

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
AND
FINDING OF NO PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE
PROPOSED AREA DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS FOR
SHEPPARD AIR FORCE BASE, WICHITA COUNTY, TEXAS

Pursuant to provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Title 42 *United States Code* (USC) § 4321 et seq.; Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations at 40 *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) Parts 1500–1508; and 32 CFR Part 989, *Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP)*, the United States (US) Air Force (Air Force) prepared the attached Final Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA) to address the potential environmental consequences associated with construction, demolition, renovation, and infrastructure projects at Sheppard Air Force Base (AFB) in Texas.

Purpose and Need

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to support Sheppard AFB's future mission and training requirements and maintain the joint training mission through selected development actions and real property improvements. The construction of new facilities, renovations and repair of existing facilities, demolition of obsolete facilities, and consolidation of mission support functions would address existing deficiencies in support facilities and operations at Sheppard AFB. The Proposed Action is needed to provide facilities and infrastructure that are adequate to meet the mission requirements of the 82d Training Wing, the 80th Flying Training Wing, and their tenant units. Left unchecked, deficiencies in facilities and infrastructure would degrade the Base's ability to meet Air Force current and future technical and pilot training mission requirements.

The Air Force developed the following selection standards to identify reasonable alternatives that would address the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. The supporting alternatives must:

- remedy facilities and infrastructure deficiencies in order to adequately support current and future strategic missions;
- be consistent with land use requirements, force protection, and planning concepts as defined in the 2016 Installation Development Plan and other Air Force guidance;
- minimize operational inefficiencies and promote sustainable development; and
- provide and promote quality of life environment on Sheppard AFB.

Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives

The PEA evaluates a total of 17 construction, demolition, renovation, and infrastructure projects, as described in the PEA. Two alternatives are evaluated in the PEA, in addition to the No Action Alternative, each containing the same number and type of projects. The two alternatives differ in the size of the individual project footprints as shown in **Table 1**.

Alternative 1

Four building construction projects are proposed under Alternative 1, each of which also would include some renovation and demolition. These projects would involve construction of a new flying training wing headquarters building, a new flying training facility, a permanent commercial vehicle inspection facility, a new munitions maintenance/storage facility, and a new training facility. These construction projects would involve demolishing the existing substandard versions of these facilities as well as renovating existing buildings.

One demolition-only project is proposed under Alternative 1—removal of one substandard facility.

One project under Alternative 1 would involve construction of an addition to the Military Working Dog Certification Training Complex.

Eleven infrastructure construction projects are proposed under Alternative 1. These projects would include construction of new infrastructure as well as additions, repairs, and maintenance to existing infrastructure on Sheppard AFB, including new airfield pavement construction, airfield pavement maintenance, airfield pavement demolition, electrical line replacement, the addition of new drainage infrastructure, and existing drainage system maintenance.

Alternative 2

The same four building construction projects proposed under Alternative 1 are proposed under Alternative 2. However, the footprint of the newly constructed buildings would be different between the two alternatives and there would be different amounts of demolition and renovation (**Table 1**).

The same demolition-only and building addition projects proposed under Alternative 1 are proposed under Alternative 2.

The same 11 infrastructure construction projects proposed under Alternative 1 are proposed under Alternative 2; However, the amounts of linear and square footage for infrastructure replacement and maintenance would be different between the two alternatives. No airfield pavement demolition would occur under Alternative 2.

**Table 1
Summary of Proposed Projects by Project Type for Each Alternative**

Activity	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
Building Construction^a		
Number of projects	4	4
New construction	344,933 ft ²	204,933 ft ²
Demolition amount	-389,835 ft ²	-246,929 ft ²
Renovation	654,266 ft ²	658,192 ft ²
Additions to Buildings		
Number of projects	1	1
Addition amount	1,000 ft ²	1,000 ft ²
Demolition-Only		
Number of projects	1	1
Demolition amount	-2,560 ft ²	-2,560 ft ²
Infrastructure/Utilities Construction^b		
Number of projects	11	11
New construction	98,676 ft and 239,924 ft ²	59,177 ft and 239,924 ft ²
Maintenance and repair	15,550 ft, 2,415,934 ft ² , and 105 acres	15,550 ft, 2,415,934 ft ² , and 105 acres
Demolition amount	-141,260 ft ²	N/A

Notes:

a Building construction and demolition totals include square footage for the "Building Addition" and "Demolition-Only" projects.

b Infrastructure construction includes non-building construction such as electrical line replacement, runway repair, and drainage installation.

ft = linear foot/feet; ft² = square foot/feet; N/A = not applicable

No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the Air Force would not implement the proposed installation development projects, and Sheppard AFB would continue to operate under current conditions. The facility and infrastructure assets of the Base would continue to degrade. In the short term, military training and operations would continue at Sheppard AFB in accordance with the status quo. Over time, the mission support capabilities of the Base would diminish along with its ability to support the future missions and requirements of its tenant activities.

