different sound characteristics called sound power and sound pressure. Every source that produces sound has a sound power level. The sound power level is the acoustical energy emitted by a sound source and is an absolute number that is not affected by the environment. The acoustical energy produced by a source propagates through the air as air pressure fluctuations. These pressure fluctuations, also called sound pressure, are what human ears hear and microphones measure.

Sound energy is physically characterized by amplitude and frequency. Sound amplitude is measured in decibels (dB) as the logarithmic ratio of a sound pressure to a reference sound pressure (20 microPascals). The reference sound pressure corresponds to the typical threshold of human hearing. A 3-dB change in a continuous broadband sound level is generally considered “just barely perceptible” to the average listener. A 5-dB change is generally considered “clearly noticeable,” and a 10-dB change is generally considered a doubling (or halving, if the sound is decreasing) of the apparent loudness.

Frequency is measured in Hertz (Hz), which is the number of cycles per second. The typical human ear can hear frequencies ranging from approximately 20 to 20,000 Hz. Normally, the human ear is most sensitive to sounds in the middle frequencies (1,000 to 8,000 Hz) and is less sensitive to sounds in the low and high frequencies. As such, the A-weighted scale was developed to simulate the frequency response of the human ear to sounds at typical environmental levels. The A-weighted scale emphasizes sounds in the middle frequencies and de-emphasizes sounds in the low and high frequencies. Any sound level to which the A-weighted scale has been applied is expressed in dBA. Similarly, the C-weighted scale is utilized to quantify low frequencies perceptible to the human ear. Any sound level to which the C-weighted scale has been applied is expressed in dBC. For reference, the sound pressure level and subjective loudness associated with some common sound sources are listed in Table 2-1.

Sound in the environment is constantly fluctuating, for example, when a car drives by, a dog barks, or a plane passes overhead. Although an instantaneous sound level measured in dBA may indicate the level of noise experienced by an observer at that point in time, environmental noise levels vary continuously. Most ambient environmental noise includes a mixture of noise from some identifiable sources plus a relatively steady background noise where no particular source is identifiable. A single descriptor called the equivalent sound level (L_{eq}) is used to describe sound that is constant or changing in level. The L_{eq} is the average sound level for a specific time period.

Table 2-1: Typical Sound Pressure Levels Associated with Common Sound Sources

Sound Pressure Level (dBA)	Subjective Evaluation	Environment	
		Outdoor	Indoor
140	Deafening	Jet aircraft at 75 ft.	--
130	Threshold of pain	Jet aircraft during takeoff at a distance of 300 ft.	--
120	Threshold of feeling	Elevated train	Hard rock band
110	--	Jet flyover at 1,000 ft.	Inside propeller plane
100	Very loud	Power mower, motorcycle at 25 ft., auto horn at 10 ft., crowd noise at football game	--
90	--	Propeller plane flyover at 1,000 ft., noisy urban street	Full symphony or band, food blender, noisy factory
80	Moderately loud	Diesel truck (40 mph) at 50 ft.	Inside auto at high speed, garbage disposal
70	Loud	B-757 cabin during flight	Close conversation, vacuum cleaner
60	Moderate	Air-conditioner condenser at 15 ft., near highway traffic	General office
50	Quiet	--	Private office
40	--	Farm field with light breeze, birdcalls	Soft stereo music in residence
30	Very quiet	Quiet residential neighborhood	Bedroom, average residence (without TV and stereo)
20	--	Rustling leaves	Quiet theater, whisper
10	Just audible	--	Human breathing
0	Threshold of hearing	--	--

Sources:

(1) Adapted from *Architectural Acoustics*, M. David Egan, 1988(2) *Architectural Graphic Standards*, Ramsey and Sleeper, 1994

3.0 APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

The State of Florida does not provide noise regulations that are applicable to the Project. The City of Tampa Code of Ordinances (Tampa Ordinance) Chapter 14 provides dBA and C-weighted decibel (dBC) sound level limits, provided in Table 3-1, that do not apply to the Project because it is not within the Central Business District, the Ybor City Historic District, or the Channel District.

Table 3-1: City of Tampa District Sound Level Limits – Not Applicable to Project

Sound Source Location	Sound Level Limit		
	Metric	6PM to 3AM	3AM to 6PM
Central Business District, the Ybor City Historic District, and Channel District	dBA	85	65
	dBC	87	75

Chapter 27 establishes dBA noise limits for sound emitted from industrial, manufacturing and processing operations to residential, commercial, and industrial receiving land that does apply to the Project. Chapter 27 does not establish any dBC noise limit criteria. The maximum A-weighted sound levels may not exceed those detailed in Table 3-2.

Table 3-2: City of Tampa Industrial Sound Level Limits

Receiving Land Use	Sound Pressure Level (dBA)	
	Daytime (7AM to 10PM)	Nighttime (10PM to 7AM)
Residential	60	55
Commercial	65	60
Industrial	75	75

Source: City of Tampa Code of Ordinances, Section 27-28.7

The UFC was issued by the Department of Defense to serve as criteria for the design of engine driven generator systems. In Section 2-4.2.2, the UFC states that these facilities should comply with federal, state, and local codes or the UFC sound limits provided in Table 3-3, whichever is stricter. The UFC sound levels are summarized in Table 3-3 and are stricter than the City of Tampa limits.

