

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
AIRPORTS DISTRICT OFFICE
ORLANDO, FLORIDA**

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

**CONSOLIDATED RENTAL CAR FACILITY/AUTOMATED PEOPLE
MOVER/ASSOCIATED IMPROVEMENTS
SOUTH TERMINAL SUPPORT AREA**

**TAMPA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
TAMPA, FLORIDA**

February 2014

BACKGROUND: The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires federal agencies to incorporate environmental considerations during the planning process of proposed actions. Pursuant to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA, Part 1502.13, the Hillsborough County Aviation Authority (HCAA), as the Airport Sponsor, has prepared a Final Environmental Assessment (Final EA) to analyze the potential environmental effects of proposed landside and surface transportation improvements in the southern portion of the Tampa International Airport (TPA) property identified in the Final EA as the South Terminal Support Area.

The attached Final EA was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Order 1050.1E, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*, and FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions*. The FAA is the lead federal agency for compliance with NEPA for airport projects. FAA's approval of an airport project constitutes the federal action subject to NEPA.

PURPOSE AND NEED: The Airport Sponsor's Draft 2013 Airport Master Plan Update (AMPU) notes the airport will sustain an increase of 17,200 aircraft operations and 1.4 million enplanements (i.e., passengers) from 2011 – 2016. The AMPU concludes the increase in demand will substantially reduce the Airport's ability to serve the ground-based transportation needs of passengers, employees, and tenants. This reduced service will result in rental car facilities, employee/tenant parking, airport roadways, and terminal curbsides reaching their respective maximum capacities by 2016. Without improvements to passenger, employee, and tenant vehicle parking areas and the roads serving them, Airport users, employees, and tenants will experience diminished service levels. The consolidation of rental car facilities, expansion of employee and tenant parking, and improvements to on-Airport roadways will enable HCAA to maintain a high level of service to the 1.4 million additional passengers who will use the Airport. *Further explanation of the Airport Sponsor's purpose and need is provided in the Final Focused EA in Section 5. Purpose and Need.*

PROPOSED PROJECT: The Proposed Project includes:

The construction and operation of the following in the South Terminal Support Area:

- Multi-story Consolidated Rental Car Facility (ConRAC);
- Automated People Mover (APM) including three loading and unloading passenger stations and one maintenance station; and
- Multi-story garage west of the ConRAC for employee/tenant parking which is currently located in several lots throughout the Airport's property.

The following connected actions:

- Development of a quick turnaround facility (QTA) and rental car storage and maintenance area east of the proposed ConRAC;
- Modification of connector Taxiway “J” bridge to accommodate the APM and roadway improvements;
- Partial relocation of the Bessie Coleman Boulevard (existing service road) from the existing U.S. Post Office to Airside A; and
- Roadway improvements in the South Terminal Support Area including transportation modifications along Airport Service Road at Spruce Street and the intersection of O’Brien Street.

The on-airport roadway improvements would improve approximately 10,700 linear feet (about 2.02 miles) of roadways and require the installation of associated new signals and lighting. The improvements would include the following actions:

- Widening the portion of Airport Service Road running north to south in the South Terminal Support Area to provide a four-lane, undivided roadway section with auxiliary lanes for access to different sections of the South Terminal Support Area;
- Constructing a three-lane roadway at APM Station 2 to provide a roadway segment dedicated to curb-side loading and unloading of the APM without delaying traffic on the main roadway segment;
- Realigning a segment of Bessie Coleman Boulevard, from the northeast corner of the South Terminal Support Area to south of Airside A, east of its existing location (approximately 4,000 feet) to facilitate the ability to access the Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting (ARFF) station while accommodating the Interface from surface to elevation APM guideway;
- Converting the South Terminal Support Area north access roadway to a three-lane road with two westbound lanes and one eastbound lane; and
- Converting the South Terminal Support Area south access entry roadway from a two-way segment to a roadway serving only eastbound traffic.

The proposed APM alignment from the Main Terminal to the ConRAC would traverse the approach Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) of Runway 10. In accordance with *FAA Interim Guidance on Land Uses Within a Runway Protection Zone*, the HCAA developed an RPZ alternatives analysis to evaluate a full range of alternatives that could minimize and mitigate this new incompatible land use within the RPZ. The FAA has completed its review of the RPZ alternatives analysis, and has no objection to HCAA’s preferred APM alignment, which includes displacing the threshold of Runway 10 by 498 feet to the east.

Further explanation of the Airport Sponsor’s Proposed Action is provided in the Final EA in Section 4 Proposed Project.

