FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
FOR INSTALLATION DEVELOPMENT
AT HANSCOM AIR FORCE BASE
BEDFORD, LEXINGTON, AND LINCOLN, MASSACHUSETTS


PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION (EA §§ 1.1 through 1.6, pages 1-1 to 1-8):
Hanscom Air Force Base (AFB) seeks to improve its understanding on the potential environmental consequences associated with future development on the installation as envisioned in Hanscom AFB’s approved Installation Development Plan (IDP), dated March 2017, by preparing a single Environmental Assessment (EA) to analyze the impacts of future development within Hanscom AFB (HAFB). The IDP provides a roadmap for future development to ensure that HAFB’s facilities, infrastructure, and resources are well managed in support of HAFB’s mission and people, while balancing multiple resource constraints. In addition to evaluating the scope of development as envisioned in the IDP, the EA is intended to serve as a baseline environmental analysis for future mission planning that may not yet be known. The Air Force desires to authorize projected development within HAFB where environmental consequences would be minimal for the next five to ten years. By identifying areas where significant environmental impacts would not occur, using geospatial and environmental analysis, the Air Force will be better positioned to conduct Military Construction (MILCON), construction and demolition projects, facility renovations, and transportation network improvements quickly and efficiently to meet the growing needs of the Air Force and HAFB. The purpose of this action is to continue supporting the evolving military mission at HAFB and to provide and maintain adequate facilities for personnel and installation support. The need for the proposed action is to meet current and future mission requirements and national security objectives associated with HAFB missions including providing the necessary supporting facilities and infrastructure to accommodate employees and operational requirements.

The EA is not intended to serve as a comprehensive NEPA analysis for every future development action. Rather, it should be seen as a starting point, helping to identify potential environmental consequences of development actions efficiently. In many cases, individual projects will require no further NEPA evaluation based on the findings and implementation of mitigation measures identified in this EA. However, some projects may require additional analysis under NEPA. For example, no new development would be conducted in wetlands or floodplains as a result of the Proposed Action as such undertakings are beyond the scope of this analysis. That said, projects which do not themselves alter wetlands or floodplains, but which may encroach into buffer zones of these resources may be executed and considered to not have a significant impact so long as the procedures identified in the EA are followed and the appropriate consultation is conducted. Similarly, no new development having an adverse effect on historic or archaeological properties would proceed without supplemental NEPA analysis. This would include providing additional opportunities for stakeholders and the public to provide input. A discussion of undertakings which are beyond the scope of the EA, and therefore would require such additional NEPA analysis, are included in each appropriate section of the EA. All proposed undertakings covered by the EA fall within the boundaries of HAFB and on Federal property. Projects that may require obtaining easements or other land grants for property which is off the installation are not covered by the EA.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

PROPOSED ACTION (PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE) (EA § 2.4.1, pages 2-1 to 2-2): The preferred alternative would authorize future development proposed in accordance with the IDP for HAFB over the next five to ten years. Facility development includes the demolition, construction, and/or upgrades to facilities deemed to be substandard or underutilized. The demolition of old or outdated facilities would minimize the area of undisturbed land required for new facilities and reduce labor costs associated with maintenance and repair of excess facilities. The construction of new
facilities would be sited in accordance with appropriate land use principles in order to continue or enhance compatibility with currently designated land use areas. Utility development projects include the removal, installation of, or upgrades to utilities to improve utility efficiency and effectiveness. Airfield improvement projects could include repairs to the existing airfield pavements necessary to sustain the HAFB portions of the airfield in accordance with its current operating conditions. Transportation network development projects could include the removal, construction of, or upgrades to paved roadways, sidewalks, and parking lots to improve on-base traffic flow, enhance safety, improve physical security, and provide sufficient parking for base employees. Maximum development that would occur under the Preferred Alternative include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Category</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Demolition</td>
<td>226,080 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Renovation</td>
<td>879,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Facility Construction</td>
<td>339,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Parking / Roadways</td>
<td>370,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repaving (parking, roads, airfield)</td>
<td>774,200 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Additional Impervious</td>
<td>512,600 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Population Increase</td>
<td>521 personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 2) (EA § 2.4.2, page 2-2)**
Alternative 2 is defined as authorizing development consistent with the HAFB IDP as discussed under Alternative 1 plus increasing the affected footprints of all categories by 25% to allow for yet-to-be identified requirements. Maximum development that would occur under Alternative 2 includes the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Category</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Demolition</td>
<td>282,600 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Renovation</td>
<td>1,098,750 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Facility Construction</td>
<td>423,750 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Parking / Roadways</td>
<td>462,500 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repaving (parking, roads, airfield)</td>
<td>967,750 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Additional Impervious</td>
<td>640,750 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Population Increase</td>
<td>651 personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE (EA § 2.4.3, page 2-3):** The No Action Alternative serves as a baseline against which the impacts of the Proposed Action and other potential action alternatives can be compared. Under this alternative, none of the IDP development would be implemented at HAFB. It is important to note, that the analysis of the no action alternative in the EA is to provide a baseline for assessing environmental impacts. However, it is equally important to note that the military mission at HAFB is steadily evolving and the need to implement projects to support this mission is critical. Pursuing a no action alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the EA.