Table 3-3: UFC Sound Level Limits

Receiving Land Use	Sound Pressure Level (dBA)			
	Peak Daytime	Peak Nighttime	Continuous Daytime	Continuous Nighttime
Residential	62	52	57	47
Light Industrial	67	57	62	52
Heavy Industrial	72	62	67	57
Hospital	45	40	35	30

Source: UFC 3-540-01 Section 2-4.2.2 Table 2-1

The Project may run at all hours of the day, so the City of Tampa nighttime and UFC continuous nighttime sound level limits will be used as design goals for the Project mitigation scenarios. Both the City of Tampa and UFC limits are applicable to Project sound levels only and are not inclusive of the ambient environment.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Burns & McDonnell personnel conducted an ambient sound level survey from February 12 to 13, 2020. Prior to onsite measurements, a desktop study was conducted to investigate potential noise-sensitive receivers within an approximately 1,500 feet radius of the proposed Project. Measurement points were then chosen in accessible locations to best represent the current sound environment of these identified noise-sensitive receivers.

4.1 Project Area

The area immediately surrounding the Project is the MacDill Air Force Base. Onsite the base, the airstrip is active with aircrafts during daytime hours. Just north of the Project site, the Tanker Way Gate Guardhouse has many semi-trailer trucks and other large vehicles during the morning hours and into the afternoon. North of the Tanker Way Gate Guardhouse is the Firehouse #19 Port Tampa just off of the frequently traveled Interbay Boulevard roadway.

There are residential developments in the area just beyond the base. A few residences are located approximately 500 feet west of the Project site, directly west of South Manhattan Ave. These residences are exposed to moderate passing traffic on South Manhattan Ave and temporary significant increases during takeoff and landing of air force base aircrafts. Another neighborhood begins approximately 550 feet northeast of the Project site and is exposed to the heavy truck traffic through Tanker Way Gate Guardhouse in addition to air force base activity. A large group of homes begins approximately 1,400 feet west of the Project site with less exposure to noise from traffic and air force activity.


4.2 Noise-Sensitive Receivers

Noise-sensitive areas are commonly defined as places where people live, sleep, recreate, worship, and study. Five noise-sensitive receivers (Rec), labeled Rec01 to Rec05, were selected to be representative of Project sound levels of residential properties in the vicinity of the Project. An additional receiver (Rec06) is located onsite near the Guardhouse and was also analyzed; however, it is not subject to the City of Tampa or UFC nighttime regulation. The six noise-sensitive receivers are shown in Figure 4-1.

Table 4-1: Noise-Sensitive Receiver Information

Receiver	Land Use	Approximate Distance from Site (feet)
Rec01	Residential	450
Rec02	Residential	450
Rec03	Residential	550
Rec04	Residential	800
Rec05	Residential	1,500
Rec06 ^a	Air Force Base	100

(a) Not located on residential property and is not subject to the City of Tampa or UFC nighttime regulation.



● Long-Term Measurement (MP) ● Short-Term Measurement (MP) ● Residential Receiver (Rec) Scale in Feet		Figure 4-1 TECO MacDill Air Force Base Receiver and Measurement Locations
--	--	--

4.3 Existing Sound Environment

The sound survey included short-term and long-term far-field measurements at offsite and onsite measurement locations. A correspondent measurement location for each noise-sensitive receiver was chosen to quantify the existing sound environment. The measurement locations were selected because they were accessible and representative of existing ambient sound levels in the direction of noise-sensitive receivers. The measurement locations, labeled measurement point (MP) MP01 to MP05, are provided in Figure 4-1.

4.3.1 Sound Survey Methodology

Measurements were taken using American National Standards Institute (ANSI) S1.4 type 1 sound level meters (Larson Davis Model 831). The sound level meters were calibrated at the beginning and end of each set of measurements. None of the calibration level changes exceeded ± 0.5 dB. Windscreens were used at all times on the microphones, and the meters were mounted on tripods. The microphones were located approximately 5 feet above ground level for short-term measurements and 7 feet for long-term measurements with the microphone directed towards the Project site, angled per the manufacturer's recommendation. All measurements were taken when meteorological conditions were favorable for conducting background sound level measurements per ANSI standards (low wind, moderate temperatures, humidity and minimal precipitation).

4.3.2 Short-Term Measurements

Short-term far-field measurements were taken during four time periods over a 24-hour span. Short-term far-field measurements were 10 minutes in duration, and measured values were logged by the sound level meter at each measurement point. The overall A-weighted L_{eq} sound level collected during the measurements are shown below in Table 4-2.

