

1 **DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)**

2 **AND**

3 **FINDING OF NO PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE (FONPA)**

4
5 **NON-NATIVE AND NOXIOUS PLANT SPECIES MANAGEMENT**

6 **Beale Air Force Base and Lincoln Receiver Site, California**

7
8 Pursuant to provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Title 42 United States
9 Code (USC) §§4321 to 4347, implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ)
10 Regulations, Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Parts 1500-1508, and 32 CFR Part
11 989, *Environmental Impact Analysis Process*, the U.S. Air Force (Air Force) assessed the
12 potential environmental consequences associated with non-native and noxious plant species
13 management using manual and mechanical control, chemical treatments, prescribed burning, and
14 livestock grazing, at Beale Air Force Base (AFB), Yuba County, California, and at the Lincoln
15 Receiver Site, Placer County, California. Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations (Title 14,
16 §15220 and following) the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board intends to rely on
17 the EA and FONSI/FONPA in the place of a mitigated negative declaration and believes that the
18 federal documents meet regulatory requirements. This EA is incorporated by reference into this
19 finding per 40 CFR 1508.13 and 40 CFR 1502.21.

20 The purpose of the Proposed Action is to manage plant species on Beale AFB and the Lincoln
21 Receiver Site in order to reduce the prevalence of non-native and noxious vegetation to protect
22 and preserve the military mission, ecosystem function, and valued resources and programs. The
23 need for the Proposed Action is to address the threats of numerous non-native and noxious plant
24 species on Beale AFB and the Lincoln Receiver Site. There is a need to eliminate or control known
25 priority infestations, and to prevent the establishment of new infestations of invasive plants. If
26 allowed to spread unchecked, non-native and noxious plant species would degrade the remaining
27 native habitat; interfere with management of sensitive resources, economic activities, and quality
28 of life; and may impede the military mission.

29 The Environmental Assessment, incorporated by reference into this finding, analyzes the potential
30 environmental consequences of non-native and noxious plant species management actions on
31 Beale AFB and the Lincoln Receiver Site and provides environmental protection measures to
32 avoid or reduce adverse environmental impacts from those actions.

33 The EA considers all potential impacts of Alternative 1 (No Action Alternative) and Alternative 2
34 (Comprehensive Control). The EA also considers cumulative environmental impacts with other
35 projects within the Region of Influence.

ALTERNATIVE 1 (No Action Alternative)

Under the No Action Alternative, the action alternatives would not occur and current management activities would continue. Current control includes limited, small-scale manual/mechanical plant removal and chemical applications. Grazing would continue on existing pastures, but there would not be the option to expand operations into new areas, change stocking rates, or vary residual dry matter targets in accordance with annual weather variability or specific non-native and noxious plant species control objectives. Sporadic prescribed burning activities would continue to occur on a limited scale. Under the No Action Alternative management activities would lack a programmatic, cohesive approach and long-term strategy; would not utilize the most effective treatment methods; would not consider the most current science, data and analyses, and management recommendations; and would not fully address current Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan and associated program management goals.

ALTERNATIVE 2 (Comprehensive Control)

Under Alternative 2, non-native and noxious plant species would be managed to reduce their prevalence using an efficient, sustainable, and long-term strategy that incorporated a programmatic, adaptive approach, and maximized opportunities for stewardship of sensitive resources. Alternative 2 would utilize a varied toolkit of control methods including manual/mechanical removal, chemical applications, livestock grazing, and prescribed burning. The Beale AFB Invasive Plant Species Management Guidelines, Grazing Management Guidelines, and Wildland Fire Management Plan would provide the basis for this alternative. Alternative 2 would allow for more effective non-native and noxious plant control than the other alternatives because it would include a variety of control methods, allow for control anywhere on the base with the implementation of environmental protection measures, allow for livestock grazing in more areas and with greater management flexibility, and more acres would be burned annually.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The analyses of the affected environment and environmental consequences of implementing Alternative 2 presented in the EA concluded that by implementing standing environmental protection measures and operational planning, the Air Force would be in compliance with all terms and conditions and reporting requirements for implementation of the reasonable and prudent measures stipulated by applicable Agencies. Agencies include the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Additional conditions are stipulated in the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) concurrence, the Aquatic Pesticide Application Plan for the Statewide General National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit for Residual Aquatic Pesticide Discharges to Waters of the United States (WoUS) from Algae and Aquatic Weed Control Applications, Water Quality Order 2013-0002-DWQ, and requirements of Feather River and Placer County Air Quality Districts' burn permits and Smoke Management Plans.