**CONSTRAINTS ANALYSIS**

**CONSTRAINTS ANALYSIS (EA § 3.1, pages 3-1 to 3-10):** A primary objective of this analysis was to look at the existing constraints to development on HAFB and to help identify areas where future development would be appropriate and least intrusive to the existing natural and human environment. This analysis utilized the Air Force GIS and the HAFB IDP to identify where both constrained and unconstrained areas occur within HAFB. In doing this, it was noted that there are two types of constraints that may affect the future development on HAFB: environmental constraints and land use constraints. The environmental constraints identified at HAFB include the following: Cultural Resources and Historic District, Wetlands and Rivers, 100-year Floodplain, and Environmental Restoration Sites. The EA would not authorize any proposed activity that would occur in an environmentally constrained area without the need for additional evaluation.
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or public involvement, therefore, significant impacts on these areas would be avoided. The land use constraints identified at HAFB include the following: Air Installation Compatible Use Zones, Airfield and Airspace Clearance Criteria, Force Protection Siting Criteria, Explosives Safety Quantity Distance (ESQD) arcs, and Electromagnetic and Radiation Sources. While the Air Force does not own or operate the airfield, coordination of development projects with the Federal Aviation Administration and Massachusetts Port Authority (MassPORT) would be required to ensure that proposed development meets their requirements and does not impact civilian flight operations. The EA would not authorize any development that is inconsistent with any land use constraint criteria without the need for additional evaluation or public involvement, therefore, significant impacts on these areas would be avoided.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Based on the findings within the environmental assessment (EA), the Proposed Action would have no effect on Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) (EA § 3.1,3 page 3-12). Because HAFB does not own or operate a military airfield, the AICUZ program is not applicable. Coordination with the Federal Aviation Administration during the design process would be required to ensure impacts to the civilian airfield (Hanscom Field) do not occur. Overall, the environmental analyses did not identify any significant impact to any of the remaining analyzed resources. In addition, no significant cumulative impacts caused by implementation of the Proposed Action when combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions occurring near HAFB were identified.

Land Use (EA §§ 3.2, pages 3-16 to 3-17; 4.2, pages 4-1 to 4-1): HAFB is located approximately 22 miles northwest of Boston, MA, just outside the Route 128/I-95 circumferential limited-access highway. The base is located just west of a major light industrial and office park corridor along the limited-access highway. HAFB, which occupies approximately 846 acres, is situated in the Towns of Bedford, Concord, Lexington, and Lincoln, all of which are primarily suburban residential communities. Adjacent to the base is the Hanscom Field, an airport owned and operated by the Massachusetts Port Authority (MassPORT). The National Park Service Minute Man National Historical Park (MMNHP) is located to the south of HAFB. The base operates as an administrative hub for various military groups with some laboratory, residential, and research and development space. A total of six planning districts have been identified for HAFB. The IDP focuses on these six planning districts, which were developed by HAFB during a vision workshop. Under both the Preferred Alternative or Alternative 2, the future land use pattern would generally resemble the installation’s existing land use pattern except the following: demolition of buildings would create open space that could remain open space or be utilized for future development; the vacant parcels, currently categorized as outdoor recreation, could be repurposed as administrative office space or could potentially be used as a photovoltaic (PV) system sites; if necessary, relocation of the running track to allow for future facility construction would result in a minor land use change; since the area is no longer geared toward research and development, the former Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) area that was previously designated as an industrial area may be reassigned to another land use category. The potential minor changes in land use identified above would not have a significant impact on the overall land use at HAFB.