Table 4-2: Short-Term Far-Field Measurement Data

Measurement Point	Sound Pressure Level L_{eq} (dBA)			
	Morning (5:00 AM)	Day (11:00 AM)	Evening (5:00 PM)	Night (11:00 PM)
MP01	62	61	60	54
MP02	47	54	54	46
MP03	63	64	65	53
MP04	45	64	50	42
MP05	51	66	54	47

The sound levels varied at each measurement point due to proximity to the MacDill Air Force Base and extraneous noises that occurred during each measurement. Aircrafts, vehicle traffic, and construction at MacDill Air Force Base were audible at the far-field measurement locations, but measurements also included other significant extraneous sounds. Extraneous sounds not produced by the MacDill Air Force Base at far-field locations included vehicle traffic, residential HVAC, insects, rustling leaves, commercial planes, etc. The measured sound levels and various noise sources for each measurement are presented in Appendix A.

4.3.3 Long-Term Measurement

A long-term far-field measurement was taken continuously and collected data over the duration of the sound study. The long-term far-field sound level meter was located at MP01 inside of the facility fenceline. The measurement was selected because it was representative of existing sound levels near residential properties and provided the ability to secure the equipment for unattended operation. Short-term measurements were taken by Burns & McDonnell personnel next to the long-term meter with accompanying measurement notes to better identify the sources of the long-term sound level data.

The sound levels varied at the long-term measurement location due to fluctuating sound sources during the continuous measurement period. The 1-minute Leq sound level was commonly influenced by passing traffic on South Manhattan Ave or passing traffic from inside the facility fenceline. Other short-term spikes were seen during takeoff events of facility aircrafts onsite. During nighttime hours, the background sound level came to a minimum, constant sound level during the late hours of the night. Graphs of the sound levels measured by long-term monitor throughout the duration of the survey is provided in Appendix B.

5.0 PREDICTIVE MODELING

Burns & McDonnell performed predictive modeling to estimate the potential noise impacts of the Project and compared the modeled sound levels to applicable regulations. Multiple scenarios were developed for varying vendors, design goals, and mitigation equipment as detailed in the following sections. Wartsila and MAN were the analyzed engine vendors. A base mitigation scenario was developed for each vendor as well as two additional mitigation scenarios per vendor that either bring the Project into compliance with the 55-dBA nighttime Tampa regulation or the 47-dBA UFC nighttime regulation.

5.1 Methodology

Noise modeling was performed using the industry-accepted sound modeling software Computer Aided Noise Abatement (CadnaA), version 2020. The software is a scaled, three-dimensional program, which takes into account air absorption, terrain, ground absorption, and reflections and shielding for each piece of noise-emitting equipment and predicts sound pressure levels. The model calculates sound propagation based on International Organization of Standardization (ISO) 9613-2:1996, General Method of Calculation. ISO 9613-2 assesses the sound level propagation based on the octave band center-frequency range from 31.5 to 8,000 Hz.

The ISO standard considers sound propagation and directivity. The software calculates sound propagation using omnidirectional, downwind sound propagation and worst-case directivity factors. In other words, the model assumes that each piece of equipment propagates its maximum sound level in all directions at all times. Empirical studies accepted within the industry have demonstrated that modeling may over-predict sound levels in certain directions, and as a result, modeling results generally are considered a conservative measure of the Project's actual sound level.

The modeled atmospheric conditions were assumed to be calm, and the temperature and relative humidity were left at the program's default values. Reflections and shielding were considered for sound waves encountering physical structures. Sound levels around the proposed Project can be influenced by the sound reflections from physical structures onsite. The physical structures were modeled with structured facades, which account for sound reflected and the amount of sound absorbed by the structure itself. The area surrounding the Project has a significant amount of elevation change, and terrain was included to account for surface effects. Ground absorption was set to 0.5 for all areas surrounding the Project as a conservative assumption. All sound modeling parameters used are provided in Table 5-1.

Table 5-1: Sound Modeling Parameters

Model Input	Parameter Value
Ground Absorption	0.5
Number of Reflections	2
Receptor Height	5 feet above grade
Terrain	USGS topographic land data
Temperature	50 °F
Humidity	70%

5.2 Balance of Plant Equipment

Additional equipment such as a fuel gas heater, transformers, inverters, make-up air units, etc. are also a part of the Project but are not provided by the analyzed vendors. Vendor provided sound levels are the significant sound levels of the Project and necessary BOP equipment can be designed in conjunction with the vendor provided equipment to meet the Project design goals. Appendix C summarizes the modeled sound power level of each piece of balance of plant and vendor equipment for each modeled scenario.

Make-up air units are intake fans used to ventilate the interior of the engine hall. Make-up air unit sound levels are significantly influenced by the interior engine hall sound level in addition to their own fan noise. Various sound level silencer reductions for the make-up air units were designed to the given scenario's design goal as detailed in Appendix C.

All base and mitigation scenarios for the engine hall include concrete panels building construction with steel roof ridge vent and silencer. The roof ridge vent provides ventilation for the engine hall interior but does not have any fans associated with it. The ridge vent noise source is fully attributable to interior engine hall noise and silencers ranging from 3 to 10 feet in width were design to the given scenario's design goal. Reductions for these options are shown in Appendix C.