Public and Agency Review

A Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft PEA and Draft FONSI was published in the *Wichita Falls Times Record News* on 5 and 6 November 2023 to commence a 30-day public comment period. However, due to technical difficulties, Sheppard AFB was unable to post the Draft PEA to its website on the date specified by this NOA. Because of this, the Air Force extended the public comment period by 30 days and published a second NOA in the *Wichita Falls Times Record News* on 26 and 27 November 2023.

The extended public comment period of the Draft PEA and Draft FONSI concluded on 25 December 2023. During the extended public comment period, the Draft PEA and Draft FONSI were available online for view or download at <https://www.sheppard.af.mil/Library/Key-Documents>. Additionally, printed copies of the Draft PEA and Draft FONSI were available upon request and placed for review at the Wichita Falls Public Library, 600 11th Street, Wichita Falls.

Sheppard AFB received comments on the Draft PEA during the public comment period from (1) the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality and (2) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, copies of which are provided in **Appendix D** of the Final PEA. The Final PEA reflects the changes made in response to these comments.

Summary of Findings

Potentially affected environmental resources were identified through communications with state and federal agencies and review of past environmental documentation. Specific environmental resources with the potential for environmental consequences include land use; air quality; earth, water, biological, and cultural resources; noise; infrastructure, transportation, and utilities; hazardous materials and wastes; safety; socioeconomics; and environmental justice and protection of children.

In the summary of findings, the term “Proposed Action Alternatives” is used to refer to Alternatives 1 and 2 when impacts are the same for both alternatives. Where differences occur, potential impacts are summarized by alternative.

Land Use

No adverse impacts to land use would result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives. The construction, demolition, renovation, and infrastructure projects under the Proposed Action Alternatives would occur entirely within the existing boundaries of Sheppard AFB. These projects would be implemented within planning districts consistent with their existing purpose, and no changes to land use would occur under the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Air Quality

Adverse impacts to air quality under the Proposed Action Alternatives would be short term and negligible due to the negligible increase in steady-state emissions and criteria pollutants in comparison to applicable thresholds.

Earth Resources

With the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) and project-specific measures, adverse impacts to earth resources from soil disturbance during construction activities under the Proposed Action Alternatives would be short term and negligible. The Proposed Action Alternatives would also result in long-term, minor, beneficial impacts to soils due to improved drainage and additional erosion control measures.

Water Resources

Surface Waters

With the use of BMPs and effective project coordination and planning, adverse impacts to surface waters due to construction activities under the Proposed Action Alternatives would be short term and negligible.

The Proposed Action Alternatives would also result in long-term, minor, beneficial impacts to surface waters due to improved drainage.

Wetlands

No impacts to wetlands would be expected to occur, as none of the projects under the Proposed Action Alternatives are in proximity to jurisdictional or non-jurisdictional wetlands.

Stormwater

Alternative 1: Adverse impacts to stormwater under Alternative 1 would be long-term and minor due to increased runoff from added impervious surface area. There would be no significant, adverse impacts as the area where projects would be located already contains a large amount of impervious surface area and is highly developed.

Alternative 2: Adverse impacts to stormwater under Alternative 2 would be similar to those under Alternative 1. However, under Alternative 2, Taxiway A South would not be demolished, resulting in a higher overall amount of added impervious surface area in combination with other Alternative 2 projects (approximately 144,166 ft² more than Alternative 1). Therefore, adverse impacts to stormwater under Alternative 2 would be expected to be greater than those occurring under Alternative 1 but would still be long-term and minor.

Floodplains

The Proposed Action Alternatives would have long-term, minor, beneficial impacts to floodplains due to improved drainage on the runway and reduced impervious surface area within the 100-year floodplain.

Groundwater and Water Quality

Alternative 1: Adverse impacts to groundwater and water quality under Alternative 1 would be long-term and minor due to increased impervious surface area affecting the natural function of groundwater. Alternative 1 would also have long-term, minor, beneficial impacts on water quality due to improved drainage and reduced erosion and sedimentation.