TIMEFRAME: The Proposed Project is scheduled to begin operating in 2017.

FAA FEDERAL ACTION: The requested Federal Action by the FAA is FAA's unconditional approval of the Proposed Project on the Airport Layout Plan (ALP). The FAA is currently reviewing an interim ALP update prepared by the Airport Sponsor that reflects the Proposed Project.

OTHER FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL ACTIONS AND PERMITS: All federal, state, and county permits required will be obtained from the applicable agencies by the Airport Sponsor, prior to construction. These will include:

- Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) from the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD);
- Wetland permit from the Hillsborough County Environmental Protection Commission (HCEPC); and
- National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP).

ALTERNATIVES: In addition to the Proposed Project and No Action Alternative, the Airport Sponsor reviewed six other potential build alternatives. Two alternatives (Alternative 1 and 2) would not meet the Level 1 Purpose and Need screening criteria.

- Alternative 1 (Blue Side Garage) does not meet the Purpose and Need because it does not provide good customer service and adds to traffic congestion.
- Alternative 2 (Blue Side Garage Return/Quick Turn-around Area with Short-Term Garage Ready Lots) does not meet the Purpose and Need because it does not provide good customer service and adds to traffic congestion.

The remaining four alternatives did not meet the Level 2 technical and economic feasibility screening criteria and were not carried forward for further environmental analysis:

- Alternative 3 (North Terminal Area ConRAC Option) is not considered reasonable or prudent due to substantial costs and its adverse effects on long-term airside needs.
- Alternative 4 (Convert South Economy Garage to a ConRAC) would provide rental car and support facilities, however, it would significantly reduce the Airport's existing general parking capacity during peak periods that occur throughout the year.
- Alternative 5 (ConRAC West of Economy Garage) is not reasonable due to its associated costs.
- Alternative 6 (ConRAC South of USPS Facility) is not considered reasonable or prudent due to its adverse effects on long-term landside needs.

The Proposed Project (ConRAC South of the Economy Garages) meets the two-level screening criteria. In the Level 1 screening criteria, the Proposed Project would meet the Purpose and Need. In the Level 2 screening, the Proposed Project is practical and feasible from technical and economic standpoints. The No-Action Alternative was retained to fulfill CEQ regulations implementing NEPA.

Further explanation of the Airport Sponsor's Alternatives Analysis is provided in the Final Focused EA in Section 6.

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT: The Airport, which is approximately 6 miles west of downtown Tampa, operates on 3,330 acres in the Tampa Westshore Business District (WBD). The area surrounding the Airport is developed with primarily commercial, industrial, and residential land uses. The Airport is bordered on the north, south, and west by Hillsborough Avenue, Veterans Memorial Highway/Veterans Expressway, and Spruce Street. The detailed project study area is approximately 220 acres, lies within the Airport's property boundary, and includes the airport's South Terminal Support Area. A majority of the project study area is developed. Some of the current uses in this area are:

- economy parking garages;
- rental car support facilities;
- taxi and bus staging areas;
- a cell phone parking area;
- a Flight Kitchen; and
- United States Postal Service (USPS).

A majority of the undeveloped areas within the project study area have been cleared and maintained as open area. Some portions of the project study area are natural uplands and wetlands, each with varying degrees of disturbance.

Further explanation of the affected environment, including existing air quality, coastal resources, potential 4(f) resources, the potential for federal/state protected species, floodplains, hazardous materials, and wetlands, is provided in the Final EA in Section 7 Affected Environment.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES: The environmental consequences section of the Final EA provides analysis of environmental resources that have the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Action. The following sections summarize the environmental impact categories identified as having the potential for permanent, minimal or temporary impacts as a result of implementation of the Proposed Action. *Further explanation of the environmental impact analysis is provided in the Final Focused EA in Section 8 Environmental Consequences.*

Air Quality: Hillsborough County is an attainment area for all criteria pollutants having a National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS), except for lead and sulfur dioxide. However, according to the Hillsborough County Environmental Protection Commission (HCEPC), the nonattainment designations are finite

areas that do not encompass the Airport property. According to the FAA's 2013 Terminal Area Forecast (TAF), the Airport had a total of 8,170,318 enplanements and 189,497 general aviation operations in 2012. Although the Airport's current operational and enplanement activity levels are above the FAA's thresholds for requiring an air quality analysis, implementation of the Proposed Project would not change the Airport's capacity and/or operational characteristics. The Proposed Project would improve vehicular movement in the South Terminal Support Area and decrease Airport-related vehicular emissions. A construction emission inventory was conducted to determine if the Proposed Project would have a significant effect on criteria pollutant concentrations as outlined in the NAAQS. Emissions resulting from the Proposed Project are not considered to be significant. No further analysis or air quality evaluation is required under either the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) or the Clean Air Act (CAA).

