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ADDENDUM

NOVEMBER 2001
ADDENDUM

Additional sampling, analysis and risk assessment have changed the status of lead-based paint and pesticides since the June 2001 Environmental Assessment.

LEAD-BASED PAINT

Although lead-based paint was present in Cove Gardens units, the sampling and analysis and risk assessment determined the condition of the lead-based paint posed no health hazard. Therefore, Environmental Resource Consultants, Inc., issued a Certificate of Lead-Based Paint Safe Housing for the Cove Gardens area on August 29, 2001. This certificate documents that the area was inspected and evaluated in accordance with applicable Federal Law consisting of the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, 42 US Code 4852d, 24 Code of Federal Regulations Part 35 and 40 Code of Federal Regulations Part 745, and was found to be lead-based paint safe as of August 29, 2001.

PESTICIDES

Laboratory analyses from two rounds of composite and discrete soil sampling indicate the presence of pesticides in 17 out of 20 sample sites at Cove Gardens. One sample site near Building B-21 had concentrations above Florida Department of Environmental Protection cleanup standards for direct contact in residential areas. Also, one sample site near Building 38 had concentrations above Florida Department of Environmental Protection cleanup standards for leachate potential.

Based on sampling in October, 2001, there is now only one area along the northwest side of multiple housing unit 21 that has pesticide values of concern and only for surface soils. Groundwater samples came back with nondetect values for pesticides of concern. This area is not completely delineated, but additional sampling is planned. Before transfer, the area having dieldrin concentrations above the State action level of 70 micrograms/liter will be delineated. This area will either have the surface soil removed and replaced with clean backfill before transfer, or the area will be fenced and have warning signs posted. If the area is fenced, once funds from the sale of Cove Gardens are received, the Air Force will ensure that the contaminated surface soil will be removed and replaced with clean backfill before the area is used for residential purposes.
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR
SALE OF COVE GARDENS MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING AREA
TYNDALL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA

AGENCY: 325th Fighter Wing (FW), Tyndall Air Force Base (AFB), Florida.

BACKGROUND: The Cove Gardens Military Family Housing (MFH) area is located in the City of Panama City, Bay County, Florida, approximately 10.2 miles (roadway miles via United States Route 98) from Tyndall AFB. The housing area is located west of Tyndall AFB in a municipal area within the city limits of the City of Panama City. The MFH area consists of approximately 33 acres of land with 130 housing units in 38 buildings constructed in 1942-1943. Most units are below the authorized Air Force square footage standards, and the area is crowded with respect to traffic and parking conditions. The age and size of the housing, as well as the distance from Tyndall AFB, make Cove Gardens MFH unsuitable for military families.

As a result of informal discussions between Tyndall AFB and the surrounding community, special legislative action was introduced and passed allowing for the purchase of Cove Gardens MFH by Panama City. This special legislative action became part of Public Law (PL) 106-65. The sale of Cove Gardens MFH would provide a feasible way to (1) comply with PL 106-65, and (2) dispose of unsuitable housing.


PROPOSED ACTION: The Air Force proposes to sell Cove Gardens MFH to Panama City in order to (1) comply with PL 106-65, and (2) dispose of unsuitable housing. The project detailed in this EA is proposed for Fiscal Year (FY) 2001.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS: The potential environmental effects of the proposed action were assessed for the following resources: infrastructure and utilities, hazardous materials, and wastes. Areas evaluated but eliminated from further consideration in this EA include: water resources, biological resources, cultural resources, land use, aircraft operations, air quality, noise, earth resources, socioeconomic resources, and environmental justice. The proposed action, as described herein, lacks any known potential to impact these resources since this is simply a deed transfer of Tyndall AFB property with existing housing and related facilities. Potential impacts of the proposed action to the analyzed environmental resources are summarized below.

Infrastructure/Utilities. The proposed action would not increase wastewater or solid waste generation or increase demand for potable water, electricity, or natural gas. Drainage patterns and transportation systems would not change. The proposed action would result in the transfer of June 2001
maintenance and upkeep of the infrastructure and utilities of Cove Gardens MFH from the Air Force to Panama City.

**Hazardous Materials and Wastes.** Hazardous materials and wastes would not be used or generated by the proposed action. There is evidence of subsurface asbestos disposal in the northeast portion of Cove Gardens. Exploratory trenching of this area was performed in support of the Environmental Baseline Survey for Cove Gardens and samples containing 40 to 60 percent non-friable asbestos debris were recovered. This type of asbestos, if left undisturbed, does not constitute immediate environmental or health concerns. According to a location plan for this site, the dimensions of the buried waste area are approximately 225 feet long, 85 feet wide, and 10 feet deep. However, a comprehensive characterization, delineation, and quantification of the buried waste site has not been established. Laboratory analyses from two rounds of composite and discrete soil sampling indicate the presence of pesticides in several (17 out of 20 sample sites) locations of Cove Gardens. One sample site, near Building B-21, had concentrations above Florida Department of Environmental Protection cleanup standards for direct contact in residential areas. Lead-based paint in the housing units would need to be abated prior to sale, or abatement may be made a condition of sale with sufficient funds escrowed. Any hazardous materials/wastes discovered from further studies at Cove Gardens MFH would be managed by the Air Force in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations prior to the sale of the area.

**Cultural Resources.** An archeological reconnaissance survey was conducted by the Air Force at Cove Gardens based on the recommendations of the Florida State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO). In addition, the base provided the SHPO with forms from a consultant indicating that the structures at Cove Gardens had no historical significance. Base personnel also took photographs of both the interior and exterior of representative housing units at Cove Gardens and sent the SHPO electronic and glossy prints of those pictures.

**NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE:** Under the no action alternative, Tyndall AFB would retain all 130 MFH units and integral infrastructure and occupancy. Military families would continue to live in housing that is (1) below the Air Force authorized square footage allowance, (2) crowded with respect to traffic and parking conditions, and (3) geographically displaced from Tyndall AFB.

**SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS:** The cumulative impacts of implementing the proposed action along with other past, present, and future projects at Tyndall AFB were assessed through FY01 based on FY00 or more recent information. No significant cumulative impacts were identified.

**PUBLIC NOTICE AND REVIEW PER AFI 32-7061 AND 32 CFR PART 989:** Tyndall AFB posted a notice in the Panama City News Herald on April 20, 2001. Subsequently, the installation waited for 30 days and received no significant comments from the public. In addition, the Florida State Clearinghouse, other state agencies involved in the Clearinghouse’s procedural reviews and the United States Environmental Protection Agency reviewed the proposal. The Florida State Historical Preservation Office requested a survey that the National Park Service performed for the base. Responses received from all other agencies indicated no concerns, no objections or concurrence. Copies of all responses are contained in Appendix B of the Environmental Assessment.
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DECISION: Based on my review of the facts and analysis contained in this environmental assessment, which are incorporated herein, I conclude the implementation of the Proposed Action will not have a significant environmental impact either by itself or considering cumulative impacts. Accordingly, the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, regulations promulgated by the President’s Council on Environmental Quality, and Air Force Instruction 32-7061 (revised in 32 CFR Part 989, July 15, 1999, Volume 64, Number 135, Page 38127-38143) are fulfilled and an environmental impact statement is not required.

WILLIAM L. BLED SOE, Colonel, USAF
Chairperson, Environmental Protection Committee

14 Jan 02
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Responsible Agency: 325th Fighter Wing (FW), Tyndall Air Force Base (AFB), Florida.

Proposed Action: Sale of Cove Gardens Military Family Housing (MFH), Tyndall AFB, Bay County, Florida.

Point of Contact: 325 CES/CEV, 119 Alabama Avenue, Tyndall AFB, Florida, 32403-5014, (850) 283-3699.

Report Designation: Final Environmental Assessment (EA).

Abstract: The Air Force proposes to sell Cove Gardens MFH to Panama City in order to (1) comply with Public Law (PL) 106-65, and (2) dispose of unsuitable housing. The Cove Gardens Military Family Housing (MFH) area is located in Panama City, approximately 10.2 miles (roadway miles via United States Route 98) from Tyndall Air Force Base (AFB). The MFH area consists of approximately 33 acres of land with 130 housing units in 38 buildings constructed in 1942-1943. Most units are below the authorized Air Force square footage standards, and the area is crowded with respect to traffic and parking conditions. The age and size of the housing, as well as the distance from Tyndall AFB, make Cove Gardens MFH unsuitable for military families.

As a result of informal discussions between Tyndall AFB and the surrounding community, special legislative action was introduced and passed allowing for the purchase of Cove Gardens MFH by Panama City. This special legislative action became part of Public Law (PL) 106-65. The sale of Cove Gardens MFH would provide a feasible way to (1) comply with PL 106-65, and (2) dispose of unsuitable housing.