Alternative 2: Adverse impacts to groundwater and water quality under Alternative 2 would be similar to those under Alternative 1. However, under Alternative 2, Taxiway A South would not be demolished, resulting in a higher overall amount of added impervious surface area in combination with other Alternative 2 projects (approximately 144,166 ft² than Alternative 1). Therefore, adverse impacts to groundwater and water quality under Alternative 2 would be expected to be greater than those occurring under Alternative 1 but would still be long-term and minor. Alternative 2 would also result in long-term, minor, beneficial impacts to water quality due to improved drainage and reduced erosion and sedimentation.

Biological Resources

Vegetation

Alternative 1: Due to the lack of vegetation in the areas proposed for development and the minimal vegetation clearing associated with Alternative 1, adverse impacts to vegetation under this alternative would be short term and negligible. The demolition of airfield pavement on Taxiway A South under Alternative 1 could have long-term, minor, beneficial impacts on vegetation by providing additional area for growth and revegetation.

Alternative 2: Adverse impacts to vegetation under Alternative 2 would be the same as those under Alternative 1. Demolition of Taxiway A South would not be included under Alternative 2; therefore, beneficial impacts to vegetation due to potential revegetation would not occur under Alternative 2.

Terrestrial Wildlife

There is limited suitable habitat for wildlife on Sheppard AFB and adverse impacts to wildlife due to noise and movement caused by construction and demolition activities would be temporary; therefore, adverse impacts to wildlife would be short term and negligible.

Threatened or Endangered Species and Other Protected Species

Sheppard AFB has minimal suitable habitat for threatened or endangered species. Project 2 would occur in an area that could serve as habitat for the Texas kangaroo rat; the site has been previously disturbed, likely limiting suitable habitat for the Texas kangaroo rat. However, the project area would be examined for potential presence of the Texas kangaroo rat prior to the start of construction. In the event of an unexpected discovery of any kangaroo rats, all construction activities would stop, and the Sheppard AFB Natural Resources Manager would be contacted.

The Texas horned lizard occurs in sandy soils with sparse native vegetation cover, which are not present at any project sites under Alternative 1.

All practicable measures to avoid and minimize effects to the tricolored bat would be taken. Such measures would include checking buildings for roosting bats prior to demolition, especially between November 16 and March 31 when tricolored bats may be overwintering and taking shelter inside structures. Additionally, any vegetation clearing involving tree removal would be scheduled outside the maternity season (May 1–July 15) to avoid impacts to nursing female bats who may be unable to move to safety if trees are cut down.

Under the Proposed Action Alternatives, there would be potential for migratory birds to nest in buildings proposed for demolition or renovation; however, all project areas would be checked prior to construction and demolition activities for nesting birds or the presence of migratory species, and Texas Parks and Wildlife Department recommendations would be followed. Adverse impacts to migratory birds from the Proposed Action would be anticipated to be short term and negligible.

Invasive Species

With the use of BMPs, adverse impacts due to invasive species under the Proposed Action Alternatives would be anticipated to be short term and negligible.

Cultural Resources

Archaeological Sites

No archaeological resources on Shepard AFB have been identified as eligible or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). There would be no effect on archaeological resources under the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Historic Architectural Properties

Alternative 1: Three buildings on the Installation were determined to be eligible for listing on the NRHP: the Kell Field Air Terminal Building, Building 2560, and the Alert Apron, all of which are located within the indirect Area of Potential Effects (APE) but outside the direct APE. In addition to these properties, the demolition or renovation under Alternative 1 would have the potential to impact the following six buildings that have yet to be surveyed for listing on the NRHP:

- The demolition of the Fort Sill National Bank (Building 200) in the Community Services District which was constructed in 1962,
- The renovation of the Aircraft Hydraulics Training Building (Building 1010) in the Technical Training District which was constructed in 1952,
- The renovation of the Kearby Hall Healthcare Sciences Training Building (Building 1900) in the Technical Training District which was constructed in 1966,

- The renovation of the Bernard Hall Civil Engineering Training Building (Building 1921) in the Technical Training District which was constructed in 1972,
- The demolition of the Mambretti Hall Power Pro Training Building (Building 2001) in the Technical Training District which was constructed in 1956, and
- The demolition of the Civil Engineering Training Storage Building (Building 2014) in the Technical Training District which was constructed in 1956.

