DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

INSTALLATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN PROJECTS AT LUKE AIR FORCE BASE

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 Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) to address the potential environmental consequences associated with construction and demolition projects at Luke Air Force Base (AFB) in Arizona.

Purpose and Need

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to support Luke AFB's future mission and training requirements associated with next-generation aircraft arrival. The construction of new facilities, demolition of obsolete facilities, and consolidation of mission support functions would address existing deficiencies in facilities at Luke AFB. Left unchecked, deficiencies in facilities and infrastructure would degrade the Base's ability to meet Air Force current and future mission requirements. The Proposed Action is needed to provide facilities and infrastructure that are adequate to meet the mission requirements of the 56th Fighter Wing at Luke AFB and its tenant units in a manner that:

- meets all applicable Department of Defense installation master planning criteria, consistent with Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) 2-100-01, *Installation Master Planning* (30 Sept 2020); Department of the Air Force Manual 32-1084, *Standard Facility Requirements* (1 April 2018); Air Force Instruction 32-1015, *Integrated Installation Planning* (as amended 4 Jan 2021); and Air Force Policy Directive 32-10, *Installations and Facilities* (20 July 2020);
- meets the need for adequate munitions storage space and functional capability to store munitions to provide timely and efficient operational support;
- reconfigures the Explosives Ordnance Disposal Proficiency Training Range (EOD Range) to comply with airfield operational safety criteria, retains the explosives safety site approval, and consolidates EOD mission support functions in one area;
- provides safe and secure pedestrian access to the Base for military personnel and their dependents living on and off Base and reducing the need for vehicular access; and
- achieves the goals and objectives laid out in the Area Development Plans for the Northwest Mission District and Munitions Storage District.

Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives

The EA evaluates the potential environmental impacts of three short-term construction and demolition actions on Luke AFB. Overall, the Proposed Action would demolish approximately 30,686 square feet (ft^2) of existing building space and construct approximately 63,480 ft^2 of new building space. The net change in building footprint under the Proposed Action would be an increase of 32,794 ft^2. The Proposed Action would occur in three locations: 1) Munitions Storage Area (MSA) within the Munitions Storage District, 2) EOD Range in the Northwest Mission District, and 3) along the eastern boundary of Luke AFB.

Munitions Storage District

An appropriately sized Munitions Control, Munitions Administrative and Munitions Operations facility is necessary to accommodate the increased flying and training missions for the F-35 aircraft at Luke AFB. The proposed MSA project includes the following elements:

- Demolition of five existing buildings totaling 23,361 ft^2: Buildings 1234, 1236, 1240, 1242, and 1245;
- Construction of a new 17,093-ft^2 munitions support and control facility with reinforced concrete foundation and floor slab, structural-steel frames, split-face masonry unit walls, structural sloping metal seam roof, and fire detection and protection system;
- Construction of a new 16,630-ft^2 missile and conventional munitions consolidated facility with reinforced concrete foundation and concrete floor slab, structural-steel frames, split-face masonry unit walls, structural sloping metal seam roof, and a fire detection and protection system; and
- Construction of parking lots for consolidated munitions support and control facility and missile and conventional munitions facility.

Overall, activities associated with the MSA would result in a net increase of 4,202 ft^2 of new structures.

Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 1, Buildings 1234, 1236, 1240, 1242, and 1245 (totaling 23,361 ft^2) would be demolished. A new MSA support and control building (administrative) would be constructed east of Ammo Road in the vicinity of the existing MSA administrative facility, which would be demolished under the Proposed Action. The current site would be reused for parking, and the new MSA administrative building would be located immediately to the north of existing Building 1242. The new missile and conventional munitions consolidated facility would be constructed east of Ammo Road near the site of existing Building 1236, which would be demolished.

Alternative 2

Under Alternative 2, Buildings 1234, 1236, 1240, 1242, and 1245 (totaling 23,361 ft^2) would be demolished. A new MSA administrative building would be constructed west of Ammo Road opposite the existing Building 1242, which would be demolished under the Proposed Action. The new missile and conventional munitions consolidated facility would be constructed near existing Building 1234, which would be demolished but is more centrally located within the MSA.