The General Conformity Rule applies to actions in air quality nonattainment or maintenance areas and considers both direct and indirect emissions. The rule applies only to federal actions that are considered "regionally significant" or where the total emissions from the action meet or exceed the de minimis thresholds presented in 40 CFR §93.153. Beale AFB is within a maintenance area for PM_{2.5}. The additional emissions from Alternative 2 would not result in an exceedance of General Conformity thresholds.

1 The Air Force has concluded that no significant adverse effects would result to the following
2 resources as a result of Alternative 2: Air Installation Compatible Use Zones (AICUZs), noise,
3 socioeconomic resources and growth-inducing impacts, environmental justice, aesthetics,
4 agricultural and forest resources, recreation, wildfire, land use, air quality, water resources, safety
5 and occupational health and public services, hazardous materials/waste, biological/natural
6 resources, cultural and tribal cultural resources, earth resources, utilities and infrastructure,
7 transportation and traffic, energy resources, and climate change. No significant adverse
8 cumulative impacts would result from activities associated with Alternative 2 when considered
9 with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects.

10 **Air Installation Compatible Use Zones (AICUZs)** – There would be no effects to the base
11 AICUZs. All land uses would be compatible with the Beale AFB use zones. Prescribed burns
12 would be scheduled so as to avoid impacts to visibility and flight capabilities near the air field.

13 **Noise** – Only minimal, short-term changes to ambient noise levels would occur as a result of
14 implementing the Proposed Action. All activities would be conducted during business hours in
15 areas where there is existing noise from aircraft, vehicle traffic, and occasional heavy equipment
16 use.

17 **Socioeconomic Resources and Growth-Induced Impacts** – Grazing expansion under the
18 Proposed Action would increase the number of acres available to be leased for grazing. This
19 would have a direct, permanent beneficial effect for both the USAF, in the form of increased
20 revenue, and the lessees, in the form of available land. Other activities would have no impact on
21 socioeconomic resources. The Proposed Action would not contribute to changes in
22 socioeconomic resources, such as impacts on housing availability, employment, community
23 resources or local population. Leases are awarded in a competitive bid process that would be
24 open to any interested parties. Grazing leases do not affect properties outside of the base. Finally,
25 the Proposed Action would not lead to unplanned population growth and would not displace any
26 people or housing; invasive species control is not related to human population growth. Therefore,
27 there would be no adverse impact to socioeconomic resources as a result of the Proposed Action.
28 The No Action alternative would result in no changes to current socioeconomic conditions.

29 **Environmental Justice** - Schools, childcare centers, and youth centers on Beale AFB are all
30 located in the cantonment or housing areas, which are the center for residential and commercial
31 facilities on the base. Only very temporary, intermittent impacts would occur as a result of the
32 Proposed Action. None of these facilities is located in an area that would experience
33 disproportionately high and adverse impacts. Treatments would not be conducted on the
34 aforementioned sites. If treatments were conducted near these facilities, it would be during
35 weather conditions that minimize smoke or herbicide drift. There are no senior facilities located
36 on the base. Treatments would occur solely on the base and would not affect off-base populations.
37 Due to the type of fuels on Beale AFB (annual grasses) smoke output would be relatively low and
38 would disperse quickly. Prescribed burns are only permitted on days that the local air quality board
39 determines there would not be an adverse impact on human health. Herbicide would be applied
40 during appropriate weather conditions to avoid off-base drift. The Proposed Action would not
41 include any activities that would discriminate in any way on the basis of race, color, national origin,
42 age, or income.

43 **Aesthetics** – The Proposed Action would not have an adverse effect on scenic vistas, would not
44 damage scenic resources, and would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of public
45 views. The Proposed Action would not create a new source of substantial light or glare. While
46 vegetation removal would occur under the Proposed Action, those species removed would be
47 invasive species that currently impede the visual character of the landscape. The project would
48 not change rural and undeveloped landscapes to an urban appearance. Many projects would not

1 be within public view. While the project includes prescribed burns, which do change the visual
2 character of a vista from brown grasses to black soil, the change would not be considered adverse
3 given that prescribed burns help prevent more catastrophic wildfires, visual impacts are temporary
4 as grasses and wildflowers germinate and provide green cover in the early fall, and because of
5 the resulting improvement of the visual character and quality of the view after fire primarily due to
6 increased quantity of wildflowers.

