

DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)
FOR
AIR FORCE PERSONNEL RELOCATION
HANSCOM AFB, MA

Pursuant to provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Title 42 United States Code (USC) Sections 4321 to 4347, implemented by Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations, Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §1500-1508, and 32 CFR §989, Environmental Impact Analysis Process, the U.S. Air Force (Air Force) has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) to identify and assess the potential environmental consequences associated with Air Force Personnel Relocation in the Greater Hanscom Air Force Base (AFB) Area, Middlesex County, Massachusetts.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION (EA § 1.0, Page 1-1)

The purpose for action is to provide Air Force personnel adequate administrative office space to meet mission requirements. Given installation-wide facility constraints, the lead time to pursue Military Construction (MILCON) and the growing portfolio the Air Force is undertaking, the best alternative is to relocate to a larger off-base facility. Hanscom AFB does not have the facilities to house the additional personnel nor does the Air Force have the option to refuse these space requirements. The EA, incorporated by reference into this finding, analyzes the potential environmental consequences of activities associated with the *Air Force Personnel Relocation* action and provides environmental protection measures to avoid or reduce adverse environmental impacts.

PROPOSED ACTION (EA § 2.1, Page 2-1)

Relocate Air Force Life Cycle Management Center (AFLCMC) HBN/HBV mission to administrative workspace in a location within 10 miles of Hanscom AFB, MA. The required space is anticipated to be approximately 30,000 Square Feet (SF) for approximately 189 personnel. The space will include parking to accommodate personnel and meet Antiterrorism/Force Protection (ATFP) requirements.

SELECTION STANDARDS (EA § 2.2, Pages 2-1 to 2-2)

Constructing new base facilities, on-base and/or purchase of modular trailers, teleworking, and designating Air Force missions to another base were alternatives that were considered but leasing administrative off-base workspace was determined to be the only reasonable alternative(s) that meets the selection standards described in EA § 2-2.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE(S) (EA § 2.4, Pages 2-3 to 2-5)

The analysis of the Proposed Action to lease administrative workspace within 10 miles of Hanscom AFB includes four (4) Alternatives based on the four (4) Regions. The EA considers all potential impacts of Alternative 1a, Alternative 1b, Alternative 1c, Alternative 1d and the No-Action Alternative. The EA also considers cumulative environmental impacts with other projects in the Region of Influence.

ALTERNATIVE 1a – Lease Property in Region 1 (EA § 2.4.1, Page 2-4)

Relocate AFLCMC HBN/HBV to leased administrative workspace in an off-base commercial building in a location within Region 1. Region 1 includes areas along the United States (US) Route 3 traffic corridor.

ALTERNATIVE 1b – Lease Property in Region 2 (EA § 2.4.2, Page 2-4)

Relocate AFLCMC HBN/HBV to leased administrative workspace in an off-base commercial building in a location within Region 2. Region 2 includes areas along the Interstate 95 and Massachusetts Route 128 traffic corridor.

ALTERNATIVE 1c – Lease Property in Region 3 (EA § 2.4.3, Page 2-4)

Relocate AFLCMC HBN/HBV to leased administrative workspace in an off-base commercial building in a location within Region 3. Region 3 includes areas along the Massachusetts Route 2 traffic corridor.

ALTERNATIVE 1d – Lease Property in Region 4 (EA § 2.4.4, Page 2-4)

Relocate AFLCMC HBN/HBV to leased administrative workspace in an off-base commercial building in a location within Region 4. Region 4 includes areas within 5 miles of Hanscom AFB.

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE (EA § 2.4.5, Page 2-4)

Status quo will not provide the space necessary for HBN/HBV to accomplish its mission. Clientele access will continue to be restricted and available space will not accommodate projected growth in personnel. Per the Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ), the No-Action Alternative will be used as a baseline to determine impacts the Proposed Action and/or any other alternative will have on the environment and will be carried forward for further analysis.

SCOPE OF ANALYSIS (EA § 3.1, Pages 3-1 to 3-2)

Regardless of the alternative selected, the following resources would not be affected by the Proposed Action and are not discussed in detail in the EA: Air installation compatible use zone/ land use, water resources, safety and occupational health, hazardous materials/waste, biological resources, cultural resources, and geology.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES (EA § 4.0, Pages 4-1 to 4-14)

The analyses of the affected environment and environmental consequences of implementing the Proposed Action (Alternative 1a, Alternative 1b, Alternative 1c, or Alternative 1d) 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.

