

## **FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)**

### **Implementing Area Development Plans at Buckley Space Force Base, CO**

Pursuant to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) at 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 1500–1508 and the Department of the Air Force (DAF) Environmental Impact Analysis Process Regulations at 32 CFR 989, the DAF has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate the potential impacts on the natural and human environment associated with the Proposed Action to implement activities outlined within five Area Development Plans (ADPs). The EA is herewith incorporated by reference into this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

#### **Purpose and Need**

The overall purpose of the Proposed Action is to support current and future mission requirements by maintaining and providing needed infrastructure. The Proposed Action is needed for the base to continue providing support infrastructure that is adequate to the needs of Space Base Delta 2 and the units it supports. Each of the projects included in the Proposed Action has a specific purpose and need as presented in Table 1.2-1 of the EA.

#### **Proposed Action**

The Proposed Action involves implementing a range of projects outlined in five ADPs that together encompass the entirety of Buckley SFB. These ADPs layout the projects planned for each area of the installation. The proposed projects are discussed in terms of type and generally classified as construction, renovation, and demolition. Projects are also discussed in terms of being “vertical” or “horizontal.” As used in the Area Development Execution Plans (ADEPs) for each of the five ADPs, these are defined as follows:

- **Vertical projects** are buildings that need to be completed to fulfill the plan.
- **Horizontal projects** include, but are not limited to, paving, pavement removal, construction of sidewalks and fences, introduction of planting strips, installation of pervious pavers, landscaping, realignment of streets, new streets, installation of bollards, and definition of access points and staging areas with concrete curbs.

#### **Alternatives**

Buckley SFB considered a range of reasonable alternatives for each of the five ADPs encompassing the installation. These alternatives were identified and dismissed during the ADP process. The locations and grouping of projects presented within each ADP represent the selected alternative for each ADP based on environmental factors, ability to support mission readiness, needs of Buckley SFB units and tenants, site security, available land for development, and proximity to support functions.

Per 32 CFR 989.8(c), the Air Force may expressly eliminate alternatives from detailed analysis based on reasonable selection standards. Reasonable selection standards were applied to determine whether action alternatives considered met the project’s purpose and need and satisfied the selection standards.

This EA has considered all reasonable alternatives under the CEQ regulation, 40 CFR §1502.14(a), which states that all reasonable alternative that have been eliminated must be briefly discussed. These can be found in section 2.4 of the EA.

#### **Description of the No-Action Alternative**

Through implementation of the No-Action Alternative, future area development projects would continue to be evaluated on an individual project basis. It is anticipated that future development would occur under the No-Action Alternative; however, those development projects would be analyzed through the preparation of project-specific NEPA documentation, as appropriate.

### Summary of Environmental Impacts

The EA evaluates the existing environmental conditions and potential environmental consequences of implementing the Proposed Action with regard to air quality and greenhouse gas/climate change, biological resources, cultural resources, environmental justice/socioeconomics, geology and soils, hazardous materials and waste, land use, noise, transportation, utilities, and water resources. Environmental consequences are summarized below. As shown in Table 1, implementation of the Proposed Action is not anticipated to result in significant adverse environmental impacts. Under the No Action Alternative, no changes to baseline conditions would occur.

**Table 1. Summary of Potential Environmental Effects from Baseline Conditions**

Resource Area	Level of Impact	Cumulative Impact
Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas/Climate Change	Adverse construction impacts to local air quality and greenhouse gas emissions impacts to the climate would be short-term and less than significant. Operations impacts would be less than significant.	Less than significant
Biological Resources	Adverse construction and operational impacts would be less than significant (no adverse effect).	Less than significant
Cultural Resources	Adverse construction impacts would be less than significant. Operations would have no adverse effect to cultural resources.	Less than significant
Environmental Justice/Socioeconomics	Adverse effects would be short-term and less than significant. Environmental justice communities in the vicinity of the installations may benefit from certain long-term effects of the Proposed Action, such as increased regional spending and increased job opportunities.	Less than significant
Geology and Soils	Adverse construction impacts would be short-term and less than significant. Operations impacts would be less than significant.	Less than significant
Hazardous Materials and Waste	Adverse construction impacts would be short-term and less than significant. Operations impacts would be less than significant.	Less than significant
Land Use	No adverse impacts on Land Use are expected.	Less than significant
Noise	Adverse construction impacts would be short-term and less than significant. Operations impacts would be less than significant.	Less than significant
Transportation	Adverse construction impacts would be short-term and less than significant. Operations impacts would be less than significant.	Less than significant
Utilities	Adverse construction impacts would be short-term and less than significant. Operations impacts would be less than significant.	Less than significant
Water Resources	Adverse construction impacts would be short-term and less than significant. Operations impacts would be less than significant.	Less than significant

### Regulatory Compliance Measures, Design Commitments, and Mitigation Measures

The DAF will implement any and all applicable best management practices (BMP) that are required in permits. All activities will be conducted in accordance with installation management plans, including but not limited to hazardous material, hazardous waste, spill prevention, natural resources, and cultural resources management.

The DAF will comply with applicable federal and state laws and regulations. With implementation of these measures and other BMP design commitments identified in the EA, the Proposed Action would be anticipated to have no significant adverse impacts.

#### **Public Review, Agency Coordination, and Government-to-Government Coordination**

The DAF published a Notice of Availability of the Draft EA and Draft FONSI in a local newspaper. These documents were available for a 30-day public review and comment period. Copies of all comments are provided in Appendix A of the Final EA with responses as appropriate.

The DAF sent early notification letters to federal, state and local governments and federally recognized tribes that are historically affiliated with the geographic region of Buckley SFB in June 2023.

#### **Finding of No Significant Impact**

Based on my review of the facts and analyses contained in the attached EA, conducted under the provisions of NEPA, CEQ Regulations, and 32 CFR §989, I conclude that the Proposed Action for implementing activities outlined within five Area Development Plans (ADPs) would not have a significant environmental impact, either by itself or cumulatively with other known projects. Accordingly, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. This analysis fulfills the requirements of NEPA, the President's CEQ 40 CFR §§ 1500-1508 and the Air Force EIAP regulations 32 CFR § 989. The requirements of NEPA and the CEQ's regulations have been fulfilled.

DEXTER.HEIDI  
.L.1187803051

Digitally signed by  
DEXTER.HEIDI.L.1187803051  
Date: 2024.07.08 15:55:58  
+06'00'

---

HEIDI L. DEXTER, Colonel, USSF  
Commander, Space Base Delta 2