The following items were identified for study in this EA: infrastructure and utilities, hazardous materials, and wastes. Areas evaluated but eliminated from further consideration in this EA include: water resources, biological resources, cultural resources, land use, aircraft operations, air quality, noise, earth resources, socioeconomic resources, and environmental justice. The proposed action lacks any known potential to impact these resources.

The proposed action would result in discontinued maintenance and upkeep of the infrastructure and utilities of Cove Gardens MFH by the Air Force.

There is evidence of subsurface asbestos disposal in the northeast portion of Cove Gardens. Samples containing 40 to 60 percent non-friable asbestos debris were recovered from this area during the Environmental Baseline Survey developed in support of the proposed action. This type of asbestos, if left undisturbed, does not constitute immediate environmental or health concerns. A comprehensive characterization, delineation, and quantification of the buried waste site has not been established. Laboratory analyses from two rounds of composite and discrete soil sampling indicate the presence of pesticides in 17 out of 20 sample sites at Cove Gardens. One sample site, near Building B-21, had concentrations above Florida Department of Environmental Protection cleanup standards for direct contact in residential areas. Lead-based paint in the housing units would need to be abated prior to sale, or abatement may be made a condition of sale with sufficient funds escrowed. Any hazardous materials/wastes discovered from further studies at Cove Gardens MFH would be managed by the Air Force in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations prior to the sale of the area.

An archeological survey will be conducted by the Air Force at Cove Gardens based on the recommendations of the Florida State Historical Preservation Office.
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Chapter 1

Purpose of and Need for Action
CHAPTER 1

PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

This section has five parts: a statement of the purpose of and need for action, a description of the location of the proposed action, a description of the scope of the environmental review, identification of applicable regulatory requirements, and an introduction to the organization of the document.

This environmental assessment (EA) is part of the environmental impact analysis process (EIAP) for the proposed action as set forth in Air Force Instruction (AFI) 32-7061, The Environmental Impact Analysis Process, 6 July 1999, (revised as 32 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Part 989 in the Federal Register at July 15, 1999, Volume 64, Number 135, Page 38127-38143); and the EIAP Desk Reference. This EA also implements the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations, and the Department of Defense (DoD) Instruction 4715.9, Environmental Planning and Analysis, dated May 3, 1996.

1.1 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

The Cove Gardens Military Family Housing (MFH) area is located approximately 10.2 miles (roadway miles via United States Route 98) from Tyndall Air Force Base (AFB). The MFH area consists of approximately 33 acres of land with 130 housing units constructed in 1942-1943. Most units are below the authorized Air Force square footage standards contained in AFI 32-6002, Family Housing Planning, Programming, Design and Construction (USAF 1997a). All units are lacking family rooms, covered parking, and screened porches (USAF 2000a).

The age and size of the housing, as well as the distance from Tyndall AFB, make Cove Gardens MFH unsuitable for military families. Families living at Cove Gardens do not feel that they are part of the Tyndall AFB community. Military families currently have the option of moving to MFH on Tyndall AFB. Since this option became available in April 2000, 34 units at Cove Gardens have been vacated (Carter 2000). No new military families are currently being placed at Cove Gardens. It is expected that occupancy of the housing area will continue to decline as families either move to the surrounding community, Tyndall AFB, or permanently leave the Panama City area.

Title 10 United States Code (USC) Section 2696 allows that a property may be released for sale provided that the United States General Services Administration (GSA) screens the property to determine whether there is any further Federal government need for the property. Cove Gardens MFH has been screened by GSA and declared to be "excess" (GSA 1999a). Since there is no continuing Federal need for Cove Gardens MFH, GSA released the property, making it available for sale. The authorization for the sale of Cove Gardens MFH is contained in Public Law (PL) 106-65, Title XXVII, Part 3, Section 2862. The sale of Cove Gardens MFH would provide a feasible way to (1) dispose of unsuitable housing, and (2) comply with PL 106-65.
1.2 LOCATION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

Tyndall AFB, Florida, home to the 325th Fighter Wing (FW), is on the Gulf of Mexico east of Panama City, Florida. Tyndall AFB comprises some 29,100 acres of land. The base is divided by United States (US) Highway 98 with the airfield and flying operations located on the north side of the highway and the remainder of the base is south of the highway. Cove Gardens MFH is approximately 10.2 miles (roadway miles via United States Route 98) from the base and adjacent to Watson Bayou near downtown Panama City. Figure 1-1 shows the regional locations of Tyndall AFB and Cove Gardens MFH. Figure 1-2 provides a detail of Cove Gardens MFH.

1.3 SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Under NEPA, Federal agencies are required to consider the environmental consequences of their proposed actions by using a systematic, interdisciplinary approach, thereby ensuring well-informed Federal decisions. The CEQ was established under NEPA to implement and oversee Federal policy in this process. To this end, the CEQ has issued regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (40 CFR 1500-1508). The DoD also published its DoD Instruction 4715.9, Environmental Planning and Analysis, outlining the DoD approach to fulfilling the NEPA and CEQ process and requirements. AFI 32-7061, The Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) (now only available as 32 CFR Part 989 in the Federal Register at July 15, 1999, Volume 64, Number 135, Page 38127-38143) implements the NEPA, CEQ, and DoD regulations within the Air Force.

The Air Force planning process includes a study of the potential environmental issues created by a proposed action. This EA identifies, describes, and evaluates the potential environmental impacts that could result from the implementation of the proposed action.

Resource areas most relevant to the proposed action will be the focus of analysis:

- **Infrastructure and Utilities** - Potential effects on sanitary sewer, potable water, solid waste management, drainage, transportation, electricity, and natural gas.

- **Hazardous Materials and Wastes** - Potential effects on existing environmental and management practices for hazardous materials and wastes. Disposal of asbestos-containing construction debris within the boundaries of the Cove Gardens housing area has been confirmed. Lead-based paint in the housing units would need to be abated prior to sale, or abatement may be made a condition of sale with sufficient funds escrowed.

Areas evaluated but not considered further in this EA include:

- **Biological Resources** - The implementation of the proposed action, as described herein, would have no impact on endangered species habitat, vegetation, or wildlife in the area. Cove Gardens is located in a developed urban area.

- **Cultural Resources** - No known archaeological sites, historic buildings/structures, or artifacts located in the proposed project area. The Cove Gardens MFH area is not listed nor is it eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. However, the Florida State Historical Preservation Office recommends that an archeological survey be conducted at Cove Gardens as indicated in comments attached in Appendix B.
Figure 1-1 Site Location Map
Figure 1-2  Cove Gardens Military Family Housing Area
• Land Use - Under the proposed action described herein, Tyndall AFB would no longer own or manage the housing area, and military families would no longer be placed at Cove Gardens by the base housing office. Although military families would no longer live in the housing area, there would be no change in land use or zoning from implementation of the proposed action.

• Water Resources - The sale of Cove Gardens MFH area would not affect surface water in the region. There would be no alteration of the impervious surface ratio as construction of additional buildings, roadways, or other improvements that would increase impervious surface are not part of the proposed action. Likewise, the proposed action would not cause changes in surface water quality.

• Aircraft Operations - The proposed action would have no effect on flight operations at Tyndall AFB. Flying operations would continue at the same pace regardless of the outcome of evaluations under this assessment.

• Air Quality - The proposed action would have no effect on air quality in the region. The proposed action would not create or reduce criteria pollutants.

• Noise - The proposed action would have no effect on noise levels at Tyndall AFB or the surrounding area. No noise generating activities are included in the proposed action. Cove Gardens MFH is not located within the 65dBA noise contour for Tyndall AFB.

• Earth Resources - The proposed action would not affect geology, topography, or soils in the area, as no ground disturbing activities are associated with the proposed action.

• Socioeconomic Resources - The proposed action would not affect the demography, housing, education, or economy of the area. The sale of the MFH area would only change the ownership of the property. Military families would either move on to the installation or to other off-base housing.

• Environmental Justice - The proposed action would not affect minority, Native American, or low-income populations. The sale of the MFH area would not cause a disproportionate, adverse effect on minority, Native American, or low-income populations.

The Air Force has announced other independent actions for Tyndall AFB concurrent with the proposed action. The environmental impacts of these other actions have been analyzed in separate NEPA documents. A cumulative impact, as defined by the CEQ (40 CFR 1508.7), is 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 which agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.”

The proposed action is an administrative transaction involving a property transfer between the Air Force and Panama City. This EA is an evaluation of potential impacts of this property transfer. Upon completion of the transaction, the Air Force would no longer have control of the future use of Cove Gardens; therefore, the potential environmental impacts from future development and land use are not known. No reasonable and foreseeable action for the property
has been identified to address future or cumulative impacts. An assessment of cumulative impacts related to proposed actions at Tyndall AFB is not appropriate due to the geographical and operational separation of Cove Gardens from Tyndall AFB proper. Therefore, no cumulative impacts from other actions at Tyndall AFB are associated with the proposed action regarding Cove Gardens.