There are 36 buildings within the APE that were previously evaluated for NRHP eligibility that have since crossed the 50-year threshold. These 36 buildings would require survey and an evaluation of eligibility prior to implementation of any construction, demolition, or renovation actions associated with the Proposed Action. The demolition of Building 920 and renovation of Buildings 1020, 1040, 1060, 1080, and 1090 would not impact cultural resources as they were previously surveyed and determined not eligible for listing on the NRHP.

Although several structures associated with Alternative 1 are greater than 50 years old and remain unevaluated, no previously surveyed structures are listed as eligible for inclusion on the NRHP within the direct APE. Implementation of Alternative 1 would require a cultural resources survey to be conducted prior to the start of any construction, renovation, or demolition activities to determine if any historic structures are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Alternative 2: Three buildings on the Installation were determined to be eligible for listing on the NRHP: the Kell Field Air Terminal Building, Building 2560, and the Alert Apron, all of which are located within the indirect APE but outside the direct APE. In addition to these properties, the demolition or renovation under Alternative 2 would have the potential to impact the following four buildings that have yet to be surveyed for listing on the NRHP:

- The demolition of the Fort Sill National Bank (Building 200) the Community Services District which was constructed in 1962,
- The renovation of the Bernard Hall Civil Engineering Training Building (Building 1921) in the Technical Training District which was constructed in 1972,
- The demolition of the Mambretti Hall Power Pro Training Building (Building 2001) in the Technical Training District which was constructed in 1956, and
- The demolition of the Civil Engineering Training Storage Building (Building 2014) in the Technical Training District which was constructed in 1956.

The same 36 buildings described under Alternative 1 within the APE that were previously evaluated for eligibility in the NRHP and that crossed the 50-year threshold would require survey and an evaluation of eligibility prior to implementation of any construction, demolition, or renovation actions associated with the Proposed Action. The renovation of Buildings 920, 1040, 1060, 1080, and 1090 would not impact cultural resources as they were previously surveyed and determined not eligible for listing on the NRHP.

Although several structures associated with Alternative 2 are greater than 50 years old and remain unevaluated, no previously surveyed structures are listed as eligible for inclusion on the NRHP within the direct APE. Implementation of Alternative 2 would require a cultural resources survey to be conducted prior to the start of any construction, renovation, or demolition activities to determine if any historic structures are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Traditional Cultural Properties

There would be no effect on Traditional Cultural Properties, as none are known to be present on Sheppard AFB. However, in the event of an unexpected discovery of an archaeological resource during any subsurface excavation associated with construction or demolition, all work activity would cease until an investigation is completed.

Sheppard AFB submitted basic information on the Proposed Action Alternatives to the Texas Historical Commission via the electronic Texas Review and Compliance portal and received an electronic response on 7 September 2023. The response from the THC supports Sheppard AFB's intention to continue Section 106 consultations on a project-by-project basis at a later date (see **Appendix A** of the Final PEA). Prior to beginning any proposed construction, renovation, or demolition activities associated with the Proposed Action and Alternatives, Sheppard AFB would evaluate all structures that have not been previously surveyed or that have exceeded 45 years of age since the last survey.

Noise

Noise associated with construction and demolition projects under the Proposed Action Alternatives would not cause any significant direct or indirect impacts on noise-sensitive receptors and would not result in any operational increases in noise.

Infrastructure (including Transportation and Utilities)

Transportation

Alternative 1: Adverse impacts to transportation under Alternative 1 would be short term and minor due to project-related traffic delays. Alternative 1 would also have long-term, minor, beneficial impacts to traffic on Sheppard AFB due to improved traffic flow from the construction of a permanent Commercial Vehicle Inspection Facility capable of meeting demand, and long-term, minor, beneficial impacts due to increased street lighting.

Alternative 2: Adverse impacts to transportation under Alternative 2 would be the same as those under Alternative 1. Alternative 2 would also have long-term, minor, beneficial impacts to traffic on Sheppard AFB due to improved traffic flow from the construction of a permanent Commercial Vehicle Inspection Facility capable of meeting demand but would not involve increased street lighting.

Electricity and Natural Gas

Alternative 1: Alternative 1 would have long-term, moderate, beneficial impacts on the electric system at Sheppard AFB due to repairs and improvements to electrical infrastructure, including moving overhead lines to protect the infrastructure from weather. Any potential adverse impacts from disruptions to electrical or natural gas service within the project areas during construction and demolition activities would be short term and negligible and would be managed through project planning.