Noise (EA §§ 3.3, pages 3-17 to 3-19; 4.7, pages 4-2 to 4-4): Currently, the ambient noise environment at HAFB primary results from normal operation of MassPORT’s Hanscom Field airport, ground-based vehicle operations, and use of privately-owned vehicles and government vehicles. The privately-owned cars are used by regular daily employees and contractors. Government-owned vehicles include on-road maintenance and utility vehicles and off-road equipment, such as sweeper vacuums, cranes, lawn mowers, and forklifts. Noise generated from maintenance and shop operations, ground traffic, and construction, is generally comparable to the noise generated in the surrounding community. Under both the Preferred Alternative and Alternative 2, construction activities would increase the noise level in the immediate area of the projects during implementation. Implementation of projects would be expected to be geographically separated in many cases. That is, numerous construction projects would not take place in the same location at the same time. Construction noise is expected to be limited to regular working hours between 7:00 AM and 5:00 PM. Implementation of the Preferred Alternative or Alternative 2 would result in short-term, minor to moderate, adverse effects on the noise environment but would not cross the threshold of significance for each receptor. The temporary minor to moderate increase in noise levels would not pose significant impacts on the areas surrounding HAFB and overall, the noise impacts would be minimal and short-term.

June 2020
Air Quality (EA §§ 3.4, pages 3-20 to 3-23; 4.4, pages 4-2 to 4-11): Per 40 CFR 81.322, current as of February 2020, Middlesex County, Massachusetts has met all but one of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. The area is currently in nonattainment with the 1997 8-hour ozone standard. The primary stationary emission sources at HAFB are the boilers at the central heating plant. The base’s Title V permit also imposes monitoring and record keeping requirements for various “emission units,” such as the heat plant, but also for large emergency generators, gas-driven chillers, aboveground and underground storage tanks, and fuel dispensing equipment. The primary mobile sources of emissions in the vicinity include aircraft operation at MassPORT’s Hanscom Field, along with ground vehicles on local and/or base roadways and small combustion engines (e.g. lawn mowers, leaf blowers). Implementation of the Preferred Alternative or Alternative 2 may result in short-term localized air quality impacts. All construction vehicles and some equipment would produce emissions that could temporarily affect air quality. Emissions are however, not anticipated to cause an adverse impact to regional air quality. The Air Force’s Air Conformity Applicability Model (ACAM) was used to perform an analysis to assess the potential air quality impact/s associated with the action in accordance with the Air Force Instruction 32-7040, Air Quality Compliance And Resource Management; the EIAP (32 CFR 989); and the General Conformity Rule (GCR) (40 CFR 93 Subpart B). None of estimated emissions associated with this action are above the conformity threshold values established at 40 CFR 93.153 (b); Therefore, the requirements of the GCR are not applicable. None of the emissions are expected to reach or exceed the air quality indicator threshold; therefore, no adverse impacts to the air quality are expected.

Water Resources (EA § 3.5, pages 3-23 to 3-25; 4.5, pages 4-11 to 4-13): The headwaters of the Shawsheen River, a tributary to the Merrimack River, are located on HAFB. Runoff flows north through a culvert near the intersection of Marrett Street and Vandenberg Drive, and flows along the eastern edge of MassPORT’s airfield. The river is confined by steep slopes, ranging from 7 to 15 feet high. Surface runoff from the eastern portion of the base drains eastward into Kihn Brook, which also drains into the Shawsheen River. Implementation of the Preferred Alternative or Alternative 2 would have similar and not significant impacts to water resources. Projects would be designed to comply with the Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook as well as UFC 3-210-10, and the Hanscom Contractor Environmental Guide. Designs would minimize the impacts of the individual projects on the existing stormwater conveyance systems and would minimize the increase in impervious surfaces required to complete each project. The designs would ensure that post development runoff does not exceed pre-development runoff using stormwater retention and treatment practices. In compliance with HAFB policies, designs would ensure that the stormwater runoff volume from the 95th percentile storm is reduced by over 10% from existing conditions. It is intended that all anticipated development would avoid sensitive and constrained areas identified at HAFB to the maximum extent practicable, including wetlands and floodplains. Development within these sensitive areas would require further analysis and/or permitting, as discussed in the EA, in order for its impacts to be deemed insignificant and are therefore not authorized by this EA.