### 1.4 APPLICABLE REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

The NEPA, as amended, requires Federal agencies to consider the environmental effects of their proposed actions and alternatives as part of the decision-making process for any actions that may have environmental consequences. The Air Force considers the potential environmental impacts identified during the EIAP in its decision-making. This EA considers applicable laws and regulations, including but not limited to the following:

- National Historic Preservation Act
- Archaeological Resources Protection Act
- Clean Air Act (CAA)
- Clean Water Act
- Endangered Species Act
- Pollution Prevention Act
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
- Executive Order 12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs
- Executive Order 12898, Environmental Justice

### 1.5 INTRODUCTION TO THE ORGANIZATION OF THE DOCUMENT

This EA is organized into seven chapters. Chapter 1 contains a statement of the purpose of and need for action, the location of the proposed action, a summary of the scope of the environmental review, identification of applicable regulatory requirements, and a description of the organization of the EA. Chapter 2 describes the history of the formulation of alternatives, describes the alternatives eliminated from further consideration, provides a detailed description of the proposed action, describes the no action alternative, summarizes other actions announced for Tyndall AFB, provides a comparison matrix of environmental effects, and discusses mitigation. Chapter 3 contains a general description of the biophysical resources that potentially would be affected by the proposed action. Chapter 4 is an analysis of the environmental consequences. Chapter 5 lists preparers of this document. Chapter 6 lists persons and agencies consulted in the preparation of this EA. Chapter 7 is a list of source documents relevant to the preparation of this EA.
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DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

This chapter is composed of eight parts: a brief history of the formulation of the proposed alternative to the proposed action, identification of alternatives eliminated from further consideration, a detailed description of the proposed action, a description of the no action alternative, other action alternatives, identification of other proposed actions announced for Tyndall AFB, a summary of environmental impacts, and mitigation.

2.1 HISTORY OF THE FORMULATION OF THE PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE

As stated in the previous chapter, the age and size of Cove Gardens MFH as well as the distance from Tyndall AFB make the housing unsuitable for military families. Since the option to move to Tyndall AFB became available, 34 units at Cove Gardens have been vacated. Because no new military families will be placed at Cove Gardens, it is expected that the occupancy of the housing area will continue to decline.

As a result of informal discussions between Tyndall AFB and the surrounding community, special legislative action was introduced and passed, allowing for the purchase of Cove Gardens MFH by Panama City. This special action became part of PL 106-65. GSA screened the Cove Gardens MFH area to determine whether any Federal agencies were interested in acquiring the property (GSA 1999b). No Federal agency identified a need for the property; therefore, the Air Force declared it to be "excess" and released the property for sale (GSA 1999a).

Since sale of Cove Gardens MFH has been authorized by Public Law and the occupancy of the housing is declining, Tyndall AFB is considering selling the property to Panama City.

2.2 IDENTIFICATION OF ALTERNATIVES ELIMINATED FROM CONSIDERATION

Three alternatives to the proposed action were considered and eliminated. Consideration was given to conveying the property to another government agency. As stated previously, the results of the GSA screening found that no Federal agency was interested in the property. Therefore, this alternative was eliminated from consideration.

The alternative of selling Cove Gardens MFH to a party other than Panama City was also considered. This alternative was eliminated because the sale of Cove Gardens is subject to congressional legislation. No other offers can be considered because PL 106-65 specifies direct conveyance to Panama City.

Lastly, the Air Force considered improving Cove Gardens MFH to increase the size of the units (remodel or replace) and improve traffic conditions. This alternative was eliminated because the cost to improve or replace Cove Gardens is beyond expected Air Force funding levels (Gleason 2000) and the distance from Tyndall AFB would be no less.
2.3 DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION
The 325th Fighter Wing of the Air Force proposes to sell Cove Gardens MFH to Panama City in order to (1) comply with PL 106-65, and (2) dispose of unsuitable housing.

Cove Gardens, constructed in 1942-1943, consists of 130 MFH units in 38 buildings located on approximately 33-acres of waterfront land in Panama City (see Figures 1-1 and 1-2). There is also a general-purpose building serving as a convenience store, which would be considered part of the transaction. Other improvements to the property, which would be considered part of the transaction, are the playground located in the center of the complex and pavilion located in the eastern portion of the complex. The 2-, 3-, and 4-bedroom, one- and two-story units are arranged as four-plexes and six-plexes. In addition, there are ten (10) one-story, single-family, 4-bedroom units. The sale would include all improvements on the property except possibly the utilities infrastructure as specified below.

Panama City would pay the government an amount equal to the fair market value of the property. The exact acreage and legal description of the property would be determined by survey.

2.4 DESCRIPTION OF THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE
Under the no action alternative, Tyndall AFB would retain all 130 MFH units. Military families would continue to live in housing that is (1) below the Air Force authorized square footage allowance, (2) crowded with respect to traffic and parking conditions, geographically displaced from Tyndall AFB.

2.5 OTHER ACTIONS ANNOUNCED FOR TYNDALL AFB
In addition to the proposed action, the Air Force has announced other proposed projects at Tyndall AFB, addressed in separate NEPA documents, including:
- Utilities privatization at Cove Gardens MFH
- MFH construction at Tyndall AFB
- Conversion of two F-15 Fighter Squadrons to F-22 Fighter Squadrons

The environmental impacts of these additional actions are analyzed in separate NEPA documents.

2.6 COMPARISON MATRIX OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF ALL ALTERNATIVES
Table 2-1 summarizes the effects of the proposed action and the no action alternative. The baseline conditions describe the no action alternative.

2.7 IDENTIFICATION OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
The preferred alternative is to sell Cove Gardens MFH as described in Section 2.3.
2.8 MITIGATION

The proposed action is the sale of the property to Panama City. Panama City has not identified their proposed development plans for this site. Since this is a paper transaction between the Air Force and Panama City, no mitigation measures are identified. Upon completion of the paper transaction, the Air Force would no longer have control of the future use of Cove Gardens. The potential environmental impacts from future development are not known. Thus, mitigation and best management practices for the future (currently unknown) development cannot be addressed.

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>No Action Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure/Utilities</td>
<td>The proposed action would result in the transfer of maintenance and upkeep of</td>
<td>No change to current maintenance and operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the infrastructure and utilities of Cove Gardens MFH from the Air Force to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panama City.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>A subsurface waste disposal area exists in the northeast portion of Cove Gardens</td>
<td>Status is the same as proposed action at the time of this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Wastes</td>
<td>and samples containing 40 to 60 percent non-friable asbestos debris have been</td>
<td>Final Draft EA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recovered during additional assessment activities. This type of asbestos, if left</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>undisturbed, does not constitute immediate environmental or health concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive characterization, delineation, and quantification of the buried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>waste site have not been established.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laboratory analyses from two rounds of composite and discrete soil sampling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indicate the presence of pesticides in 17 out of 20 sample sites at Cove Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One sample site, near Building B-21, had concentrations above Florida Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Environmental Protection cleanup standards for direct contact in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>residential areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lead-based paint in the housing units would need to be abated prior to sale, or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abatement may be made a condition of sale with sufficient funds escrowed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the existing environment or baseline conditions for the biophysical resources that could potentially be affected by the implementation of the proposed action. This section is organized by individual resources, and includes descriptions of both the biological and physical portions of the ecosystems potentially impacted by the proposed action. Information is presented in this chapter to the level of detail necessary to support the conclusions made in Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences.

3.2 COVE GARDENS MFH LOCATION, HISTORY, AND CURRENT MISSION

Cove Gardens MFH is located approximately 10.2 miles (roadway miles via United States Route 98) northwest of Tyndall AFB and adjacent to Watson Bayou near downtown Panama City. Tyndall AFB is located on the Gulf of Mexico, east of the City of Panama City, in Bay County, Florida. The Federal Public Housing Authority constructed Cove Gardens MFH in 1942-43. The property was transferred to the War Department in October 1946 to provide housing for military personnel assigned to Tyndall Field. The original site structures have been utilized as MFH since that time, with one major renovation occurring in 1985-86. The renovation included room additions, interior renovations, and replacement of the roof materials.

The age and size of Cove Gardens MFH as well as the distance from Tyndall AFB make the housing unsuitable for military families. Since the option to move to Tyndall AFB became available, 34 units at Cove Gardens have been vacated. Because no new military families will be placed at Cove Gardens, it is expected that the occupancy of the housing area will continue to decline.