5.3 Wartsila Equipment Analysis

5.3.1 Wartsila Supplied Equipment

Each piece of vendor supplied equipment associated with the proposed Project was modeled with expected sound levels applied to them. Wartsila provided sound level data for the engine, charge air intake, exhaust gas outlet, and radiators. All Wartsila noise radiator sound options are provided per radiator unit. Standard noise radiator and low-noise radiator are specified as four radiator units per engine,

while ultra-low noise radiators are specified as five radiator units per engine. A-weighted octave-band and overall sound power levels provided by Wartsila for each piece of equipment is provided in Table 5-2.

Table 5-2: Wartsila Provided Sound Power Levels

Equipment	A-weighted Octave Band Sound Power Level (dBA) (Hz)									Total (dBA)
	31.5	63	125	250	500	1000	2000	4000	8000	
W18V50SG Engine	--	87	108	115	120	122	124	120	112	128
Charge Air Intake ^a	79	89	92	95	108	125	135	136	134	140
Exhaust Gas Outlet ^a	120	121	125	133	133	135	139	117	--	142
Standard Noise Radiator ^b	79	79	87	96	100	102	100	97	94	107
Low Noise Radiator ^b	75	75	82	92	96	98	96	93	90	103
Ultra-Low Noise Radiator ^c	--	67	75	78	86	87	87	84	75	93

(a) Charge air intake and exhaust gas outlet are without silencer and are rated per piece of equipment

(b) For one radiator unit, four radiator units per engine

(c) For one radiator unit, five radiator units per engine

The Project was modeled with the various sound level reductions to meet the strictest applicable regulations. Table 5-3 provides a summary of the potential mitigation required for each scenario with an overall reduction. Appendix C provides a detailed octave-band and overall sound power levels for each piece of modeled equipment for each modeled scenario. Mitigation measures provided are considered preliminary and final mitigation design is to be determined during detailed design of the Project.

Table 5-3: Modeled Wartsila Sound Level Reduction

Mitigation	Wartsila Mitigation Scenarios		
	Base	Mitigation 1	Mitigation 2
<i>Design Goal at Nearest Residence</i>	--	55 dBA	47 dBA
Charge Air Intake	Standard Inlet Silencer (45-dB total reduction)	Standard Inlet Silencer (45-dB total reduction)	Custom Charge Air Silencer (55-dB total reduction)
Exhaust Stack	Standard Exhaust Silencer (35-dB total reduction)	Custom Exhaust Silencer (40-dB total reduction)	Custom Exhaust Silencer (47-dB total reduction)
Exhaust Ducting	No Lagging	Standard Duct Lagging (10-dB total reduction)	Custom Duct Lagging (17-dB total reduction)
Radiator	Standard Radiator	Ultra-Low Noise Radiator (13-dB reduction from Standard Radiator)	Ultra-Low Noise Radiator plus Additional Reductions (24-dB reduction from Standard Radiator)

The site general arrangement was used to locate each structure and piece of equipment in the model and is provided in Appendix D.

5.3.2 Wartsila Model Results

Sound levels were modeled at the six previously designated noise-sensitive receivers in the surrounding community. The predicted sound levels were compared to the strictest applicable limit for each receiver land use location. Modeled sound levels are potential Project-emitted sound levels only and are not inclusive of ambient environment. Sound level contours of all the modeled scenarios are provided in Appendix E.

5.3.2.1 Wartsila Base Scenario Results

The Base scenario was modeled with no additional attenuation incorporated for each scenario and no design goal. Table 5-4 presents the estimated Project sound level compared to the applicable design goal for this scenario.

Table 5-4: Wartsila Base Scenario Modeled Sound Levels from Project

Receiver Location	Land Use	Sound Pressure Level (dBA / dBC)	
		Project	Design Goal
Rec01	Residential	69 / 92	-- / --
Rec02	Residential	69 / 94	-- / --
Rec03	Residential	67 / 87	-- / --
Rec04	Residential	64 / 85	-- / --
Rec05	Residential	59 / 86	-- / --
Rec06	Air Force Base	78 / 93	-- / --

5.3.2.2 Mitigation Scenario 1 Results

The Mitigation Scenario 1 was modeled with a standard charge air silencer, a custom exhaust silencer, standard duct lagging, and ultra-low noise radiator. The design goal of 55 dBA for this scenario was achieved at the nearest noise-sensitive receivers. Table 5-5 presents the estimated Project sound level compared to the applicable design goal for this scenario.

Table 5-5: Wartsila Mitigation 1 Scenario Modeled Sound Levels from Project

Receiver Location	Land Use	Sound Pressure Level (dBA / dBC)	
		Project	Design Goal
Rec01	Residential	53 / 83	55 / --
Rec02	Residential	55 / 86	55 / --
Rec03	Residential	50 / 78	55 / --
Rec04	Residential	49 / 76	55 / --
Rec05	Residential	46 / 78	55 / --
Rec06	Air Force Base	61 / 84	-- / --

5.3.2.3 Mitigation Scenario 2 Results

The Mitigation Scenario 2 was modeled with a custom charge air silencer, a custom exhaust silencer, custom duct lagging, and ultra-low noise radiator with added custom radiator reductions. The design goal for this scenario was 47 dBA at the nearest noise-sensitive receiver. The reductions modeled in this phase were based on the design goal of 47 dBA and may be challenging to achieve. Table 5-6 presents the estimated Project sound level compared to the applicable design goal for this scenario.