7 **Agricultural and Forest Resources** – As the Proposed Action aims to improve native
8 landscapes, grazing lands and forested landscapes would be maintained. Effects are expected
9 to be beneficial. The Proposed Action would not convert farmland to another use, would not
10 conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and would not conflict with existing zoning for or
11 cause rezoning for forest lands or timberlands. Prescribed burns are conducted in a way that
12 protect oaks if woodlands are targeted for burning, which they typically are not. Oak trimming (i.e.
13 removing low branches) may be undertaken as a fuels reduction practice, to help reduce the
14 possibility that oak trees would burn during a wildfire. Oaks are a valuable part of the natural flora,
15 and their protection, not removal, would occur under the Proposed Action.

16 **Wildfire** - Beale AFB is surrounded on three sides by moderate fire hazard severity zones as well
17 as several small sections of very high fire hazard severity zones. While invasive species activities
18 may increase vehicle or ATV traffic on little used, dirt and gravel roads as well as some off-road
19 travel, thereby increasing the risk of fire, all staff follow fire precautions. The Proposed Action
20 would not impair emergency response or evacuation plans, does not exacerbate wildfire risk,
21 does not include installation of equipment such as utility lines that exacerbate wildfire risks, and
22 would not be expected to expose people or structures to downstream flooding or landslides as a
23 result of runoff or post-fire slope instability. Overall, the Proposed Action would have a beneficial
24 impact on wildfire severity as it would expand prescribed burning, grazing and mowing practices
25 which reduces fuel loads and fire risk.

26 **Land Use** – There would be no irreversible effects to land use, or changes to land use designation
27 as a result of the Proposed Action. Any land improvements or infrastructure installed for livestock
28 grazing expansion could be removed if mission requirements change. Any other effects to land
29 use would be minor and temporary.

30 **Air Quality** – Negligible to moderate adverse effects to air quality may result from prescribed
31 burns. The effects would be temporary, localized, and mitigated by the implementation of a Smoke
32 Management Plan, and therefore would not be significant. Emissions resulting from construction
33 equipment, vehicles, mowers, and hand-held equipment would not affect regional air quality
34 attainment status. Grazing lessees and construction projects would be required to comply with
35 standard mitigation measures and fugitive dust control mitigation measures to minimize air quality
36 impacts. None of the active herbicide ingredients proposed for use are subject to the California
37 Department of Pesticide Regulation's nonfumigant volatile organic compounds regulations.
38 Herbicides with the potential to emit volatile organic compounds or to create drift would not be
39 applied under conditions when volatilization or drift are likely to occur.

40 **Water Resources** – Under the Proposed Action no significant effects to water resources would
41 occur. Livestock would either be excluded from aquatic resources, or would be closely managed
42 in areas where they could access aquatic resources. Vegetated buffers would be used to protect
43 aquatic resources from erosion resulting from prescribed burns. Herbicide-specific application
44 buffers would be implemented around aquatic resources to prevent contamination. Any herbicide
45 application in or adjacent to aquatic resources would be done using aquatic-approved herbicides
46 and would follow the Aquatic Pesticide Application Plan best management practices and
47 monitoring requirements. Erosion control measures would be implemented for large areas of
48 exposed ground to reduce the potential for erosion and water contamination. Work conducted in

wetlands and 100-year floodplains would be anticipated to have overall beneficial impacts by improving water flow and wetland hydrology. Ground disturbance within wetlands and floodplains would be minimized to the greatest extent possible, including limiting firebreak creation to non-soil disturbing methods. A Notice of Intent to prepare an EA for Proposed Actions that would occur in floodplains and may affect wetlands was published in the Marysville Appeal-Democrat newspaper, soliciting public comments on 2 and 6 October 2019. The notice invited the public to provide comments on the proposal and any practicable alternatives that may reduce impacts by 31 October 2019. No comments were received.