Occupational Safety and Health (EA § 3.6, pages 3-25 to 3-26; 4.6, pages 4-1 to 4-14): Standard safety procedures exist to ensure limited public access during construction operations. All contractors performing construction activities are responsible for following ground safety and OSHA regulations (29 CFR 1910.12 and 29 CFR 1926). Construction activities would comply with all applicable federal, state, local, and applicable AF regulatory safety standards. During construction, a temporary chain link fence would be installed around the perimeter of the construction area, and only authorized personnel with appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE) would be allowed to enter the construction zone. As a result, no significant short-term safety and occupational health concerns would be experienced as a result of implementing either the Preferred Alternative or Alternative 2 and long-term positive benefits may be realized as the new facilities would meet DoD force protection requirements. As discussed in Section 3.6, Building 1208 is designated for munitions storage area and north of Building 1440 is designated for the military working dog/munitions bunker. This EA does not authorize any undertakings within these restrictive areas, therefore there would be no impacts related to explosives and munitions storage. As discussed in Section 3.6, a small portion of land located at the northeast end of HAFB, encompassing 43.9-acres, is located within the airfield Transitional Surface Area. An even smaller portion of the land located right along northeast corner of the HAFB, encompassing 3.9 acres, is located within the Approach and Departure Clearance Zone. Any undertaking that encroaches upon these areas would require additional coordination with the FAA to ensure no impacts to airfield operations would occur. If the FAA concurs that the proposed undertaking in consistent with FAA requirements, then no significant impact would be present and further analysis would not be
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required. Should the FAA determine that an impact to airfield operations would occur, then that undertaking would not be covered under this analysis and supplemental NEPA analysis would be required.

Solid Wastes and Hazardous Materials/Wastes (EA § 3.7, pages 3-25 to 3-26; 4.7, pages 4-14 to 4-18): HAFB operates a comprehensive waste management program which includes implementation of an Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan and a Hazardous Waste Management Plan. HAFB has a goal of 100% recycling rate for yard waste and construction and demolition debris (10% composted, 40% fully recycled, and 50% incinerated off base with heat recovery). Compostable materials (yard waste) are collected by Base Civil Engineering Roads and Grounds Section or are mulched back into the ground during mowing. All other solid waste is collected by a private contractor and processed at an off-base facility within MA. Demolition and renovation of some of existing structures could result in generation of LBP and/or ACM waste. The management and disposal of the Lead-based Paint (LBP) and/or Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM) waste would be performed in accordance with HAFB’s LBP Management Plan and/or Asbestos Management Operating Plan and Federal, state and local regulations. The waste estimated to be produced from implementing the Preferred Alternative (2,258 tons per year) is within the capacity for solid waste disposal of HAFB and the Air Force does not anticipate any significant impacts from implementing Alternative 1. The waste estimated to be produced from implementing the Alternative 2 (2,823 tons per year) is within the capacity for solid waste disposal of HAFB and the Air Force does not anticipate any significant impacts from implementing Alternative 2. There are three active Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) sites located within the HAFB main base. Any construction activities near the existing ERP site would be coordinated with HAFB’s environmental office to ensure no adverse impacts to and from these sites would occur. Any undertaking that would have the potential to affect an ERP site would require coordination with the EPA as discussed in Section 1.5.1 to ensure that there would be no impacts. Should EPA determine there to be an adverse impact, that undertaking would require additional analysis under NEPA. As a result, no impacts from implementing the Proposed Actions are anticipated to these ERP sites.