Cove Gardens MFH supports Tyndall AFB, the primary mission of which is the training and evaluation of personnel and weapons (USAF 2000c). The 325 FW provides for F-15 air-to-air pilots, Air Battle Managers and Weapons Directors, Intelligence personnel, and air traffic control officers. The 325 FW provides training for all Air Force F-15 pilots in air-to-air combat.

3.3 DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

3.3.1 Infrastructure/Utilities

Utilities provided at the Cove Gardens Military Family Housing Area include water, sewer, electricity, natural gas, telephone, and cable TV.

3.3.1.1 Sanitary Sewer

Sanitary sewer service at the Cove Gardens MFH area is provided by the Panama City Water Department. Underground sanitary sewer collection lines are located on the rear (back) side of
all structures. Service laterals provide service to the individual units. Wastewater from the site flows south and into an outfall line (owned by Panama City) near the southeast corner of the property. Although sewer service is provided by Panama City, the Air Force retains ownership of the collection system upstream of the outfall line. The City outfall lines run under Watson Bayou to the Millville Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Wastewater flows within Panama City are treated by the Millville Wastewater Treatment Plant. Operated by Panama City, this plant is located on the east shore of Watson Bayou at 1800 East 3rd Street, Panama City, which is due east of Cove Gardens MFH. This plant has a design capacity of 5.0 million gallons per day (mgd), with a maximum permitted flow of 4.0 mgd. The plant is currently operating at 57 percent of its capacity, with average daily flows of 2.3 mgd.

### 3.3.1.2 Potable Water

Drinking water is supplied to Cove Gardens MFH by Panama City Water Department. Water service enters the Cove Garden MFH area along the south side of Third Court. The supply line branches at a tee along the west side of Victory Court, and loops around the Cove Gardens area with a 6" main. Service laterals ranging in size from ¾" to 1½" supply water to the individual units. The city facilities end at the meter along Third Court, and distribution facilities from the meter to the housing units are owned and maintained by the Air Force. A single meter at the entry to the housing area meters water usage at Cove Gardens MFH, and usage at the individual housing units is not metered. Typical monthly water usage at Cove Gardens MFH is 1.2 million gallons.

The Panama City Water Department purchases water wholesale from Bay County Utilities. Bay County's primary drinking water source is Dear Point Lake, located in the northeastern portion of Bay County. Dear Point is a 5000-acre fresh water surface impoundment with a storage capacity of 10 billion gallons. The lake is formed by an impoundment structure constructed across Deer Point at the northerly end of North Bay. Residence time in the reservoir is approximately 17 days. Production from the facility averages between 25 and 30 mgd. Inflows to the reservoir average 600 mgd, with an average of 550 mgd flowing over the dam into the adjacent North Bay. During the current drought conditions, inflows to the reservoir are approximately 230 mgd, with approximately 200 mgd flowing over the dam into North Bay.

Panama City purchases an average of 181 million gallons of water per month for distribution to their customers. Water usage by Panama City for the months of May 2000 and June 2000 were somewhat higher than average, with monthly usage totals of 206 million gallons and 196 million gallons respectively. The Consumer Confidence Report provided by the City of Panama City does not report any inadequacies in water pressure or supply quantities. Discussions with Bay County indicate adequate water supply for the region.

### 3.3.1.3 Solid Waste Management

Overall Panama City collects approximately 4,000 tons of solid waste monthly and disposes of the waste at one of two (2) disposal facilities.

The majority of waste material is transported to the Bay County Incinerator located approximately 12 miles north of Panama City at 7500 Highway 231 in the Bay County Industrial
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The facility is permitted to process 245 tons per day at each of the two (2) incinerator units, with a total annual throughput of 178,000 tons. The plant is currently operating at approximately 96 percent of capacity. There are no near-term plans to expand the plant, although long-term plans do include a third incinerator unit. Typically, 3,000 tons per month are disposed of by Panama City at this incinerator. Disposal costs are lower at the incinerator than at other disposal sites, and all material suitable for incineration is disposed of at this facility.

The remaining waste, which is not suitable for incineration, is disposed of at the Panama City Disposal, Inc. landfill located at 2141 E. 9th Street in Panama City. Only material not suitable for incineration is disposed of at this facility. Relevant details concerning the expected operational lifetime and permit status of this landfill are unavailable at the current time.

The City provides curbside collection of municipal solid waste in the Cove Gardens MFH area. Records regarding the quantity of municipal solid waste generated at the Cove Gardens MFH area are not maintained by either the Air Force or Panama City. An estimate of the amount of municipal solid waste (MSW) generated by the residents of Cove Gardens was derived assuming a population of 800 persons generating 5 pounds of municipal waste per day. The estimated quantity of municipal waste generated by Cove Gardens, with full nominal occupancy, would be 60 tons per month, or 1.5 percent of the municipal waste generated by Panama City.

### 3.3.1.4 Drainage

Drainage across the Cove Gardens MFH area is a combination of sheet flow, surface channels, and a subsurface drainage system. Overall drainage across the property is south and east, toward Watson Bayou. Due to local topography, storm water from up gradient areas does not flow across Cove Gardens MFH. Most up gradient flows are intercepted by offsite drainage facilities and flow directly into Watson Bayou without crossing Cove Gardens MFH. Storm water flows originating from within Cove Gardens MFH are discharged directly into Watson Bayou. Most storm water flows enter Victory Circle and enter the subsurface drainage system through curb inlets. Flows entering the subsurface drainage system subsequently discharge into Watson Bayou through one of six (6) outfall structures. Near the southeast corner of Cove Gardens, storm water from Victory Circle is discharged to a concrete drainage channel that discharges into Watson Bayou. Storm water that does not enter Victory Circle sheet flows across the land surface into Watson Bayou.

No industrial activities are conducted at the Cove Gardens MFH area. National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Storm Water program permits are not applicable to discharges from this site.

### 3.3.1.5 Transportation Systems

Transportation infrastructure in the vicinity of Cove Gardens MFH consists of residential type local streets interspersed with minor and major collector streets. Major arterials include State Route 30 (6th Street), which runs east and west just north of Cove Gardens MFH and serves as the principal commuting route from Cove Gardens to Tyndall AFB proper. Other major arterials include State Route 77 (Cove Boulevard) and State Route 75/ United States Highway 231 (Harrison Avenue). No Interstate Highways are located in the immediate project vicinity.
The layout of Third Court, the single street access into Cove Gardens, and Victory Circle, the one-way main street of the MFH area, results in traffic congestion and has been a reported concern. The streets in Cove Gardens are narrow and parking spaces were allocated on the basis of one vehicle per housing unit at the time of the MFH construction in the 1940s (USAF 2000a). When more than one vehicle per housing unit exists, the extra vehicles must park on the street. On-street parking further restricts the narrow streets and causes traffic congestion.

3.3.1.6 Electricity/Natural Gas

Gulf Power Company provides electricity to Cove Gardens MFH. Electrical service enters the housing area by way of overhead lines along the north side of Third Court near the westerly side of the property. Distribution lines and transformers within the MFH area are owned and maintained by Tyndall AFB. These electrical power distribution facilities provide a network centered on Victory Circle along a series of 35' tall power utility poles. Pole mounted transformers drop the distributed electrical current to residential service power levels.

Natural gas service facilities to Cove Gardens MFH were installed in 1960. The West Florida Gas Company provides natural gas. Gas enters the area at a meter located north of Third Court near the west side of the property. From the meter, the distribution system is configured in a loop around Victory Circle with a 2½" main pipeline and 1" service laterals. The gas pipe loop network is buried under the roadway approximately 1 foot from the inner curb of Victory Circle. The gas main supplying this meter has a capacity to deliver 45,000 cubic feet of natural gas per hour at a pressure of 10 pounds per square inch. The total gas requirement for all utilities at Cove Garden MFH is 8,120 cubic feet per hour.

3.3.2 Hazardous Materials and Wastes

3.3.2.1 Hazardous Materials

Asbestos. Asbestos management at Air Force installations is established in AFI 32-1052, Facility Asbestos Management. AFI 32-1052 incorporates by reference applicable requirements of 29 CFR 669 et seq.; 29 CFR 1910.1025; 29 CFR 1926.58; 40 CFR 61.140; Section 112 of the CAA, and other applicable AFIs and DoD Directives. AFI 32-1052 requires installations to develop an asbestos management plan for the purposes of maintaining a permanent record of the current status and condition of all asbestos-containing material in the installation facility inventory and documenting all asbestos management efforts. The instruction requires installations to develop an asbestos operating plan that details how the installation will conduct asbestos-related projects (USAF, 1994e).