Safety and Occupational Health and Public Services – Effects on occupational health and safety would not be expected, but adverse effects could occur if appropriate safety procedures were not followed. Individual prescribed fire plans would be prepared for prescribed burns, which would contain applicable safety measures to be followed and required personal protective equipment. Exposure to toxic levels of herbicides would be avoided by following applicable state and federal laws, label instructions, DoD requirements, and best management practices included in the EA. Herbicide would only be applied by California or DoD qualified or certified applicators. Appropriate personal protective equipment would be worn when using manual or mechanical equipment, and Air Force safety protocols would be followed. Finally, invasive species control activities would not result in adverse physical impacts to government facilities, would not require new or altered government facilities in order to maintain service ratios, and would not alter response times of any public service offered on Beale AFB.

Hazardous Materials/Waste – Minor effects from hazardous materials and hazardous waste generation could occur as a result of the Proposed Action. There are Environmental Restoration Program Sites throughout Beale AFB. Environmental Baseline Surveys would be conducted for these areas prior to pasture construction to identify any risks to humans or livestock. Personnel would be trained to identify and avoid unexploded ordinances during prescribed burns and other soil disturbing activities. Hazardous waste would be generated in the form of herbicide containers; these would be disposed of at appropriate facilities on or off Beale AFB.

Biological/Natural Resources – The effects of the Proposed Action on biological resources would be largely beneficial. Non-native and noxious plant species often out compete native plant species leading to lower plant biodiversity and degraded fish and wildlife habitat. Negative effects to biological resources are possible but would be minimized with the implementation of Avoidance and Minimization Measures and Best Management Practices in this EA. Herbicides would be used in accordance with label instructions and applicable federal, state, and DoD regulations in addition to requirements in this EA. These are designed to prevent toxic effects to nontarget vegetation, fish, and wildlife. Species-specific and aquatic resource herbicide buffers would minimize the risk of exposure to special status species. Protective buffers and firebreaks that do not require soil disturbance would be used to avoid effects to special status plants and animals, and their habitat during prescribed burns. Livestock grazing would be carefully managed and monitored to avoid negative effects from overgrazing. Beale AFB has consulted with the USFWS to identify measures that would be implemented to protect special status species.

Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources – No impacts to cultural or tribal cultural resources would occur. Adverse effects from livestock would be avoided by coordinating the location of livestock-holding areas, water sources, and mineral supplements with the base Cultural Resources Manager and placing them outside of cultural resource site boundaries. The location of any soil-disturbing invasive plant treatments would be approved by the Cultural Resources Manager and earth disturbing equipment would not be used within cultural resource site boundaries. If needed, excessive plant biomass would be removed by hand prior to prescribed burns in order to prevent extreme heat affects to cultural resources. Restoration treatments in

1 areas with sensitive cultural resources would be limited to re-seeding and other activities that
2 would not require soil disturbance.

3 **Earth Resources** – The Proposed Action does not have the potential to alter or otherwise affect
4 geology or topography or minerals. The effects of the Proposed Actions on soils would be largely
5 beneficial. Invasive plants can increase the risk of soil erosion and alter soil chemical composition,
6 so controlling these plants would indirectly benefit soils. Restoration treatments would benefit
7 soils by restoring native vegetation, increasing vegetative cover and soil moisture retention, and
8 reducing soil erosion. Cattle and other livestock could directly and indirectly, adversely,
9 temporarily or permanently impact soils. However, with routine rangeland monitoring and carefully
10 managed grazing effects to soil would be negligible to minor. Prescribed burns would be
11 conducted in ways that limit fire intensity and would not result in a severe fire that could negatively
12 impact the physical and chemical properties of the soils. Adverse effects to soils and soil biomes
13 from herbicide would be avoided by adherence to the herbicide application Best Management
14 Practices.

15 **Utilities and Infrastructure** – The Proposed Action would have an overall benefit to utilities and
16 infrastructure. Expansion of the grazing program would benefit utilities and infrastructure by
17 maintaining roads and waterlines, adding fencing, and reducing fire risk. Chemical treatments
18 would have no effect on utilities and infrastructure. Overall, prescribed burns would have
19 beneficial effects on infrastructure by reducing fuel loads, but could negatively affect utilities and
20 infrastructure if they got out of control. Negative effects would be avoided through the
21 implementation of a Prescribed Fire Plan for each burn. Manual, mechanical and restoration
22 treatments may involve excavation and could harm utilities and infrastructure if lines or pipes were
23 broken. This would be avoided by obtaining the proper clearance prior to earth disturbing work.