Explosives Ordnance Disposal Proficiency Training Range

The Proposed Action would include the following elements:

- Demolition or repurposing of an existing 7,325-ft^2 EOD facility within the main industrial portion of the Base;
- Construction of a new 30,000-ft^2 EOD facility to consolidate EOD administrative and storage functions;
- Replacement of the boundary fence at the existing EOD Range; and
- Siting of an EOD magazine (EODMAG) structure in proximity to the administrative and storage facilities proposed for construction.

The existing EOD facilities at Luke AFB support the 56th Explosives Ordnance Disposal Unit (56 EOD) and 944 EOD units, which provide 24-hour emergency management response capability to aircraft recovery operations, explosive-related incidents, and weapons of mass destruction or other terrorist-related events. The existing EOD Range is out of compliance with UFC 3-260-01, *Airfield and Heliport Planning and Design* (2019, Change 1), as the southernmost portion of the EOD Range lies within the airfield's runway lateral clearance zone, primary surface, and transitional surface, presenting an airfield safety hazard.

The Proposed Action would consolidate of all EOD activities into the existing detonation area on Base, including temporary and permanent space for advanced EOD storage magazine, space for development of an EOD practical training area, and the construction of a permanent EOD facility.

Under the Proposed Action, the current footprint of the EOD Range would be shifted approximately 5 acres to the north in compliance with UFC 3-260-1. Correspondingly, approximately 5 acres of land comprising the southernmost portion of the existing EOD Range would be vacated. The Proposed Action would demolish or repurpose an existing 7,325-ft^2 EOD facility within the main industrial portion of the Base and construct a new, expanded 30,000-ft^2 EOD facility in the Northwest Mission District to consolidate EOD administrative and storage functions.

The Proposed Action would also include the replacement of the boundary fence at the existing EOD Range and would site an EODMAG structure within the fenced area. The EODMAG is a deployable explosive storage magazine that provides a minimal quantity-distance arc while storing explosive items found in a typical EOD deployment package. The structure itself is approximately a cube with a footprint of approximately 49 ft^2. Overall, activities associated with EOD Range would result in a net increase of 22,675 ft^2 of impervious surfaces.

Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 1, the existing EOD Range would be reconfigured and shifted to the north by 5 acres. The proposed EOD administrative and storage facility, measuring 30,000 ft^2 in size, would be located on the eastern side of the 5-acre parcel. An existing 7,325-ft^2 EOD facility within the main industrial portion of the Base would be demolished or repurposed. An EODMAG structure would be sited near the new EOD facility.

Alternative 2

Under Alternative 2, the existing EOD Range would be reconfigured and shifted to the north by 5 acres. The proposed EOD administrative and storage facility, measuring 30,000 ft^2 in size, would be located on the western side of the 5-acre parcel. An existing 7,325-ft^2 EOD facility within the main industrial portion of the Base would be demolished or repurposed. An EODMAG structure would be sited near the new EOD facility.

Pedestrian Gates

The pedestrian gates would include the following elements:

- Construction of two new pedestrian gates along the eastern boundary of Luke AFB, measuring approximately 240 ft^2 in size;
- Equipping the gates with two 36-inch-wide doors compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act, a 30-inch-diameter turnstile, bollards to prevent vehicular breaching of the gate, four security cameras, an integrated camera and intercom system, and a card reader to scan Base access passes; and
- Construction of a pedestrian gatehouse allowing for remote control access to the Base.

The pedestrian gatehouse would be constructed at the intersection of Litchfield Road and Glendale Avenue, allowing the Base to remotely control access of pedestrians who already have Base access.

The two pedestrian gates would be installed along the eastern boundary of Luke AFB. The first gate, known as the Litchfield Pedestrian Gate, would be constructed just west of North Litchfield Road near the intersection of Litchfield Road and Glendale Avenue. The second gate, known as the Kachina Pedestrian Gate, would be constructed just north of Glendale Avenue near the intersection with Lalomai Street.