Tyndall AFB maintains Asbestos Management Plan and an Asbestos Operations Plan, both dated 1 May 1998. Requirements and procedures contained in this plan apply to all facilities operated by Tyndall AFB, including the Cove Gardens housing area.

Asbestos is also regulated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). Emissions of asbestos to ambient air are controlled under Section 112 of the CAA. Identification of asbestos-containing material in base facilities is governed by OSHA under the authority of the Occupational Safety and Health
Act, 29 USC § 669 et seq. The USEPA has a policy that addresses leaving asbestos in place if its disturbance or removal could pose a health threat.

A limited asbestos survey of construction materials in structures of the Cove Gardens MFH area was performed under a separate Air Force contract in May 2000. The survey included collection of 32 samples from two multi-family housing units. No friable asbestos containing material (ACM) was identified in this survey. However, non-friable ACM was identified in samples of floor tile, floor tile mastic, and roof sealant.

The Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) performed for Cove Gardens (February 2001) provided data that includes a 1986 aerial photograph and an engineered drawing acquired from the Real Property Division at Tyndall AFB indicating evidence of non-friable ACM disposal at Cove Gardens. The aerial photograph depicts an area in the northeast portion of the property having been cleared and excavated in the past. The engineered drawing also places a construction debris disposal area in this same location. From the drawing it states that asbestos roof shingles and non-specific construction debris were disposed of in the construction debris disposal area. Non-friable ACM were discovered in the construction debris disposal area from an additional soil sampling investigation conducted on 8 through 9 December 2000 in support of the EBS for Cove Gardens. Five bulk samples were collected from the subsurface and analyzed for asbestos. Four of the five samples had non-friable asbestos concentrations ranging from 40 to 60 percent chrysotile asbestos. All of the ACM samples obtained were determined to be non-friable. The buried non-friable ACM is not considered to be an immediate environmental or health hazard if undisturbed. Disturbance of this buried material may constitute a potential health hazard without proper health and safety precautions.

Lead-based Paint. Lead-based paint (LBP) management at Air Force installations is established in the Air Force policy and guidance on LBP in facilities. The policy incorporates by reference the requirements of 29 CFR 1910.1025, 29 CFR 1926, 40 CFR 50.12, 40 CFR 240 through 280, the CAA, Public Law 102-550, and other applicable federal regulations. This policy requires each installation to develop and implement a facility management plan for identifying, evaluating, managing, and abating LBP hazards (USAF, 1993b).

LBP is most likely to be found in industrial facilities, on steel structures such as water tanks and pipelines, in yellow painted pavement markings, and in non-industrial facilities constructed before 1980 (AFCEE 1992). Painted ferrous metal surfaces in non-industrial facilities constructed during or after 1980 are also likely to contain LBP.

A LBP survey was conducted in 1994 on 48 housing units in the Cove Gardens MFH area. Approximately 89 percent of the units surveyed contained LBP. The highest incidence of LBP was identified in windowssills, stair risers and baseboards, and exterior wood trim. Lead-based paint in the housing units would need to be abated prior to sale, or abatement may be made a condition of sale with sufficient funds escrowed.

The Phase I Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) prepared for Cove Gardens included collection of two composite surface soil samples from the perimeter of housing units at the site. These samples were analyzed for total lead to assess the residual presence of LBP at the site. Lead was detected in both samples at concentrations of 58 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) and
77 mg/kg (USAF 2000e). These levels are below the FDEP direct exposure criteria for a residential setting, which is 400 mg/kg.

**Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) Materials.** Based on information contained in the EBS, there is no evidence to indicate that PCB wastes or transformers containing PCB oils were stored or disposed of in the Cove Gardens MFH area. There is also no evidence to indicate a release of PCB oils at Cove Gardens. Tyndall AFB has removed all known PCB-containing transformers (USAF 1999b) from all of its facilities, including Cove Gardens, according to the base Management Action Plan. Transformers operated and maintained by the municipal provider of electrical services are PCB-free (Gulf Power 2001).

**Pesticides.** No known historical pesticide application records or data are available for Cove Gardens (either inside or outside the housing units). The EBS prepared for Cove Gardens included two separate soil sample collection events. The first sampling event, which was for screening only, occurred 25 May 2000 and consisted of six (6) composite surface soil samples collected from the perimeter of six (6) housing units. Sample results indicated that there are pesticide residues, including DDT, dieldrin, and chlordane, in the soils at Cove Gardens. One area, near building B-21, was found to have soil sample concentrations exceeding Florida target soil cleanup levels for direct exposure in residential areas. Many of the pesticide compounds detected (e.g., chlordane, DDT) were commonly used through the 1970’s but have since been banned by the USEPA. Pesticides such as these were banned for various reasons including toxicity from accumulation of concentrations in organisms and their persistence in the environment. They can be detected for many years after their application because these pesticides take a long time to decompose. The second sampling event in support of the EBS for Cove Gardens occurred 8 through 9 December 2000.

Detectable concentrations of pesticides in soil samples obtained at Cove Gardens were found at 17 of 20 locations sampled in the MFH area. This may be indicative of past pesticide applications, rather than a result of a spill incident, accidental release, or deliberate disposal of pesticides. No documentation of a pesticide spill or uncontrolled release was found during the records reviews conducted in support of the Phase I EBS. Additional information regarding the pesticide sampling and analyses can be obtained from the Cove Gardens EBS (USAF 2001).

### 3.3.2.2 Hazardous Waste

Management of hazardous waste is governed by Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Subtitle C (40 CFR Parts 260 through 270) regulations, which are administered by the USEPA. The regulations require hazardous waste to be handled, stored, transported, disposed of, or recycled in compliance with applicable regulations.

No hazardous wastes are currently generated at Cove Gardens aside from household hazardous wastes, which are exempt from regulations and there is no evidence that hazardous waste disposal has ever occurred at Cove Gardens.
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ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

4.1 INTRODUCTION
This chapter describes potential impacts that could occur if the proposed action is implemented by Tyndall AFB and Panama City. Additionally, potential impacts are addressed for the no action alternative. Any resultant irreversible or irretrievable resource commitments are noted. Criteria used to evaluate potential impacts are discussed at the beginning of each resource area.

4.2 CHANGE IN CURRENT MISSION
The sale of Cove Gardens MFH would not affect the mission of Tyndall AFB since other housing is available, either on or off base.

4.3 DESCRIPTION OF THE EFFECTS OF ALL ALTERNATIVES ON THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

4.3.1 Infrastructure/Utilities
The following factors were considered in evaluating potential impacts to infrastructure and utilities: (1) the degree to which a utility service would have to alter operating practices and personnel requirements; (2) the degree to which the change in demands from implementation of the proposed action and alternatives would impact the utility system’s capacity; (3) the degree to which a transportation system would have to alter operating practices and personnel requirements to support the action; (4) the capacity required from new or revised transportation systems; (5) the degree to which the increased demands from the proposed action would reduce the reliability of transportation systems, or aggravate already existing adverse conditions; and (6) the degree to which the proposed action changes surface water runoff and erosion characteristics.

4.3.1.1 Sanitary Sewer

4.3.1.1.1 Proposed Action
Sanitary sewer facilities are adequate for existing facilities. The proposed action would result in discontinued maintenance and upkeep of the sanitary sewer system of Cove Gardens MFH by the Air Force. No adverse impact on sanitary sewer facilities is anticipated.

4.3.1.1.2 No Action Alternative
Under the no action alternative, there would be no change in the baseline conditions described in Section 3.3.1.1.
4.3.1.2 Potable Water

4.3.1.2.1 Proposed Action
The proposed action would not increase demand for potable water. No changes in potable water requirements are anticipated for the Cove Garden MFH area. Existing production and distribution systems are adequate to supply the anticipated required usage by the proposed action as described herein. The proposed action would result in discontinued maintenance and upkeep of the water distribution system of Cove Gardens MFH by the Air Force.

4.3.1.2.2 No Action Alternative
Under the no action alternative, there would be no change in the baseline conditions described in Section 3.3.1.2.

4.3.1.3 Solid Waste Management
The following factors were considered in evaluating potential impacts to solid waste management: (1) the degree to which the proposed action could affect the existing solid waste management program and (2) capacity of the area landfills.

4.3.1.3.1 Proposed Action
No changes in solid waste management are anticipated for the Cove Garden MFH area. Existing collection and disposal facilities would not change, and are adequate to handle solid waste generated at Cove Gardens MFH at the time of this EA and as anticipated by the proposed action as described herein. The proposed action would result in discontinued waste disposal services for Cove Gardens MFH by the Air Force.

4.3.1.3.2 No Action Alternative
Under the no action alternative, there would be no change in the baseline solid waste generation rates described in Section 3.3.1.3.