Biological Resources (EA §§ 3.8, pages 3-30 to 3-32; 4.8, pages 4-18 to 4-19): Most of the land area at HAFB, along with its native vegetation cover, has been altered by the development of base structures, streets, and recreational areas. For the most part, uplands are dominated by roadways, parking areas, structures, and recreational fields. Remnant grasslands occur in scattered patches and linear strips along developed areas occupying less than 5% of the uplands. Under the Preferred Alternative, a minor impact on the vegetation from C&D activities is anticipated; however, since the majority of land at HAFB is already developed, disturbance to any vegetation or forested areas within the base would be minimal. In addition, potential physical impacts on wildlife and habitat alternations would also be minimal, depending on the locations of the proposed actions and their vicinity to any habitats. Any noise associated with C&D activities could have a minor, short-term impact on local wildlife as well, however, once development activities are completed, the areas will most likely be re-occupied by local wildlife, due to their tolerance and existing adaptation to humans and development. Under Alternative 2, the impacts on biological resources at HAFB would be similar to those under the Preferred Alternative. The size and duration of the proposed projects might increase, resulting in a slight increase in vegetation and wildlife disturbance. As discussed in Section 1.5.1, every undertaking that proceeds under the EA would be required to undergo separate consultation with USFWS and NHESP to ensure that any effects on protected species are considered. Should any undertaking have an adverse effect on these species, it would not be authorized by this EA and supplemental evaluation under NEPA would be required. Therefore, any undertaking authorized under this EA would, by definition, have no significant impact to biological resources.

Cultural Resources (EA §§ 3.9, pages 3-32 to 3-35; 4.9, page 4-19): A survey of all historic and archaeological properties within the Main Base of HAFB including areas of archaeological sensitivity, has been documented in the HAFB Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP) updated in September 2017. Under both the Preferred Alternative and Alternative 2, none of the undertakings pursued under this EA would be located within a historic district or archaeologically sensitive area; however, several of the development project areas in the northeast section of the installation are located near zones of archaeological potential. Per the ICRMP, the objective regarding impacts to the cultural resources are to avoid archaeologically sensitive areas; however, if any development projects have the potential to affect historic properties, HAFB would proceed with consultation procedures discussed in Section 1.5.1 of the EA. In the event that any of those consultations resulted in an unmitigated impact to cultural resources, they would not be authorized.
Massachusetts and 16.3% of the population of the United States identify as of being of Hispanic or Latino origins. The United States. 2.7% of the population within ROI, 3.6% in the Middlesex County, 9.6% of the population of the State of Massachusetts were characterized to establish a baseline environmental justice analysis. The census tract of ROI was underlain by the Andover granite, with a portion of the northeast part of the Base underlain by the Assabet quartz diorite and the Shawsheen gneiss. According to the topographic map the elevation of the site is approximately 220 feet above mean sea level. The majority of the soils on base (outside the housing area) are loamy sands or fine sandy loams associated with glaciofluvial deposits. Twentieth century earthmoving activities on HAFB have substantially altered naturally occurring soils on the property. Under both the Preferred Alternative and Alternative 2, no disturbance to geology would occur; therefore, no effects on geology would be anticipated from the Proposed Action. Long-term, minor, adverse effects would be expected associated with the demolition, site preparation and construction activities. Most of the future development projects would occur on previously disturbed land and only minor grading would be required. Soils would be temporarily impacted by land clearing and/or construction activities associated with the proposed projects. In addition, any airfield improvements, such as airfield re-pavement, could involve soil grading and compacting, and infrastructure improvement activities could expose sub-surface soil. These soil disturbances, however, are expected to be minimal.

**Earth Resources (EA § 3.10, pages 3-35 to 3-36; 4.10, pages 4-19 to 4-20):** HAFB is located in an area that was occupied by a Pleistocene-age lake known as Glacial Lake Concord. The series of rounded hills and valleys that exist in the area are the result of bedrock structure and glacial erosion. Exposed areas of bedrock are found in the highly elevated outlying areas. Most of HAFB is underlain by the Andover granite, with a portion of the northeast part of the Base underlain by the Assabet quartz diorite and the Shawsheen gneiss. According to the topographic map the elevation of the site is approximately 220 feet above mean sea level. The majority of the soils on base (outside the housing area) are loamy sands or fine sandy loams associated with glaciofluvial deposits. Twentieth century earthmoving activities on HAFB have substantially altered naturally occurring soils on the property. Under both the Preferred Alternative and Alternative 2, no disturbance to geology would occur; therefore, no effects on geology would be anticipated from the Proposed Action. Long-term, minor, adverse effects would be expected associated with the demolition, site preparation and construction activities. Most of the future development projects would occur on previously disturbed land and only minor grading would be required. Soils would be temporarily impacted by land clearing and/or construction activities associated with the proposed projects. In addition, any airfield improvements, such as airfield re-pavement, could involve soil grading and compacting, and infrastructure improvement activities could expose sub-surface soil. These soil disturbances, however, are expected to be minimal.

**Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice (EA §§ 3.11, pages 3-36 to 3-41; 4.11, pages 4-20 to 4-21):** HAFB provides worldwide support for the Air Force Life Cycle Management Center (AFLCMC) and outstanding quality-of-life opportunities for military personnel, their family members and the many workers at HAFB. HAFB's Total Estimated Economic Impact is approximately $8.44 billion with more than 5,500 primary jobs and 14,500 secondary jobs created. Race, ethnicity, and the poverty status of people within the region of influence (ROI) and the State of Massachusetts were characterized to establish a baseline environmental justice analysis. The census tract of ROI was compared to Middlesex County, the State of Massachusetts, and the United States. The ROI contained a lower minority population at 15.9% compared to 20% of Middlesex County, 79.6% of the State of Massachusetts and 27.6% of the United States. 2.7% of the population within ROI, 3.6% in the Middlesex County, 9.6% of the population of the State of Massachusetts and 16.3% of the population of the United States identify as of being of Hispanic or Latino origins. The percentage of individuals below poverty level was reported to be at 2.5% within the ROI, 8.2% in the Middlesex County, 11.1% in the State of Massachusetts and 14.6% in the United States. The median family income within the ROI is $101,081. Positive short-term employment benefits would accrue to the construction industry during project execution as a result of the implementing the Preferred Alternative or Alternative 2. Although not quantified, a short-term increase in the revenue generated in the surrounding area may result due to contractor employees utilizing local businesses for supplies and personal use. The location of the Proposed Action is considerably removed from unique populations with respect to poverty and ethnicity. Access to HAFB is restricted to credentialed professionals who must first obtain access from the Federal government. Implementation of the Preferred Alternative or Alternative 2 would only affect property within the boundaries of HAFB. Air emissions resulting from construction are expected to be minor and temporary in nature. As a result of these conditions, no disproportionate environmental health or safety risks to children would occur. Therefore, the Proposed Action is consistent with the objectives of Executive Order 12898 and 13045 and no significant impacts would occur.

**Infrastructure (EA §§ 3.12, pages 21 to 23; 4.12, pages 39 to 43):** HAFB operates a consecutive community water system that serves approximately 11,300 persons at industrial, commercial, residential, tenant organizations, and MassPORT (an off-base entity). Under contract, the Town of Lexington supplies the potable water produced by the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA) used at the main base. In 2018, HAFB purchased a total of 181.5 million gallons (mg) representing an average daily demand of 497,205 gallons per day (gpd) or 0.497 mgd. This average daily usage corresponds to 24.8% of the maximum contract capacity. The maximum single day volume pumped in 2018 was 932,000 gallons or 0.932 mg which occurred on November 12, 2018. This represents 46.6% of the maximum contract capacity. During construction, an additional 60,000 gpd would be required for dust suppression which represents an increase of 12% on days when dust mitigation is implemented and is well within HAFB’s total capacity. After full implantation of the IDP, it is estimated that an additional 8-12,000 gallons would be consumed per day. An
additional allowance of 5,000 gpd is assumed for office cleaning and other non-routine uses. There are no industrial process operations that are expected to consume significant amounts of water. This totals 18,000 gpd of additional water consumption over current usage at HAFB, representing an increase of 3.6% over HAFB’s current daily consumption, well within HAFB’s total capacity.

Sanitary wastewater at HAFB is pumped by two major lift stations (Buildings 1539 and 1306) and three smaller lift sumps, finally leaving the base at Building 1306. The primary lift station at Building 1306 has a wet well storage capacity of approximately 260,000 gallons and is capable of pumping up to 1,500-gallons per minute (gpm). The sanitary waste is pumped under permit via a 10-inch force main, through the Town of Bedford and eventually into the MWRA wastewater treatment plant at Deer Island. The permit limits the base to an outflow of 1,500-gpm and maximum daily volume of 1,270,000 gpd. The base currently discharges and average of approximately 650,000 gpd with a peak discharge of 970,000 gpd. This represents an average of 51.2% and a peak of 76.4% of total capacity. The Proposed Action would continue to use existing sanitary sewer systems. After full IDP implementation, wastewater generation is expected to be primarily driven by employee consumption and restroom usage. There are no industrial process at that are expected to generate significant amounts of wastewater. The USEPA provides guidance on estimating daily wastewater generation and recommend using a figure equal to 70% of total water consumption. The resulting wastewater generated at this rate is estimated to be an additional 12,600 gpd. The additional wastewater estimated to be generated after IDP implementation represents an increase of 2.4% and is well within HAFB’s total capacity.