Alternative 2: Alternative 2 would also have beneficial impacts on the electric system at Sheppard AFB, but to a lesser extent than Alternative 1. Alternative 2 would involve repairs and improvements to electrical infrastructure but would not move overhead lines underground to protect them from weather, resulting long-term, minor, beneficial impacts, compared to long-term, moderate, beneficial impacts under Alternative 1. Any potential adverse impacts from disruptions to electrical or natural gas service within the project areas during construction and demolition activities would be short term and negligible and would be managed through project planning.

Solid Waste

Alternative 1: Adverse impacts on solid waste management due to construction and demolition projects under Alternative 1 would be short term and minor. Alternative 1 would result in an additional 1,284 tons of construction waste and 42,149 tons of demolition waste. The existing landfills utilized by Sheppard AFB have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional waste generated.

Alternative 2: Adverse impacts on solid waste management due to construction and demolition projects under Alternative 2 would be short term and minor. Alternative 2 would result in an additional 976 tons of construction waste and 19,710 tons of demolition waste. The existing landfills utilized by Sheppard AFB have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional waste generated.

Potable Water Supply

Adverse impacts to the potable water supply system under the Proposed Action Alternatives would be short term and negligible and would occur during construction and demolition when existing lines would be connected to new buildings or capped as appropriate. Additional adverse impacts would occur as operation of new buildings would increase demand on the potable water supply system; however, changes in demand would be minimal, and the system has the capacity to meet new demands.

Wastewater and Stormwater

Adverse impacts on the sanitary sewer and wastewater treatment system under the Proposed Action and Alternatives would be short term and negligible and would occur during construction and demolition of the Proposed Action Alternatives when existing lines would be connected to new buildings or capped as appropriate. Additional adverse impacts would occur as operation of new buildings would increase demand on the sanitary sewer and wastewater treatment system; however, changes in demand would be minimal, and the system has the capacity to meet new demands. The Proposed Action Alternatives would also have long-term, minor, beneficial impacts on stormwater drainage capabilities due to repairs and upgrades to drainage infrastructure on the Installation.

Communications

Adverse impacts to communications systems under the Proposed Action Alternatives could occur from disruptions during construction and demolition and would be anticipated to be short term and negligible. Any potential short-term disruptions to the communications system would be managed through project planning.

Hazardous Materials and Wastes

Hazardous Materials and Wastes

Adverse impacts on the generation of wastes due to the Proposed Action and Alternatives would be short term and negligible. Sheppard AFB is a large quantity generator of hazardous wastes and a large quantity handler of universal wastes, and there would be no significant, adverse impacts on waste generation.

Installation Restoration Program (IRP)

Several demolition actions under the Proposed Action Alternatives would occur in the immediate vicinity of three existing IRP sites: ST012, ST015, and ST016. Land use controls are in place for ST012 and ST016, which require that any construction on and around the sites must be for non-residential uses. With those land use controls in place, the sites have been granted closure by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, with regular site evaluations occurring every five years. ST015 is also closed; therefore, no impacts to IRP sites would be anticipated under the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP)

One construction action under the Proposed Action Alternatives would occur in the immediate vicinity of two existing MMRP sites: TS880 and TS881. Both are former skeet ranges and are in remedial investigation and action operation stages, respectively. BMPs would be implemented if any stray lead shot or lead-contaminated soil were discovered during ground-disturbing activities. TS880 and TS881 themselves would remain undisturbed, and no impacts to MMRP sites would be anticipated under the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances

Project 13 under the Proposed Action Alternatives would occur and involve soil disturbance within the boundaries of aqueous film forming foam (AFFF) release area SS005P and would occur in close proximity to sites SS003P and SS007P. Demolition actions under Project 4 would also occur in close proximity to an AFFF site, site SS006. Land use controls are in place for this site, requiring that any construction on or around it must be for non-residential uses. SS006P has been granted closure by the Texas Commission

on Environmental Quality with site evaluations occurring every five years. With the implementation of BMPs and Texas Commission on Environmental Quality-recommended additional AFFF release prevention measures, as well as adherence to all applicable regulations and policies, adverse impacts to AFFF sites under the Proposed Action Alternatives would be anticipated to be short term and minor.