Table 5-6: Wartsila Mitigation 2 Scenario Modeled Sound Levels from Project

Receiver Location	Land Use	Sound Pressure Level (dBA / dBC)	
		Project	Design Goal
Rec01	Residential	45 / 73	47 / --
Rec02	Residential	47 / 77	47 / --
Rec03	Residential	45 / 69	47 / --
Rec04	Residential	45 / 67	47 / --
Rec05	Residential	38 / 69	47 / --
Rec06	Air Force Base	53 / 75	-- / --

5.4 MAN Equipment Analysis

5.4.1 MAN Supplied Equipment

Each piece of equipment associated with the proposed Project was modeled with expected sound levels applied to them. MAN provided sound level data for the engine, charge air intake, exhaust gas outlet, and radiators. Only one MAN radiator cooler option was provided with overall sound levels and no octave-band components. The frequency spectrum provided by Wartsila was used and scaled to the specified MAN overall sound level for the radiators. MAN radiator cooler is specified per one radiator unit and requires one radiator unit per engine. A-weighted octave-band and overall sound power levels provided by MAN for each piece of equipment is provided in Table 5-7.

Table 5-7: MAN Provided Sound Power Levels

Equipment	Octave Band Sound Power Level (dB) (Hz)									Total (dBA)
	31.5	63	125	250	500	1000	2000	4000	8000	
18V 51/60 G Engine	111	111	107	107	108	106	106	99	96	112
Charge Air Intake ^a	136	135	133	131	132	148	148	143	141	153
Exhaust Gas Outlet ^a	150	150	142	138	136	135	133	132	131	141
Radiator Coolers ^b	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	110

(a) Charge air intake and exhaust gas outlet are without silencer and are rated per piece of equipment

(b) For one radiator unit, one radiator unit per engine

The Project was modeled with the various sound level reductions to meet the strictest applicable regulations. Table 5-8 provides a summary of the mitigation required for each scenario with an overall reduction. Appendix C provides sound power levels for each piece of modeled equipment for each

modeled scenario. Mitigation measures provided are considered preliminary and final mitigation design is to be determined during detailed design of the Project.

Table 5-8: Modeled MAN Sound Level Reduction

Mitigation	MAN Mitigation Scenarios		
	Base	Mitigation 1	Mitigation 2
<i>Design Goal at Nearest Residence</i>	--	55 dBA	47 dBA
Charge Air Intake	Standard Inlet Silencer (45-dB total reduction)	Custom Inlet Silencer (54-dB total reduction)	Custom Inlet Silencer (62-dB total reduction)
Exhaust Stack	Standard (35-dB total reduction)	Custom Exhaust Silencer (38-dB total reduction)	Custom Exhaust Silencer (42-dB total reduction)
Exhaust Ducting	No Lagging	Standard Duct Lagging (10-dB total reduction)	Custom Duct Lagging (13-dB total reduction)
Radiator	Standard Radiator	Radiator Coolers plus Additional Mitigation (11-dB reduction from Standard Radiator)	Radiator Coolers plus Additional Mitigation (19-dB reduction from Standard Radiator)

5.4.2 MAN Model Results

Sound levels were modeled at noise-sensitive receivers in the surrounding community. The same six noise-sensitive receivers modeled for the Wartsila equipment scenarios, as shown in Figure 4-1, was also modeled for the MAN scenarios. The predicted sound levels were compared to the strictest applicable limit for each receiver land use location. Modeled sound levels are potential Project-emitted sound levels only and are not inclusive of ambient environment. Sound level contours of all the modeled scenarios are provided in Appendix E.

5.4.2.1 MAN Base Scenario Results

The Base scenario was modeled with no additional attenuation incorporated for each scenario and no design goal. Table 5-9 presents the estimated Project sound level compared to the applicable design goal for this scenario.

Table 5-9: MAN Base Scenario Modeled Sound Levels from Project

Receiver Location	Land Use	Sound Pressure Level (dBA / dBC)	
		Project	Design Goal
Rec01	Residential	63 / 88	-- / --
Rec02	Residential	70 / 94	-- / --
Rec03	Residential	55 / 80	-- / --
Rec04	Residential	55 / 79	-- / --
Rec05	Residential	60 / 85	-- / --
Rec06	Air Force Base	63 / 87	-- / --

5.4.2.2 Mitigation Scenario 1 Results

The Mitigation Scenario 1 was modeled with a custom charge air silencer, a custom exhaust silencer, standard duct lagging, and ultra-low noise radiator. The design goal for this scenario was 55 dBA at the nearest noise-sensitive receptor. Table 5-10 presents the estimated Project sound level compared to the applicable design goal for this scenario.