AIR QUALITY (EA § 4.2, Pages 4-1 to 4-5)

Air Conformity Applicability Models (ACAM) were conducted for all four (4) alternatives, in accordance with NEPA (42 USC §4321) and AF regulations (32 CFR 989). If a Region exceeded any National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for any pollutant(s), then that threshold was added to the ACAM for that Region. A summary of the findings of the ACAM studies are provided below. The Proposed Action is not considered vulnerable to the effects of climate change (i.e. increasing sea level, drought, extreme weather, ecological change, etc.). The Proposed Action's contribution to climate change, regardless of its minor collective impact to air quality/GHG emissions, must be considered when deciding between the Proposed Action and the No-Action Alternative.

Region 1 is located in the Boston-Lawrence-Worcester (E. MA) regulatory area. Conservative Ozone limits were applied in the ACAM. In addition to Boston-Lawrence-Worcester (E. MA) conservative Ozone limits, Region 2 also includes the 1971 Carbon Monoxide (CO) standard because parts of Waltham, MA are within Region 2. Similar to Region 3, in addition to Boston-Lawrence-Worcester (E. MA) conservative Ozone limits, Region 3 also includes the 1971 Carbon Monoxide (CO) standard because parts of Waltham, MA are within Region 3. Region 4 is located in the Boston-Lawrence-Worcester (E. MA) regulatory area. Conservative Ozone limits were applied in the ACAM.

Results of the ACAMs showed that ***implementing Alternative 1a, Alternative 1b, Alternative 1c, or Alternative 1d would result in negligible direct/indirect impacts in air quality/GHG emissions in the short-term and long-term.*** The No-Action Alternative would result in no direct/indirect impacts in air quality/GHG emissions in the short-term and long-term.

SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES/ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE (EA § 4.3, Page 4-6)

Demographic information derived from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) EJSCREEN: Environmental Justice Screening and Mapping Tool and representative samples for each Region were researched. Analysis (EA §3.3 Pages 3-4 to 3-8) showed that ***implementing Alternative 1a, Alternative 1b, Alternative 1c, or Alternative 1d would not adversely impact minorities, low-income families, people at susceptible life stages, or local businesses.*** Local businesses, particularly restaurants, convenience stores, and fueling stations would benefit from the increase in workforce in the local area. The No-Action Alternative would not adversely impact minorities, low-income families, people at susceptible life stages, or local businesses.

TRANSPORTATION-TRAFFIC (EA § 4.4, Pages 4-7 to 4-12)

The EPA EJSCREEN traffic proximity/volume calculations, population estimates for each Alternative (Region), and Hanscom AFB commuting habits data were used to determine the context and intensity of effects in traffic. Analysis (EA §4.4 to Pages 4-7 to 4-12) showed that based on level of service for the current road networks within the regions, the negligible increase in commuters by ***implementing Alternative 1a, Alternative 1b, Alternative 1c, or Alternative 1d would not have a significant impact on traffic at the leased facility or within the region as a whole.*** The No-Action Alternative would not adversely impact traffic at Hanscom AFB.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Air Force has concluded that no significant adverse effects would result to the following resources as a result of the Proposed Action (Alternative 1a, Alternative 1b, Alternative 1c, or Alternative 1d): air quality, greenhouse gases, biological resources, geology and earth resources, land use, coastal zone resources, noise, public health and safety, transportation, socioeconomics / environmental justice, and water resources.

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would result from activities associated with Alternative 1a, Alternative 1b, Alternative 1c, or Alternative 1d when considered with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

Based on my review of the facts and analyses contained in the *Air Force Personnel Relocation* EA, conducted under the provisions of NEPA, CEQ Regulations, and 32 CFR §989, I conclude that the Proposed Action (Alternative 1a, Alternative 1b, Alternative 1c, or Alternative 1d) would not have a significant environmental impact, either by itself or cumulatively with other known projects. Accordingly, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. The signing of this Finding of No Significant Impact completes the environmental impact analysis process.

THOMAS J. SCHLUCKEBIER, P.E., CFM, LEED AP
Base Civil Engineer

Date