Lead-Based Paints and Asbestos

Under the Proposed Action Alternatives, the potential risk of exposure to lead-based paint or asbestos during demolition and renovation actions would be managed with BMPs and in accordance with all applicable requirements and management plans. Adverse impacts due to these materials would be anticipated to be short term and minor. The Proposed Action Alternatives would also result in long-term, minor, beneficial impacts due to the removal of older structures that have the potential to contain lead-based paint and asbestos, thereby lowering the risk of future exposure.

No significant impacts to hazardous materials and waste management would occur under either alternative. Existing plans are sufficient to manage any hazardous materials or wastes and would with those plans and any applicable requirements in place, potential impacts to hazardous materials and wastes would be minor and short term.

No significant effects to hazardous materials and wastes would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Safety

Ground Safety

Alternative 1: Adverse impacts to ground safety under Alternative 1 during proposed construction periods would be short term and negligible-to-minor due to potential exposure of construction personnel to safety and health hazards associated with construction activities. These impacts would be minimized to the greatest extent possible with personal protective equipment and implementation of applicable programs and regulations. Alternative 1 would result in long-term, minor, beneficial impacts to ground safety due to pavement, electrical and drainage infrastructure and structural repairs and improvements, the demolition of obsolete buildings, and the improved street lighting.

Alternative 2: Adverse impacts to ground safety under Alternative 2 would be the same as those under Alternative 1. Beneficial impacts under Alternative 2 would be long-term and minor but not to the extent described in Alternative 1. Alternative 2 would not include street lighting improvements, and overhead electrical lines would not be moved underground for protection from weather.

Flight Safety

Alternative 1: Alternative 1 would result in long-term, minor, beneficial impacts to flight safety due to improved airfield drainage, grading to bring the imaginary surface of Runway 15L/33R into compliance, and the demolition of Taxiway A South to prevent it from being mistaken as an active runway.

Alternative 2: Beneficial impacts to flight safety under Alternative 2 would be the same as those under Alternative 1, except for those described under Project 12. Taxiway A South would not be demolished as part of Project 12 under Alternative 2, and the associated flight safety benefits would not be realized.

Explosives Safety

The Proposed Action Alternatives would result in long-term, minor, beneficial impacts to explosives safety by improving storage conditions and capacity within the munitions storage area.

Socioeconomics

The Proposed Action Alternatives would have short-term, minor, beneficial impacts to employment due to the need for local construction personnel to complete construction actions. The Proposed Action Alternatives would not have impacts on housing, education resources, or population.

Environmental Justice and Protection of Children

Disproportionate adverse effects to communities with environmental justice concerns or youth populations would not occur under the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Cumulative Impacts

The PEA considered cumulative impacts that could result from the incremental impact of implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives when added to other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable environmental trends or planned actions at Sheppard AFB. Long-term, beneficial cumulative impacts to utilities, including electrical systems and sanitary sewer (see attached PEA) would be expected to occur. No significant cumulative impacts were identified.

Mitigation

The PEA analysis concluded that the Proposed Action Alternatives would not result in significant environmental impacts; therefore, no mitigation measures are recommended. BMPs are described and recommended in the PEA where applicable.

Finding of No Practicable Alternative. Pursuant to Executive Order (EO) 11988, *Floodplain Management* (amended by EO 13690) and considering all supporting information, the Air Force finds that there is no practicable alternative to the Proposed Action being located in floodplains as discussed in the attached PEA. Although six projects are located within the 100-year floodplain, these projects would occur on previously disturbed land and would involve existing buildings and infrastructure. In accordance with EO 11988, the Air Force considered alternatives for the proposed projects within and adjacent to the 100-year floodplain. However, because the projects included under the Proposed Action Alternatives are associated with pre-existing facilities and infrastructure components, relocation of project sites outside the floodplain boundary was not feasible, and the associated floodplain impacts are unavoidable.

Finding of No Significant Impact. After review of the PEA prepared in accordance with the requirements of NEPA, CEQ regulations, and 32 CFR Part 989, and which is hereby incorporated by reference, I have determined that the proposed activities would not have a significant impact on the quality of the human or natural environment. Accordingly, an Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared. This decision was made after considering all submitted information, including a review of agency comments submitted during the 30-day public comment period, and considering a full range of practical alternatives that meet project requirements and are within the legal authority of the US Air Force.

PATEL.BIRJU.HARE
SHCHAN.1278840
537

Digitally signed by
PATEL.BIRJU.HARESHCHAN.127
8840537
Date: 2024.04.04 13:40:38
-05'00'

4 April 2024

BIRJU H. PATEL, Major, USAF
Chief, AETC Engineering Branch

DATE