Coastal Resources – Florida Coastal Management Program (FCMP): The State of Florida “has no objections to the allocation of federal funds for the proposed project and, therefore, the funding award is consistent with the Florida Coastal Management Program (FCMP). The state's continued concurrence will be based on the activities' compliance with FCMP authorities, including federal and state monitoring of the activities to ensure their continued conformance, and the adequate resolution of any issues identified during the current regulatory review. The state's final concurrence of the project's consistency with the FCMP will be determined upon completion of the environmental permitting process, in accordance with Section 373.428, *Florida Statutes*.”

Compatible Land Use: The Proposed Project occurs entirely on airport property and would not create significant noise impacts when compared to the No Action alternative, and would therefore not affect the compatibility of existing or future land uses associated with changes in airport noise. The Proposed Project would not change the number or type of aircraft utilizing the airport, the air traffic patterns, or approaches to the airport. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not disrupt surrounding communities, require the relocation of surrounding residences or off-airport businesses, or significantly impact natural resource areas. Implementation and operation of the Proposed Project would not create a potential wildlife hazard.

Construction Impacts: Compared to the No Action alternative, the Proposed Project would result in short-term increases in ambient noise levels and air quality emissions due to noise and dust from construction equipment during construction. These short-term increases would be minor and would not cause significant noise impacts or air quality impacts to surrounding areas. Potential water quality impacts will be mitigated for through the use of erosion and sediment control best management practices. A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction permit would be obtained prior to any construction. Potential traffic disruption would be temporary, relatively minor, and would not permanently degrade Levels of Service (LOS) of Spruce Street or other roadways in the vicinity of the Proposed Project. Best management

construction traffic measures would be used to minimize any construction-related traffic effects.

Department of Transportation Act: Section 4(f) and Land and Water Conservation Fund Section 6(f) Resources: The Proposed Project is located entirely within the Airport's property. The Proposed Project would not increase the number of operations or change the operational characteristics at the Airport, and therefore, the sizes and shapes of the Airport's noise contours would not change. In addition, the Proposed Project's roadway improvements would not physically use any of the Section 4(f) resources near the Airport. The Proposed Project would not cause any physical disturbance or constructive use of any 4(f) or 6(f) resource in the vicinity of the Airport.

Farmland: Prime, Unique or State-Significant: The Proposed Project will not impact prime, unique, or state- significant farmland. The Proposed Project will be constructed on the existing airport.

Fish, Wildlife, and Plants: The Proposed Project would result in the conversion of approximately 21.14 acres of developed land (including some disturbed uplands that are mowed and maintained by airport staff), 0.65-acre of other surface waters, and 2.45 acres of disturbed wetlands. Implementation of the Proposed Project is not anticipated to affect any Federally-listed species due to lack of suitable habitat, implementation of standard protection measures during construction, and previously obtained wetland mitigation. Although no evidence of the Eastern indigo snake was found during field investigations, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) *Standard Protection Measures for the Eastern Indigo Snake* will be implemented during the construction phase to avoid any unintended impacts should the species be found on-site. The Proposed Project is located within a Wood Stork Core Foraging Area (CFA) for three rookeries (615333, Sheldon Road, and East Lake/Bellows Lake).ⁱ The Proposed Project may result in the loss of forage biomass within the CFA. The potential loss of 2.45 acres of wetlands/forage biomass within the service area would be offset through the previously obtained and ongoing updates to wetland mitigation compensation and modification of the ERP.

Floodplains: There is no practicable alternative to the location of the Proposed Project in the base floodplain. The Proposed Project is located in and would encroach upon base/100-year floodplains as designated by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (see Exhibit A-4 in the Final EA). According to Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) panel number 12057C0333H, the project unavoidably lies partially in Zone AE (base flood or 100-year flood zone) with a base flood elevation of 9 feet (see Attachment F for the FEMA FIRM). The Proposed Project would unavoidably impact approximately 20 acres of the 100-year floodplain. Floodplain compensation would be provided during the design and permitting phases for impacts to the 100-year floodplain. Additionally, stormwater control permits would be obtained from Hillsborough County and the SWFWMD to compensate for the addition of impervious surfaces. Thus, the

Proposed Project will not result in adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values.

Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention, and Solid Waste: Site rehabilitation using Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) risk-based corrective action provisions is ongoing. The following facilities would be vacated and cleared: Enterprise [(fka) Alamo] (299803235), Hertz (299801747), Avis (298624865), DTG (298625617) and Budget (298733634), and LSG Sky Chefs (2920573). The regulated petroleum storage system(s) would undergo tank removal and, if required, tank closure assessments under close coordination with the local delegated authority. Any facilities that have regulated petroleum storage system(s) would undergo tank removal and tank closure assessments under close coordination with HCEPC, the local delegated authority to ensure best practice, tank removal measures are used. Also, as part of the due diligence process, prior to demolishing any structures, property asbestos surveys and later asbestos abatement would be conducted in accordance with NESHAP, FDEP, and HCEPC requirements. Implementation of the Proposed Project would include the removal of existing rental car fuel position structures. Demolition activities would comply with applicable local, state, and Federal rules and regulations, including the National Emission Standards of Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP). HCAA would involve the HCEPC and other local permitting agencies in the planning process after the design-builder has been selected. After construction of the Proposed Project is complete, the fuel positions would be located in the ConRAC. Design of the ConRAC and associated maintenance and storage facility could include features to address potential levels of volatile organic compound emissions. As discussed in Section 8(1)(c) of the Focused EA, those design features have not yet been determined. However, state-of-the-art ConRAC facilities such as the one planned here typically include emission equipment to ensure levels of volatile organic compounds and CO will not be harmful to rental car workers or patrons.

Historical, Architectural, Archeological, and Cultural Resources: The Florida Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) has determined the Proposed Project would not affect historic resources (Attachment D-2 in the Final EA). The Proposed Project would not change aircraft operations at the Airport. Therefore, there would not be any aircraft-related direct or indirect impacts on any NRHP resources.

Light Emissions and Visual Impacts: Implementation of the Proposed Project will not impact nearby residential areas or other light-sensitive resources. The Proposed Project would be consistent with the existing Airport setting and would not result in visual impacts to adjacent commercial areas.

Natural Resources, Energy Supply, and Sustainable Design: Constructing the Proposed Project would not create any major changes that would have adverse effects on local supplies of fuel, energy, or natural resources. During construction, trucks and other construction equipment would consume fuels as

needed for construction purposes. The consumption would not strain local or regional diesel fuel supplies. Building the Proposed Project would not cause a shortage of available building materials. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse energy or natural resource impacts. HCAA is currently working on a Sustainability Management Plan and plans to incorporate sustainable design into the ConRAC.

Noise Impacts: The Proposed Project would be located entirely within the Airport's property and would not increase the number of enplanements, operations, or significantly change operational characteristics at the Airport, compared to the No-Action alternative. There would be no significant difference between the Proposed Project and No-Action alternative noise condition. No noise analysis was required for the Proposed Project. The Proposed Action will not create any significant noise impacts, either aircraft or construction related.

Secondary (Induced) Impacts: The Proposed Project construction activities would occur within airport property boundaries. No induced, secondary or socioeconomic impacts to surrounding communities are anticipated to occur due to the implementation of the Proposed Project.

Socioeconomic Impacts, Environmental Justice, and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks: The Proposed Project would not result in any residential units being relocated. Current on-Airport rental car businesses would be temporarily relocated during construction of the Proposed Project. The HCAA currently plans to relocate the affected businesses to temporary facilities in the northern portion of the South Terminal Support Area, behind the Economy Parking garages. This area has already been disturbed and paved and would not affect any environmental resources. These businesses would be moved into the new ConRAC after construction is complete. The Proposed Project will improve access to the Airport and the efficiency of the on-Airport roadway system. Improvements to the on-Airport roadway system associated with the Proposed Project would help maintain and/or improve the long-term Level of Service (LOS) of those roadways. The Proposed Project would not directly or indirectly affect low-income or minority populations. The construction and operation of the Proposed Project would occur in a secured and controlled environment, and would not have a substantial effect on products or substances that a child would likely touch, digest, or be exposed to. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project is not anticipated to result in risks to the health and safety of children.

Water Quality: Implementation of the Proposed Project would unavoidably directly impact approximately 0.65 acre of surface water (Exhibit A-6 in the Final EA), approximately 2.45 acres of wetlands and 20 acres of floodplains. These (and other wetland impacts throughout the Airport property, not related to the Proposed Project) have been permitted through a Dredge and Fill permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and conceptually permitted through the

Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD). The FDEP has indicated that the project would require an ERP modification from the SWFWMD and that any new sewer lines and water mains would require state water facilities permits. The SWFWMD indicated that an amendment to the existing ERP (ERP No. 49008387.043) and construction permits would be needed (see Attachment G in the Final EA). The Water, Waste and Air Divisions of the HCEPC responded June 7th, 2013 with comments regarding the project (see Attachment D-2 in the Final EA). The Water Division of the HCEPC indicated that an FDEP NPDES stormwater permit will be required and that stormwater control permits from the County and water management district will be required to compensate for new imperious areas.