All buildings on HAFB are connected to a primary distribution system that is owned and maintained by the base. Local utility provider Eversource’s local distribution system has three feeds coming into a central substation. The HAFB electrical system has a capacity of 17.2 megawatts (MW) or 151,000 megawatt-hours (MWh). The current consumption is 5.4 MW or 47,718 MWh. This represents 31.3% usage versus capacity resulting in available capacity of an additional 11.8 MW. The majority of the electrical distribution system is in condition code 1, resulting in an adequate rating. With the available headroom of 68.7%, implementation if the IDP is expected to have no significant impact on electrical systems.

The HAFB workforce of Federal civilian employees, non-appropriated fund employees, military, and contractors consists of approximately 6,065 personnel. Traffic congestion in the vicinity of the base primarily occurs in the peak morning period between 6 and 9 am when most of workers arrive from the local and regional highway system. HAFB commuters primarily use Route 2A and Hanscom Drive to access the base through the Sartain Gate or use Route 4/225 and Hartwell Avenue to enter the base through the Ruiz Gate. Both of these state routes interchange with the Route 128/I-95 beltway that rings the Boston area and connects to other radial limited-access highways. Based on data provided by local transportation management agencies, approximately 134,213 personnel originate within or traverse through the area within a 5-mile radius of HAFB when commuting to work. Based on anticipated increase in the workforce, it is estimated that at peak morning commuting times (between 6:00AM and 7:00 AM) a maximum of an additional 65 vehicle trips per hour on arteries and supporting roads to access to HAFB, particularly Route 4/225 and Hartwell Ave would be realized under the Preferred Alternative and an additional 82 trips per hour under Alternative 2. Similarly, it is estimated that at peak evening commuting times (between 4:00 PM and 5:00 PM) a maximum of an additional 79 vehicle trips per hour on arteries and supporting roads within the region would be realized under the Preferred Alternative and 99 additional vehicle trips per hour under Alternative 2. This increase is extremely small, (less than 0.05%) of the total population within the 5-mile radius of HAFB. Therefore it can be concluded based on level of service for the current road network within the region, this negligible change in commuting patterns would not have a significant impact on local traffic or within the region as a whole. When taking into consideration the other undertakings within the regions, there would be no significant incremental adverse cumulative effects on transportation.

As a result of these findings, implementation of the Preferred Alternative or Alternative 2 would not have a significant impact on infrastructure at HAFB. In addition, when taking into consideration the other undertakings within the region, there would be no significant incremental adverse cumulative effects on infrastructure.
PUBLIC REVIEW / INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

A public notice of availability was published in the *The Concord/Lincoln Journal*, the *Lexington Minuteman*, the *Bedford Minuteman* and *The Hansconian* on Jun 10, 2020 inviting the public to review the draft environmental assessment and draft finding of no significant impact, beginning the 30-day comment period. The public comment period closed on July 15, 2020. (summarize comments received in final FONSI).

In consideration of the potential impact of the ongoing coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic on the usual methods of access to information and ability to communicate, such as the mass closure of local public libraries and challenges with the sufficiency of an increasingly-overburdened internet, the Air Force encouraged members of the public and all interested stakeholders to contact HAFB directly by email or telephone to discuss and resolve issues involving access to the Draft EA and Proposed FONSI or the ability to comment. The Air Force received no request(s) for assistance in obtaining/commenting upon the EA/FONSI; this/these request(s) were resolved by (providing hard copies or a CD of the draft EA/FONSI to the affected individuals by regular mail… etc…..).

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Based on my review of the facts and analysis summarized above and contained within the attached environmental assessment, I find the proposed decision to implement either the Preferred Alternative or Alternative 2 will not have a significant impact on the natural or human environment; therefore, an environmental impact statement is not required. This analysis fulfills the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, the President’s Council on Environmental Quality 40 C.F.R. §§ 1500 – 1508 and the Air Force EIAP regulations 32 C.F.R § 989.