Table 5-10: MAN Mitigation Scenario 1 Modeled Sound Levels from Project

Receiver Location	Land Use	Sound Pressure Level (dBA / dBC)	
		Project	Design Goal
Rec01	Residential	51 / 80	55 / --
Rec02	Residential	55 / 84	55 / --
Rec03	Residential	47 / 74	55 / --
Rec04	Residential	47 / 72	55 / --
Rec05	Residential	46 / 76	55 / --
Rec06	Air Force Base	53 / 80	-- / --

5.4.2.3 Mitigation Scenario 2 Results

The Mitigation Scenario 2 was modeled with a custom charge air silencer, a custom exhaust silencer, custom duct lagging, and ultra-low noise radiator with added custom radiator reductions. The design goal for this scenario was 47 dBA at the nearest noise-sensitive receptor. The reductions modeled in this phase were based on the design goal of 47 dBA and may be challenging to achieve. Table 5-11 presents the estimated Project sound level compared to the applicable design goal for this scenario.

Table 5-11: MAN Mitigation Scenario 2 Modeled Sound Levels from Project

Receiver Location	Land Use	Sound Pressure Level (dBA / dBC)	
		Project	Design Goal
Rec01	Residential	45 / 72	47 / --
Rec02	Residential	47 / 76	47 / --
Rec03	Residential	45 / 67	47 / --
Rec04	Residential	45 / 65	47 / --
Rec05	Residential	38 / 68	47 / --
Rec06	Air Force Base	51 / 73	-- / --

6.0 CONCLUSION

Burns & McDonnell conducted an environmental sound study of the Project for TECO. Regulations applicable to the Project were reviewed from the Tampa Ordinance and UFC. Both regulations have daytime and nighttime sound level limits at residential property, where nighttime limit are more restrictive. Three scenarios were developed around these regulations: a base scenario with standard equipment, a first mitigation scenario to comply with the City of Tampa nighttime limit, and a second mitigation scenario to comply with the stricter UFC nighttime limit.

An ambient sound level survey was conducted at potential noise-sensitive receptors in the surrounding area of the Project. The significant existing sound environment consists of the MacDill Air Force Base active airstrip, busy roadways, a nearby fire station, and heavy morning truck traffic. Measured residential daytime sound levels ranged from 50 dBA to 66 dBA and nighttime sound levels ranged from 42 dBA to 54 dBA.

A sound model was developed to estimate the Project sound levels onto surrounding noise-sensitive property. Multiple scenarios were developed using varying vendors, design goals, and mitigation equipment. The reductions modeled in the mitigation phases were based off the 55 dBA and 47 dBA design goals and may be challenging to achieve.

APPENDIX A - MEASUREMENT DATA

Appendix A - Measurement Data

TECO

MacDill Air Force Base

<i>Point Number</i>	<i>LAeq¹</i>	<i>LA90²</i>	<i>LCeq³</i>	<i>Notes</i>
02/12/20 - 5:00 PM - Evening				
79°F, 86% hm, 75°F dp, 1-3 mph				
MP01	60 dBA	42 dBA	66 dBC	Passing traffic, planes, car horn, dog barking
MP02	54 dBA	42 dBA	67 dBC	Constant insects, low frequency truck rumble, passing traffic, aircrafts, backup alarms
MP03	65 dBA	52 dBA	72 dBC	Passing traffic, dog barking, firetruck, aircrafts
MP04	50 dBA	46 dBA	63 dBC	Aircrafts, constant insects, neighborhood activity, dog barking
MP05	54 dBA	41 dBA	68 dBC	Aircrafts, insects, commercial planes, distant traffic, horn, passing traffic, 6:03 takeoff
02/12/20 - 11:00 PM - Night				
72°F, 94% hm, 70°F dp, calm				
MP01	54 dBA	40 dBA	60 dBC	Water pump, idling aircraft, constant insects
MP02	46 dBA	39 dBA	56 dBC	Residential HVAC, constant insects, distant water pump, truck start
MP03	53 dBA	45 dBA	61 dBC	Constant fire station HVAC, constant insects, distant water pump
MP04	42 dBA	41 dBA	59 dBC	Idling aircraft, constant insects, distant water pump
MP05	47 dBA	38 dBA	59 dBC	Idling aircraft, distant traffic, distant water pump, constant insects, passing traffic
02/13/20 - 5:00 AM - Morning				
72°F, 77% hm, 64°F dp, calm				
MP01	62 dBA	50 dBA	73 dBC	Constant insects, passing traffic, distant water pump, heavy trucks at Tanker Way
MP02	47 dBA	42 dBA	56 dBC	Water pump, residential HVAC, constant insects, passing traffic, distant traffic
MP03	63 dBA	46 dBA	72 dBC	Fire station HVAC, constant insects, passing traffic, 5:19 haul truck, 5:22 motorcycle
MP04	45 dBA	38 dBA	62 dBC	Constant insects, passing traffic, garage door
MP05	51 dBA	41 dBA	64 dBC	Commercial planes, distant water pump, distant traffic, passing traffic, conversation
02/13/20 - 11:00 AM - Day				
79°F, 76% hm, 71°F dp, 3-5 mph out of SW				
MP01	61 dBA	49 dBA	72 dBC	Water pump, haul trucks, construction, leaves, backup alarms, passing traffic, dog barking, commercial planes
MP02	54 dBA	45 dBA	69 dBC	Passing traffic, birds, insects, distant construction, leaves
MP03	64 dBA	52 dBA	76 dBC	Dog barking, passing traffic, fire station HVAC, leaves, 12:21 air force base intercom, 12:26 takeoff
MP04	64 dBA	55 dBA	76 dBC	Aircrafts, commercial planes, haul trucks, leaves, 11:30 takeoff, 11:32 takeoff, 11:34 takeoff
MP05	66 dBA	50 dBA	76 dBC	Haul trucks, construction, water pump, backup alarms, passing traffic, door slam, car start