Wetlands: The Proposed Project would unavoidably impact state jurisdictional wetlands. Implementation of the Proposed Project would directly impact approximately 2.45 acres of low-quality wetland habitat and approximately 0.65 acre of surface water. Modifications of the Conceptual ERP No. 49008387.043 and Individual Construction Environmental Resource Permits (ERPs) are required to construct the Proposed Project. Mitigation for the Proposed Project is located in the Brooker Creek Buffer Preserve, which is designated as FM 4143481. Identification number FM 4143481 is used to designate all Airport projects. Purchased mitigation credits equal 8.98 acres under Conceptual ERP 49008396.043 and federal permit 2002-01521 (IP-CJW). The SW-90 Brooker Creek Buffer Preserve Mitigation Plan is a Surface Water Improvement and Management (SWIM) project within the Tampa Bay Drainage Watershed. The Brooker Creek Buffer Preserve is a SWIM / County co-sponsored project since Brooker Creek flows into Lake Tarpon and Tampa Bay; both designated SWIM water bodies. The mitigation activities at the Preserve, which is located 10 miles from the Proposed Project, would provide compensation for the Proposed Project's impacts to the low-quality wetlands. Use of this mitigation bank would meet FAA's Wetland Banking Strategy and would not cause hazards to aviation (e.g., create a wildlife hazard).

Wild and Scenic Rivers: The Proposed Project is not located within ¼ mile from a WSRS or NRI river.

Cumulative Impacts: In November 2013, the HCAA submitted three projects to the FAA for approval: the reconstruction of the Taxiway J Bridge over the George Bean Parkway, the displacement of the Runway 10 threshold 498 feet to the east, and in-pavement runway guard lights (RGL) on Taxiway J at Runway 1R-19L. The proposed bridge reconstruction is needed to maintain the taxiway pavement which allows access between the two main parallel runways along the south side of the airport. In addition, the taxiway bridge is designed to accommodate future widening (additional lanes) of the George Bean Parkway, the adjacent service road, and the right-of-way for the planned Automated People Mover (APM). Further to the south of the taxiway bridge, the proposed APM alignment traverses the approach RPZ for Runway 10. To minimize and

mitigate this new incompatible land use in the RPZ, the landing threshold for Runway 10 (west end of Runway 10-28) is displaced 498 feet to the east. The APM alignment avoids impacts to the existing George Bean Parkway and with the Runway 10 threshold displacement maintains the operational length of the runway for existing aircraft. The Runway 10 threshold displacement achieves airspace clearance over the APM, and the location of the APM within the RPZ complies as closely as possible with the FAA's RPZ requirements. Based on supporting information provided by the Airport Sponsor, the FAA categorically excluded (CATEX) these three projects (Taxiway J Bridge, Runway 10 threshold displacement, and RGL lighting) from the requirements of NEPA. However, it was noted in the supporting CATEX documentation that the APM, ConRAC, and associated roadway projects would require an environmental assessment and FAA approval. A copy of the approved CATEX is available from the FAA by request.

The Proposed Project's mitigation, design elements, and permit requirements would reduce temporary construction-related air quality and water-quality impacts. Unavoidable wetland and water quality related impacts would be mitigated in accordance with Federal, state, and local permit requirements. With regards to recent past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects affecting the same environmental resources, the Proposed Project when combined with the effects of other projects, would not cause significant cumulative environmental impacts. Based on the environmental analysis in the Final EA, review by Federal, State, and local agencies, and permit and mitigation requirements, it is reasonable to conclude that the Proposed Project will not result in any significant cumulative effects.

FEDERAL FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT: I have carefully and thoroughly considered the facts contained in the attached Environmental Assessment (EA). Based on my independent review, I find the EA is consistent with FAA's regulations and is consistent with the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (40 CFR Part 1500) as well as FAA's Orders 1050.1E and 5050.4B for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA. Consequently, I find the proposed Federal action will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment or include any condition requiring any consultation pursuant to section 102(2) (C) of NEPA. As a result, the FAA issues this Finding of No significant Impact, determining that an Environmental Impact Statement for this action is not necessary.

APPROVED: *Bob Venable*

DATE: 2/13/2014

DISAPPROVED: _____

DATE: _____