4.3.1.4 Drainage

4.3.1.4.1 Proposed Action
The sale of Cove Gardens MFH is not expected to affect drainage patterns. The proposed action would result in discontinued maintenance and upkeep of existing drainage systems and erosion controls at Cove Gardens MFH by the Air Force.

4.3.1.4.2 No Action Alternative
Under the no action alternative, drainage patterns would not change from the baseline conditions described in Section 3.3.1.4.
4.3.1.5 Transportation Systems

4.3.1.5.1 Proposed Action
No changes in transportation systems are anticipated for the Cove Garden MFH area by the proposed action as described herein. Transportation systems would not be directly impacted by the proposed action. No increase in the number of individuals living at Cove Gardens will occur upon implementation of the proposed action as described herein. The proposed action would result in discontinued traffic controls in Cove Gardens MFH by the Air Force.

4.3.1.5.2 No Action Alternative
Under the no action alternative, there would be no change in the transportation infrastructure described in Section 3.3.1.5.

4.3.1.6 Electricity/Natural Gas

4.3.1.6.1 Proposed Action
Existing gas and electric facilities are sufficient to provide continued service to the property and to support the proposed action as described herein. No increase in the number of persons living at the property is anticipated, and no increased use of natural gas or electricity is anticipated. The proposed action would result in discontinued maintenance and upkeep of the electrical and natural gas distribution system and fixtures in Cove Gardens MFH by the Air Force.

4.3.1.6.2 No Action Alternative
Under the no action alternative, there would be no change from the baseline conditions described in Section 3.3.1.6.

4.3.2 Hazardous Materials and Wastes

4.3.2.1 Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Wastes

4.3.2.1.1 Proposed Action
No hazardous materials or wastes would be used or generated by the proposed action. Hazardous materials/wastes discovered from further studies at Cove Gardens MFH area prior to implementation of the proposed action would be managed by the Air Force in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations. Therefore, the proposed action would not affect hazardous materials or hazardous waste management.

4.3.2.1.2 No Action Alternative
Under the no action alternative, there would be no change from the baseline conditions described in Section 3.3.2. Additional subsurface investigations could be used to provide more definitive...
assessments of previous land-disturbing activities; specifically those conducted during 1986, to better determine and characterize the various wastes buried at the site. Any hazardous materials/wastes discovered from further studies at Cove Gardens MFH area would be managed by the Air Force in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations.
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### LIST OF PREPARERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Organization</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Professional Discipline</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Moyer, EIT/Versar</td>
<td>BS, MS Civil Engineering</td>
<td>Project Manager, Water resources, hazardous waste, infrastructure, biological resources, cultural resources</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Sedlak, CPG/Versar</td>
<td>BS, MS, Geology</td>
<td>Hazardous materials and wastes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Haas/Versar</td>
<td>BS, MS Natural Resources</td>
<td>Water resources, infrastructure and utilities</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory Laskoskie/Versar</td>
<td>BS, Geography - Environmental Studies</td>
<td>CADD support</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Southerland/Versar</td>
<td>BA, Zoology; Ph.D. Biology (Ecology)</td>
<td>Senior Technical Review, cumulative effects</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paige Rhodes/Formerly with Versar</td>
<td>BS, Biology; MS Environmental Science</td>
<td>Project Manager through 12 October 2000 during Period of Performance of this EA</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PERSONS AND AGENCIES CONSULTED

The following individuals and agencies were consulted during the preparation of this EA:

6.1 FEDERAL AGENCIES

U.S. Air Force

HQ AETC:
Russel Farringer (HQ AETC/CEVN)

Tyndall AFB:
Lt. Chris Bishop (325 ADS/SGGB)
Robert Bushway (CES/DJO)
Ann Carter (325 CES/CEH)
John Dingwall (325 CES/CEV)
Ann Garner (325 CES/CEV)
Ken Gleason (325 CES/CEC)
John Kain (325 CES/CEO)
Bert Lent (325 CES/CEV)
Joe McLeman (325 CES/CEV)
Henry Malec (325 CES/CEV)
Wes Smith (325 CES/CECB)
Brenda Straw (325 CES/CERR)
Captain Lee Ann Summer (325 FW/JA)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4
Bill Bush, Office of Environmental Assessment

U.S. Department of the Interior
Mike Brim, Fish and Wildlife Service

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Region IV
William Straw, Regional Environmental Officer, Mitigation Division

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Janet Shelby, Mobile District

June 2001
6.2 STATE AGENCIES

State of Florida, State Clearing House
  Mike McDaniel, Division of Community Planning, Bureau of Local Planning

State of Florida, Department of Community Affairs
  Vickie Morrison, Florida Coastal Management Program

State of Florida, Department of Environmental Protection
  Gary Shaffer, District Branch Office - Northwest

State of Florida
  Laura Kammerer, Division of Historical Resources

6.3 COUNTY AND LOCAL AGENCIES

Bay County Chamber of Commerce
  Jim Cherry

Bay County Commissioners, Environmental Group
  John E. Goin, Assistant County Manager for Community Service

Bay County Utilities
  Bill Hudson, Director, Bay County Solid Waste Division
  Kathy McDonald

Emergency Management Office, Bay County
  Robert Majka, Jr., Chief of Emergency

City of Panama City
  Anthony Mitchell, Community Development Program
  Willis Holley, Solid Waste Division
  Mike Bush, City Clerk
  Sherry Kocheuar, Water Department
  Ron Morgan, Panama City Utilities Department
  David Slusser, Chief, Panama City Police Department
  Steve Malone, Panama City Land Use Code Enforcement

6.4 LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS

Felton and BeBe Cofer, Friends of Watson Bayou

June 2001
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Straw 2000. E-mail correspondence with Brenda Straw, Tyndall AFB Real Estate Office, 325 CES/CERR, 1 June 2000.
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REQUEST FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

INSTRUCTIONS: Section I to be completed by Proposant. Sections II and III to be completed by Environmental Planning Function. Continue on separate sheets as necessary. Reference appropriate item numbers.

SECTION I - PROPONENT INFORMATION

1. TO Environmental Planning Function

2. FROM (Proposant organization and functional address symbol)

3. TELEPHONE NO.

SECTION II - PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL SURVEY.

1. AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBILITY USE ZONELAND USE AFFECTS, accident potential, encroachment, etc.

2. AIR QUALITY (Excursions, attainment status, state implementation plans, etc.)

3. WATER RESOURCES (Quality, quantity, source, etc.)

4. SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH (Radiation, chemical exposure, etc.)

5. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/DOMAIN (Leakage, migration, solid waste, etc.)

6. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (Wildlife, birds, flora, fauna, etc.)

7. CULTURAL RESOURCES (Native American cultural sites, historical, etc.)

8. GEOLOGY AND SOILS (Topography, soils, geothermal, etc.)

9. SOCIOECONOMIC (Employment, population projections, etc.)

10. OTHER (Other potential impacts not addressed above)

SECTION III - ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS DETERMINATION

11. PROPOSED ACTION QUALIFIES FOR CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION [SELECT #]

12. PROPOSED ACTION DOES NOT QUALIFY FOR A CATEGORY, FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS IS REQUIRED.

REMARKS

HISTORY

AF FORM 813, AUG 93 (EF-77)

THIS FORM CONSOLIDATES AF FORMS 813 AND 814.

PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF BOTH FORMS ARE OBSOLETE.
4. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION:

The purpose of selling the Cove Gardens Military Family Housing (MFH) area is to dispose of substandard housing in accordance with the special legislation discussed below. The Cove Gardens MFH area is old, does not meet current housing standards and is very expensive to maintain.

5. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES:

The proposed action is to sell the Cove Gardens MFH area to the City of Panama City, Florida. This sale is authorized by special legislation: Public Law 106-65, TITLE XXVII, PART 3, SECTION 2862. The property has cleared screening by the General Services Administration as indicated by the attached letter dated 24 Nov 99. Thus, the no action alternative is the only feasible alternative to selling the property.
Mr. Jimmy G. Dishner  
Deputy Assistant Secretary  
of the Air Force Installations  
The Pentagon – Room 4C940  
Washington, DC 20330-1660

Dear Mr. Dishner,

The property actions listed below have been declared excess and their conveyance from Federal custody has been authorized by Congress with the enactment of P.L. 106-65 on October 5, 1999. Pursuant to section 2814 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1998 (10 U.S.C. 2696), these properties have been screened to determine if there is any continuing Federal need for their use.