24 **Traffic and Transportation** – The Proposed Action would have minor impacts to transportation
25 during grazing infrastructure construction, prescribed burns, chemical treatments, and
26 mechanical treatments. During these activities, an increase in traffic would be expected by
27 contractors through the Wheatland Gate for large equipment and would include light construction
28 vehicles and personal vehicles through the Wheatland or Vassar Lake gates. Construction
29 vehicles on these roadways could disrupt traffic speeds and increase gate delays. Impacts would
30 be short term in nature and localized. Smoke from prescribed burns could have temporary
31 adverse effects on transportation and traffic by obscuring visibility for drivers. Prescribed fire signs
32 would be posted along roadways and Security Forces would conduct traffic control as needed.

33 **Energy Resources** – The use of energy resources associated with the increased effort to control
34 invasive species would be minor and would not be wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary. All energy
35 use would be for temporary weed control projects and would not use energy continuously over
36 time. Besides the energy resources consumed during transportation to and from field sites,
37 mechanical equipment would use oil and gasoline. Little electricity would be used during the
38 course of invasive species management activities and those activities that would require it, such
39 as watering equipment for grazing and habitat enhancement projects, would typically source it
40 from renewable solar power. Overall, the project would have negligible impacts to local and
41 regional energy supplies.

42 **Climate Change** – Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for the Proposed Action's maximum
43 expected annual activity, which would include 4,500 acres of prescribed burns, by far the largest
44 contributor of GHGs. Emissions could range between 1,316 to 4,200 metric tons of carbon dioxide
45 equivalent per year. These emissions would not exceed threshold limits for stationary,
46 operational-related activities or construction-related activities and would be in line with the Feather
47 River Air Quality Management District's guidelines, which has not set thresholds for GHG
48 emissions. While the Proposed Action would result in GHG emissions during implementation, it

1 would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of
2 reducing the emissions of GHGs. In fact, it's been widely recognized that the use of prescribed
3 fire needs to increase in California to help address and prevent the catastrophic wildfire events
4 that have occurred over the past several years in California; fires that impact 25% of the state's
5 population who live in high-risk fire areas. CAL FIRE identifies five forestry strategies for reducing
6 GHGs which includes fuels reduction practices. In 2020, wildfires burned over 1,000 acres at
7 Beale AFB, which could have been reduced with strategic prescribed burns. Given the variability
8 of fuel load conditions and the unlikely scenario that Beale AFB burns 4,500/ acres per year,
9 reaching projected levels of GHG emissions is unlikely. The largest annual total acreage of
10 prescribed burns at Beale AFB since 2013 was only 800 acres, for instance. The climate change
11 impact from the Proposed Action would, therefore, be minor and temporary, and not would not be
12 significant.

FINDING OF NO PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE (FONPA)

Executive Order (EO) 11990, *Protection of Wetlands*, (24 May 1977) directs agencies to avoid to the extent possible the long- and short-term adverse impacts associated with the destruction or modification of wetlands and to avoid direct or indirect support of new construction in wetlands wherever there is a practicable alternative. Federal agencies are to avoid new construction in wetlands, unless the agency finds there is no practicable alternative to work within wetlands and the proposed projects incorporate all possible measures to limit harm associated with work done in wetlands. Agencies should use economic and environmental data, agency mission statements, and any other pertinent information when deciding whether or not to build in wetlands. EO 11990 directs each agency to provide for early public review of plans for construction in wetlands. In accordance with EO 11990 and 32 CFR Part 989, a Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA) must accompany the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) stating why there are no practicable alternatives to development within or affecting wetland areas.

Similarly, EO 11988, *Floodplain Management* (May 24, 1977), requires Federal agencies to avoid to the extent possible the long and short-term adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of floodplains and to avoid direct and indirect support of floodplain development wherever there is a practicable alternative. If it is found that there is no practicable alternative, the agency must minimize potential harm to the floodplain and circulate a notice explaining why the action is to be located in the floodplain prior to taking action. Finally, new construction in a floodplain must apply accepted flood proofing and flood protection to include elevating structures above the base flood level rather than filling in land. In accordance with EO 11988, a FONPA must accompany the FONSI stating why there are no practicable alternatives to development within or affecting floodplains.