Note:

1. Equivalent sound pressure level in dBA


2. Equivalent 90% exceedance sound pressure level in dBA, otherwise known as background sound exceeded 90% of the duration of the measurement

3. Equivalent sound pressure level in dBC


APPENDIX B - LONG-TERM SOUND LEVEL DATA

Measurement: MacDill Air Force Base 02-12-20
Location: MP01

KCM_LT1.001 - 1/3 Leq Spectrum + SLM - LAeq - Sliding L90 (3600)
KCM_LT1.001 - 1/3 Leq Spectrum + SLM - LAeq - Sliding Leq (60)



Leq Spectrogram



APPENDIX C - MODELED SOUND POWER LEVELS

Appendix C - Modeled Sound Power Levels

TECO

MacDill Air Force Base

Vendor: Wartsila

Mitigation Scenario	Equipment	Name	Number of Sources	Sound Power Level (dB) ¹ Octave Band Frequency (Hz)									Overall (dBA)
				31.5	63.0	125	250	500	1000	2000	4000	8000	
Base	Wartsila	Exhaust Stack Outlet	4	140	120	104	102	92	82	84	66	--	103
		Exhaust Duct ²	4	126	110	100	96	83	76	73	49	--	92
		Radiators ³	4	124	111	109	111	109	108	105	102	101	113
		Charge Air Inlet	8	124	120	107	88	79	93	92	92	102	104
	BOP	Engine Hall Roof Vent ²	1	--	110	119	115	108	100	102	106	104	113
		Inverter	5	68	66	69	69	65	62	57	60	56	85
		Battery Transformer	5	61	66	78	67	64	60	59	58	47	86
		Fuel Gas Heater	1	90	86	75	67	66	72	74	77	75	82
		Plant Transformer	2	80	85	97	86	83	79	78	77	66	103
		Make-Up Air Unit	4	--	91	102	102	101	100	101	97	91	113
Mit 1 (55 dBA goal)	Wartsila	Exhaust Stack Outlet	4	135	114	103	98	90	80	83	65	--	98
		Exhaust Duct ²	4	114	98	90	86	78	71	68	44	--	82
		Radiators ⁴	4	--	100	98	94	96	94	93	90	83	100
		Charge Air Inlet	8	124	120	107	88	79	93	92	92	102	104
	BOP	Engine Hall Roof Vent ²	1	--	85	90	85	71	59	59	76	77	82
		Inverter	5	68	66	69	69	65	62	57	60	56	85
		Battery Transformer	5	61	66	78	67	64	60	59	58	47	86
		Fuel Gas Heater	1	90	86	75	67	66	72	74	77	75	82
		Plant Transformer	2	80	85	97	86	83	79	78	77	66	103
		Make-Up Air Unit	4	--	74	85	85	84	83	84	80	74	96
Mit 2 (47 dBA goal)	Wartsila	Exhaust Stack Outlet	4	124	105	94	94	83	79	82	64	--	91
		Exhaust Duct ²	4	107	93	83	79	71	66	66	44	--	76
		Radiators ⁴	4	--	101	94	89	82	77	76	81	84	89
		Charge Air Inlet	8	117	105	97	81	72	81	80	82	95	95
	BOP	Engine Hall Roof Vent ²	1	--	82	84	75	60	52	52	68	72	75
		Inverter	5	68	66	69	69	65	62	57	60	56	85
		Battery Transformer	5	61	66	78	67	64	60	59	58	47	86
		Fuel Gas Heater	1	90	86	75	67	66	72	74	77	75	82
		Plant Transformer	2	80	85	97	86	83	79	78	77	66	103
		Make-Up Air Unit	4	--	61	72	72	71	70	71	67	61	83

Notes:

1. All sound levels are inclusive of required attenuation.

2. Sound level per meter of length

3. Sound levels per engine, assuming four Standard Radiator units per engine

4. Sound levels per engine, assuming five Ultra-Low Noise Radiator units per engine

Appendix C - Modeled Sound Power Levels

TECO

MacDill Air Force Base

Vendor: MAN

Mitigation Scenario	Equipment	Name	Number of Sources	Sound Power Level (dB) ¹ Octave Band Frequency (Hz)									Overall (dBA)
				31.5	63.0	125	250	500	1000	2000	4000	8000	
Base	MAN	Exhaust Stack Outlet	4	131	123	105	98	92	82	79	82	88	100
		Exhaust Duct ²	4	117	113	101	92	83	76	68	65	65	91
		Radiators ³	4	122	108	106	108	106	105	102	99	98	110
		Charge Air Inlet	8	134	132	124	112	97	108	103	97	105	114
	BOP	Engine Hall Roof Vent ²	1	--	86	80	76	71	62	63	64	65	74
		Inverter	5	68	66	69	69	65	62	57	60	56	85
		Battery Transformer	5	61	66	78	67	64	60	59	58	47	86
		Fuel Gas Heater	1	90	86	75	67	66	72	74	77	75	82
		Plant Transformer	2	80	85	97	86	83	79	78	77	66	103
		Make-Up Air Unit	4	89	89	85	85	86	84	84	77	74	96
Mit 1 (55 dBA goal)	MAN	Exhaust Stack Outlet	4	126	115	105	98	92	82	79	82	88	97
		Exhaust Duct ²	4	108	100	90	81	76	69	61	58	58	80
		Radiators ³	4	122	108	101	98	88	83	81	87	98	99
		Charge Air Inlet	8	126	109	101	104	91	85	87	91	105	105
	BOP	Engine Hall Roof Vent ²	1	--	83	73	68	56	43	42	56	60	65
		Inverter	5	68	66	69	69	65	62	57	60	56	85
		Battery Transformer	5	61	66	78	67	64	60	59	58	47	86
		Fuel Gas Heater	1	90	86	75	67	66	72	74	77	75	82
		Plant Transformer	2	80	85	97	86	83	79	78	77	66	103
		Make-Up Air Unit	4	72	72	68	68	69	67	67	60	57	79
Mit 2 (47 dBA goal)	MAN	Exhaust Stack Outlet	4	120	107	97	95	86	82	79	82	88	93
		Exhaust Duct ²	4	104	90	83	77	69	66	61	60	60	75
		Radiators ³	4	112	100	90	85	80	75	71	77	90	91
		Charge Air Inlet	8	115	101	90	93	88	77	77	81	97	97
	BOP	Engine Hall Roof Vent ²	1	--	80	67	58	45	36	35	48	55	59
		Inverter	5	68	66	69	69	65	62	57	60	56	85
		Battery Transformer	5	61	66	78	67	64	60	59	58	47	86
		Fuel Gas Heater	1	90	86	75	67	66	72	74	77	75	82
		Plant Transformer	2	80	85	97	86	83	79	78	77	66	103
		Make-Up Air Unit	4	59	59	55	55	56	54	54	47	44	66


Notes:

1. All sound levels are inclusive of required attenuation.


2. Sound level per meter of length

3. Sound levels per engine

APPENDIX D - SITE LAYOUT



SITE KEY	
1	EXISTING SUBSTATION
2	BESS FACILITY
3	CONSTRUCTION PARKING
4	CONTAINER STORAGE
5	CONSTRUCTION TRAILERS
6	RICE PLANT
SITE KEY	
TP1	NATURAL GAS TIE-IN POINT
TP2	ELECTRICAL TIE-IN POINT



**PRELIMINARY - NOT
FOR CONSTRUCTION**

D	01/12/20	WRL	ADDED BESS LAYOUT AND EXISTING SUBSTATION						
C	10/28/19	WRL	ADJUSTED RADIATORS						
B	10/24/19	WRL	ADJUSTED ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT AND ADDED CONTROL ROOM						
A	09/19/19	WRL	PRELIMINARY						
no.	date	by	chkd	description	no.	date	by	chkd	description


**BURNS
MCDONNELL**
9400 WARD PARKWAY
KANSAS CITY, MO 64114
816-605-7822

designed _____ detailed **W. LESNAK**

HONOLULU, HAWAII

MacDILL RICE PLANT 4 x 18MW GAS RECIP ENGINE PLANT OVERALL SITE PLAN	
project	contract
drawing	REV. A
sheet	of
file	119465 SITEPLAN RED.DWG


APPENDIX E - SOUND LEVEL CONTOURS



400 200 0 400

Scale in Feet

Figure 1
TECO
MacDill Air Force Base
Sound Level Contours
Wartsila - Base





● Residential Receiver (Rec)


NORTH

400 200 0 400

Scale in Feet

Figure 2
TECO
MacDill Air Force Base
Sound Level Contours
Wartsila - Mitigation 1





**Sound Level
Contours (dBA)**

- | | |
|----|----|
| 30 | 50 |
| 35 | 55 |
| 40 | 60 |
| 45 | 65 |
| 47 | 70 |

● Residential Receiver (Rec)



NORTH



400 200 0 400

Scale in Feet

**BURNS
MCDONNELL**

Figure 4
TECO
MacDill Air Force Base
Sound Level Contours
MAN - Base







CREATE AMAZING.

Burns & McDonnell
200 W. Adams St. Suite #2700
Chicago, IL 60606
O 816-333-9400
F 816-333-3690
www.burnsmcd.com