- Land conveyance, Newington Defense Fuel Supply Point, New Hampshire
- Land conveyance, Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida
- Land conveyance, Port of Anchorage, Alaska
- Land conveyance, Forestport Test Annex, New York
- Land conveyance, McClellan Nuclear Radiation Center, California

If you have any further questions please do not hesitate to contact me or Ms. Naomi Chisley of my staff on (202) 501-0745.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Brian K. Polly  
Assistant Commissioner  
Office of Property Disposal
Appendix B

Interagency Coordination
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Point of Contact</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida Department of Community Affairs</td>
<td>Ms. Jasmin Raffington (850-922-5438)</td>
<td>Project is consistent with Florida Coastal Management Program</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Department of Environmental Protection</td>
<td>Ms. Linda B. McDowell</td>
<td>No Comment/Consistent</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>Mr. Brian Barnett</td>
<td>No Comment/Consistent</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Mr. Jimmy Bailey (850-638-6193)</td>
<td>No significant impacts to Florida roadways were determined</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Florida Water Management District</td>
<td>Mr. Duncan J. Cairns</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources</td>
<td>Mr. Ken Misner, Historic Sites Specialist (850-487-2333) <a href="mailto:kmisner@mail.dos.state.fl.us">kmisner@mail.dos.state.fl.us</a></td>
<td>&quot;...archeological and historic sites...are likely to occur in the area...&quot;,&quot;...there is a reasonable probability that historic properties eligible for listing in the National Register, or otherwise of historical or archeological significance are present in the area.&quot;</td>
<td>Tyndall AFB concurs with the comments from the Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources. An archeological survey of Cove Gardens MFH will be conducted by the Air Force.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FLORIDA STATE CLEARINGHOUSE
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100
(850) 922-5438
Fax:(850) 414-0479

To: John
Date: 6-28-01

Fax #: (850) 283-3854 Pages: 7, including cover sheet.

From: Jack

Subject: Consistency Letter

June 28, 2001

Lieutenant Colonel John K. Borland  
Commander, 325th Civil Engineer Squadron  
Department of the Air Force  
119 Alabama Avenue  
Tyndall AFB, Florida 32403

RE: A Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) to Evaluate the Potential Environmental Consequences at Tyndall Air Force Base to Sell Cove Gardens Housing Area to the City of Panama City - Bay County, Florida  
SAI: FL200105020269C

Dear Lieutenant Colonel Borland:

The Florida State Clearinghouse, pursuant to Presidential Executive Order 12372, Gubernatorial Executive Order 95-359, the Coastal Zone Management Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1451-1464, as amended, and the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321, 4331-4335, 4341-4347, as amended, has coordinated a review of the above-referenced project. Based on the information contained in the referenced application and the enclosed comments provided by our reviewing agencies, the state has determined that the referenced project is consistent with the Florida Coastal Management Program. Should questions arise regarding this letter, please call Ms. Jasmin Raffington at (850) 922-5438.

Very truly yours,

Steven M. Seibert  
Secretary

SMS/ijj

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

- Federal Assistance to State or Local Government (15 CFR 930, Subpart F). Agencies are required to evaluate the consistency of the activity.
- Direct Federal Activity (15 CFR 930, Subpart C). Federal Agencies are required to furnish a consistency determination for the State's concurrence or objection.
- Outer Continental Shelf Exploration, Development or Production Activities (15 CFR 930, Subpart E). Operators are required to provide a consistency certification for state concurrence/objection.
- Federal Licensing or Permitting Activity (15 CFR 930, Subpart D). Such projects will only be evaluated for consistency when there is not an analogous state license or permit.

To: Florida State Clearinghouse  
Department of Community Affairs  
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100  
(850) 922-5438  
(850) 414-0479 (FAX)

From: Division/Bureau: FDEP/DIP  
Reviewer: Wanda McDowell  
Date: 05/29/01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE AGENCIES</th>
<th>WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICTS</th>
<th>OPB POLICY UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Community Affairs  
Environmental Protection  
Fish & Wildlife Conserv. Comm  
OTTED  
State  
Transportation  
Northwest Florida WMD  | Environmental Policy/C & ED  |  |

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

- Federal Assistance to State or Local Government (15 CFR 930, Subpart F). Agencies are required to evaluate the consistency of the activity.
- Direct Federal Activity (15 CFR 930, Subpart C). Federal Agencies are required to furnish a consistency determination for the State's concurrence or objection.
- Outer Continental Shelf Exploration, Development or Production Activities (15 CFR 930, Subpart E). Operators are required to provide a consistency certification for state concurrence/objection.
- Federal Licensing or Permitting Activity (15 CFR 930, Subpart D). Such projects will only be evaluated for consistency when there is not an analogous state license or permit.

To: Florida State Clearinghouse
Department of Community Affairs
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100
(850) 922-5438 (SC 292-5438)
(850) 414-0479 (FAX)

From: Division/Bureau: ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
Reviewer: BRIAN BARNET

EQ. 12372/NEPA
Federal Consistency

☑ No Comment
☐ Comments Attached
☐ Not Applicable
☑ No Comment/Consistent
☐ Consistent/Comments Attached
☐ Inconsistent/Comments Attached
☐ Not Applicable

MAY 14 2001
Florida Department of Transportation

Office of the Director of Planning
Post Office Box 607
Chipley, Florida 32428-0607
June 5, 2001

Department of Community Affairs
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100

SUBJECT: SAI# FL200105020269C, Cove Gardens
Bay County

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

Based upon the information provided, the proposed project has been determined to have no significant impacts to the roadway system in the involved portion of Bay County. The proposal has been reviewed in accordance with Presidential Executive Order 12372 and Governor's Executive Order 83-150 for consistency with the following:

+ Florida Transportation Plan and any modal system and work program plans directly related to this project;
+ Level of Service Standards; + Environment Commitments;
+ Access Management Standards; + Right of Way costs and advanced acquisition;
+ Chapters 334 and 339, Laws of Florida

Additional coordination of this project may be done with Mr. Jimmy Bailey, E.P., District Environmental Management Administrator of my office. If you have any questions regarding this response, please contact me at 850/638-0250 ext. 204 (SUNCOM 767-1204) or Mr. Bailey at 850/638-6193 (TTY) or SUNCOM 767-1511. Mr. Bailey cannot speak but he can hear. Mr. Bailey's e-mail (preferred method of contacting him) is jimmy.bailey@dot.state.fl.us. His Fax is 850/638-6368.

Very truly yours,

Marvin Stukey, P. E.
Director of Planning

cc: Sandra Whitmire, Jimmy Bailey, Regina Battles, Jerry Campbell

www.dot.state.fl.us
TO: State Clearinghouse
Department of Community Affairs
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100

DATE: May 11, 2001

SUBJECT: Project Review: Intergovernmental Coordination
Title: U.S. Air Force-Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) – Sale of Cove Gardens Military Family Housing-February 2001-Tyndall Air Force Base-Bay County, FL
SAI #: FL200105020249C

The District has reviewed the subject application and attachments in accordance with its responsibilities and authority under the provisions of Chapter 373, Florida Statutes. As a result of this review, the District has the following responses:

**ACTION**

- [X] No Comment.
- [ ] Supports the project.
- [ ] Objects to the project; explanation attached.
- [ ] Has no objection to the project; explanation optional.
- [ ] Cannot evaluate the project; explanation attached.
- [ ] Project requires a permit from the District under ___.

**DEGREE OF REVIEW**

- [X] Documentation was reviewed.
- [ ] Field investigation was performed.
- [ ] Discussed and/or contacted appropriate office about project.
- [ ] Additional documentation/research is required.
- [ ] Comments attached.

**SIGNED**

Duncan Jay Calrns
Chief, Bur. Env. & Res. Plng.
The attached document requires a Coastal Zone Management Act/Florida Coastal Management Program consistency evaluation and is categorized as one of the following:

- Federal Assistance to State or Local Government (15 CFR 930, Subpart F). Agencies are required to evaluate the consistency of the activity.
- Direct Federal Activity (15 CFR 930, Subpart C). Federal Agencies are required to furnish a consistency determination for the State's concurrence or objection.
- Outer Continental Shelf Exploration, Development or Production Activities (15 CFR 930, Subpart E). Operators are required to provide a consistency certification for state concurrence/objection.
- Federal Licensing or Permitting Activity (15 CFR 930, Subpart D). Such projects will only be evaluated for consistency when there is no analogous state license or permit.

To: Florida State Clearinghouse
Department of Community Affairs
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100
(850) 922-5438 (SC 292-5438)
(850) 414-0479 (FAX)

EO. 12372/NEPA
No Comment/Consistent
Comments Attached/Comments Attached
Not Applicable/Not Applicable

Federal Consistency

From: NWFWMDFederal Consistency
Division/Bureau: Resource Management Div.
Reviewer: Duncan J. Callins
Date: 11 MAY 01

Project Description:
AREA OF PROPOSED ACTIVITY: COL Y: Bay County

☐ FEDERAL ASSISTANCE ☑ DIRECT FEDERAL ACTIVITY ☐ FEDERAL LICENSE OR PERMIT ☐ OCS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION


PLEASE CHECK ALL THE LOCAL GOVERNMENTS BELOW FROM WHICH COMMENTS HAVE BEEN RECEIVED; ALL COMMENTS RECEIVED SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE RPC'S CLEARINGHOUSE RESPONSE PACKAGE. IF NO COMMENTS WERE RECEIVED, PLEASE CHECK "NO COMMENT" BOX AND RETURN TO CLEARINGHOUSE.