Wetlands: There is no practical alternative to conducting the Proposed Action in wetlands, because many of the targeted plants grow in wetlands. The Proposed Action would include all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands. Wetland impacts would be reduced to the maximum extent possible through project design and implementation of environmental protection measures. Pursuant to §404(b)(1) of the CWA, wetland impacts must be avoided to the greatest extent practicable. A Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers concurred that there are approximately 3,089 acres of wetlands, including vernal pools, and/or other water bodies present within Beale AFB and 40 acres of the Lincoln Receiver Site that are potential WoUS regulated under §404 of the CWA, as depicted in the 23 February 2010 Beale AFB Wetland Delineation drawings. These drawings would be used to identify wetlands within an area before implementing control activities. Any necessary agency coordination and required permits would be acquired prior to commencing any activities. Measures to minimize wetland impacts may include site plan reconfiguration, installation of buffer areas along the perimeter of wetlands, or erosion controls to prevent sedimentation in adjacent wetlands. Activities associated with these projects would be conducted in accordance with the California General National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit and its associated procedures as detailed in the Aquatic Pesticide Application Plan.

As noted in the attached EA, there are no practicable alternatives to the Proposed Actions that would avoid all impacts or further minimize impacts to wetlands because the objectives sought by these projects preclude the selection of any practicable alternatives due to mission requirements, installation layout constraints, and the nature of proposed projects. Taking all the environmental, economic, and other pertinent factors into account, pursuant to EO 11990, the authority delegated by Secretary of the Air Force Order 791.1, and taking into consideration the submitted information, I find that there is no practicable alternative to this action and the Proposed Action includes all practical measures to minimize harm to the environment.

Floodplains: There is no practical alternative to conducting the Proposed Action in floodplains, because many of the targeted plants grow in floodplains. All invasive plant control is anticipated to have direct and indirect beneficial impacts to floodplains. The invasive plant treatments would reduce the hazard and risk of flood loss by improving water flow and floodplain functionality by controlling invasive vegetation growing in waterways and floodplains. Successful invasive plant control and revegetation of floodplains with native plant species would help to reduce the impact of floods on human safety, health, and welfare. If this work is not conducted in floodplains, invasive plants currently degrading floodplains and water ways would not be controlled, which would lead to increased risk of flood damage and reduced floodplain functionality and biodiversity. Impacts to floodplains related to the Proposed Actions would, in general, be minimized through implementation of an approved avoidance and minimization measures, best management practices, and other appropriate environmental protection measures; and through adherence to the Statewide General National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit for Residual Aquatic Pesticide Discharges to Waters of the United States from Algae and Aquatic Weed Control Applications, Water Quality Order 2013-0002-DWQ and Beale Air Force Base specific Aquatic Pesticide Application Plan. The Proposed Action would not lead to loss of, or long-term impacts to floodplains and would be largely beneficial.

As noted in the attached EA, there are no practicable alternatives to the Proposed Actions that would avoid all impacts or further minimize impacts to floodplains because the objectives sought by these projects preclude the selection of any practicable alternatives due to mission requirements and the nature of proposed project. Project alternatives were evaluated throughout the base using the selection criteria identified in the EA. The remaining projects that would impact floodplains are constrained to their proposed locations due to the nature of the projects. Taking all the environmental, economic, and other pertinent factors into account, pursuant to EO 11988, the authority delegated by Secretary of the Air Force Order 791.1, and taking into consideration the submitted information, I find that there is no practicable alternative to this action and the Proposed Action includes all practical measures to minimize harm to the environment.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

Based on my review of the facts and analyses presented in the attached EA, I conclude that the Proposed Actions would not have a significant impact on the natural or human environment either by itself or cumulatively. The requirements of NEPA and the CEQ's regulations have been fulfilled. An Environmental Impact Statement is not required and will not be prepared.

DEE JAY KATZER, Colonel, U.S. Air Force Chief,
Civil Engineer Division HQ Air Combat Command (ACC/A4C)

Date