COMMENTS DUE TO RPC: 05/23/2001

_____ Bay County

NO COMMENTS: _____

(IF THE RPC DOES NOT RECEIVE COMMENTS BY THE DEADLINE DATE, THE RPC SHOULD CONTACT THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT TO DETERMINE THE STATUS OF THE PROJECT REVIEW PRIOR TO FORWARDING THE RESPONSE PACKAGE TO THE CLEARINGHOUSE.)

NOTES:

8487-05-09-2001

ALL CONCERNS OR COMMENTS REGARDING THE ATTACHED PROJECT (INCLUDING ANY RPC COMMENTS) SHOULD BE SENT IN WRITING BY THE DUE DATE TO THE CLEARINGHOUSE. PLEASE ATTACH THIS RESPONSE FORM AND REFER TO THE SAI # IN ALL CORRESPONDENCE.

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING THE ATTACHED PROJECT, PLEASE CONTACT THE STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AT (904) 922-5438 OR SUNCOM 272-5438.
Mr. John Dingwall
325th Civil Engineer Squadron
119 Alabama Avenue
Tyndall AFB FL 32403-5014

May 30, 2001

Re: DHR Project File No. 2001-04182
Received by DHR April 27, 2001
U. S. Air Force, Tyndall Air Force Base (TAF3), Florida
Final Draft Environmental Assessment, Sale of Cove Gardens Military Family Housing

Dear Mr. Dingwall:

Our office reviewed the above referenced environmental assessment in accordance with the provisions of Florida's Coastal Zone Management Act and Chapter 267, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures contained in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended in 1992, and 36 C.F.R., Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties. The State Historic Preservation Officer advises and assists federal agencies as they identify historic properties (listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register of historic Places or otherwise of historical or archaeological value), assess effects of projects upon those properties, and consider alternative means of development to avoid or reduce adverse effects.

Our review of the Florida Master Site File and our records indicates that there are no archaeological or historic sites currently recorded within the area encompassed by the environmental assessment. However, the lack of recorded historic properties is not considered significant because the area has never been subjected to a systematic, professional survey to locate such properties. Data from environmentally similar areas in Bay County indicate that archaeological and historic sites, especially the former, are likely to occur in the area encompassed by the environmental assessment. It is, therefore, the opinion of this office that there is a reasonable probability that historic properties potentially eligible for listing in the National Register, or otherwise of historical or archaeological significance are present in the area.

Since potentially significant archaeological and historic sites may be present, it is our recommendation that the area should be subjected to a systematic, professional archaeological and historical survey. The purpose of this survey will be to locate and assess the significance of historic properties present. The resultant survey report shall conform to the specifications set forth in Chapter 1A-46, Florida Administrative Code, and will need to be forwarded to this agency.
If historic properties eligible for inclusion in the National Register are located, the data described in the survey and the conclusions of the consultant performing the survey will assist this office in determining measures that must be taken to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse impacts to historic properties listed, or eligible for listing in the National Register, prior to the proposed land conveyance.

Because this letter and its contents are a matter of public record, consultants who have knowledge of our recommendations may contact your office. This should in no way be interpreted as an endorsement by this agency. The Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA) is the national certifying organization for archaeologists. A list of archaeologists who are RPA members living or working in Florida can be accessed at www.dos.state.fl.us/bar/download. In addition, the complete RPA directory of Certified Professional Archaeologists is available at www.rpanet.org. Otherwise, upon request, we will forward our RPA list to your office.

If you have any questions concerning our comments, please contact Ken Misner, Historic Sites Specialist, at (850) 487-2333 or (800) 847-7278 or by electronic mail, kmisner@mail.dos.state.fl.us.

Your interest in protecting Florida's historic resources is appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. Janet Snyder Matthews, Ph.D., Director,
Division of Historical Resources
State Historic Preservation Officer

JSM/km
Dear Ms. Trainor:

Our office reviewed the above referenced environmental assessment in accordance with the provisions of Florida's Coastal Zone Management Act and Chapter 267, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures contained in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended in 1992, and 36 C.F.R., Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties. The State Historic Preservation Officer advises and assists federal agencies as they identify historic properties (listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register of Historic Places or otherwise of historical or archaeological value), assess effects of projects upon those properties, and consider alternative means of development to avoid or reduce adverse effects.

Our review of the Florida Master Site File and our records indicates that there are no archaeological or historic sites currently recorded within the area encompassed by the environmental assessment. However, the lack of recorded historic properties is not considered significant because the area has never been subjected to a systematic, professional survey to locate such properties. Data from environmentally similar areas in Bay County indicate that archaeological and historic sites, especially the former, are likely to occur in the area encompassed by the environmental assessment. It is, therefore, the opinion of this office that there is a reasonable probability that historic properties potentially eligible for listing in the National Register, or otherwise of historical or archaeological significance are present in the area.

Since potentially significant archaeological and historic sites may be present, it is our recommendation that the area should be subjected to a systematic, professional archaeological and historical survey. The purpose of this survey will be to locate and assess the significance of historic properties present. The resultant survey report shall conform to the specifications set forth in Chapter 1A-46, Florida Administrative Code, and will need to be forwarded to this agency.

May 30, 2001

Ms. Cherie Trainor
State Clearinghouse
Department of Community Affairs
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100

Re: DHR Project File No. 2001-04520
Received by DHR May 8, 2001
U. S. Air Force, Tyndall Air Force Base (TAFB), Florida
SAI # FL200105020269C
Final Draft Environmental Assessment, Sale of Cove Gardens Military Family Housing

R.A. Gray Building
500 South Bronough Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0250
http://www.flheritage.com

Director's Office
(850) 488-1480 • FAX: 488-3355
Historic Pensacola Preservation Board
(850) 595-5985 • FAX: 595-5969
Archaeological Research
(850) 487-2299 • FAX: 414-2207
Palm Beach Regional Office
(561) 279-1475 • FAX: 279-1476
Historic Preservation
(850) 487-2333 • FAX: 922-1496
St. Augustine Regional Office
(904) 825-5045 • FAX: 825-5044
Historical Museums
(850) 488-1484 • FAX: 921-2503
Tampa Regional Office
(813) 272-2340 • FAX: 272-2340

06/28/01 THU 08:54 [TX/RX NO 9449]
If historic properties eligible for inclusion in the National Register are located, the data described in the survey and the conclusions of the consultant performing the survey will assist this office in determining measures that must be taken to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse impacts to historic properties listed, or eligible for listing in the National Register, prior to the proposed land conveyance.

Because this letter and its contents are a matter of public record, consultants who have knowledge of our recommendations may contact the project applicant. This should in no way be interpreted as an endorsement by this agency. The Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA) is the national certifying organization for archaeologists. A list of archaeologists who are RPA members living or working in Florida can be accessed at www.dos.state.fl.us/bar/download. In addition, the complete RPA directory of Certified Professional Archaeologists is available at www.rpanet.org. Otherwise, upon request, we will forward our RPA list to the applicant.

If you have any questions concerning our comments, please contact Ken Misner, Historic Sites Specialist, at (850) 487-2333 or (800) 847-7278 or by electronic mail, kmisner@mail.dos.state.fl.us.

Your interest in protecting Florida's historic resources is appreciated.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Janet Snyder Matthews, Ph.D., Director, Division of Historical Resources State Historic Preservation Officer

JSM/km

Xc: Jasmin Raffington, FCMP-DCA
John Dingwall
Appendix C

Public Law 106-65
SEC. 2862. LAND CONVEYANCE, TYNDALL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA.

(a) Conveyance Authorized.--The Secretary of the Air Force may convey to Panama City, Florida (in this section referred to as the "City"), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including improvements thereon,

containing the military family housing project for Tyndall Air Force Base known as Cove Garden.

(b) Consideration.--As consideration for the conveyance under subsection (a), the City shall pay to the United States an amount equal to the fair market value of the real property to be conveyed, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) Use of Proceeds.--In such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriations Acts, the Secretary may use the funds paid by the City under subsection (b) to construct or improve military family housing units at Tyndall Air Force Base and to improve ancillary supporting facilities related to such housing.

(d) Description of Property.--The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of the survey shall be borne by the City.

(e) Additional Terms and Conditions.--The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.