Conceptual design for the new pedestrian gates indicates that the approximate footprint for each gate would be 240 ft^2. Each gate would be equipped with two 36-inch-wide doors compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act, a 30-inch-diameter turnstile, bollards to prevent vehicular breaching of the gate, four security cameras, an integrated camera and intercom system, and a card reader to scan Base access passes.

Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the new pedestrian gates would be installed just west of North Litchfield Road near the intersection of Litchfield Road and Glendale Avenue and just north of Glendale Avenue near the intersection with Lalomai Street. The pedestrian gatehouse would be constructed at the intersection of Litchfield Road and Glendale Avenue.

No other reasonable alternative locations for the pedestrian gates exist. A stop light is needed to allow safe crossing of Litchfield Road by pedestrians and bicyclists. The stop light at the intersection of North Litchfield Road and West Glendale Avenue is the only stop light along Litchfield Road. This location also leads into the housing area on the main part of Luke AFB. On Glendale Avenue, the intersection with Lalomai Street provides the only reasonable connection for pedestrians and bicyclist between housing on the north and south sides of Glendale Avenue.

No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the Air Force would not implement the proposed installation development projects and Luke AFB would continue to operate under current conditions. The facility and infrastructure assets of Luke AFB would continue to degrade. In the short term, military training and operations would continue at Luke 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. The EOD Range would remain out of compliance with the established airfield safety zones.

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; geological resources; air quality; water resources; biological resources; cultural resources; infrastructure, transportation, and utilities; noise; 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 both Alternatives 1 and 2 when impacts are the same for both alternatives. Where differences occur between alternatives, potential impacts are summarized by each alternative.

Land Use

No significant adverse effects to land use would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives. The Proposed Action Alternatives would resolve the land use conflict between the EOD Range and the Luke AFB airfield by shifting the EOD Range to the north by 5 acres, removing it from the airfield lateral clearance zone and bringing it into safety compliance. The construction and demolition projects under the Proposed Action Alternatives in both the MSA and the EOD Range would occur entirely within the existing boundaries of Luke AFB. These projects would be implemented on lands dedicated to their existing missions and no changes to land use would occur. The pedestrian gates would improve access to on- and off-Base destinations and enhance the multi-modal transportation network at Luke AFB. No land use change would occur under the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Geological Resources

No significant effects to geological resources would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives. Soils on Luke AFB range from fine sandy loams to clay loams and are suitable for development. The demolition of buildings in the MSA would create soil disturbances if foundation materials are excavated and any surrounding impervious surfaces are removed. The construction of new buildings in both the MSA and EOD Range would disturb soils at each building site during the installation of foundations and utilities. Soil disturbance could increase the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation from stormwater runoff. Soil erosion potential would be short term and limited to construction and demolition activities. Removing and reinstalling fencing around the reconfigured EOD

Range would have a negligible impact on soils and soil erosion potential. The pedestrian gate projects are relatively small (less than 1,000 ft^2 total), and the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation is low. With proper project site analyses and implementation of best management practices (BMPs), the potential for increased soil erosion and sedimentation would be expected to be low and could be managed with structural controls such as stormwater diversion, detention ponds, wattles, silt fences, berms, and erosion control mats. No impacts to prime farmland would occur because no prime farmland occurs within Luke AFB.

Air Quality

No significant effects to air quality would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives. The estimated total annual emissions of the Proposed Action Alternatives would not exceed the *de minimis* or Prevention of Significant Deterioration permitting thresholds or any criteria pollutant or precursor. Therefore, impacts from the Proposed Action Alternatives on regional air quality would be expected to be minor, and no adverse impacts would be expected to occur. Based on the Air Conformity Applicability Model, the net change in emissions associated with this project would be anticipated to be short term.

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, in terms of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e), do not have a regulatory threshold; however, estimated emissions for CO_2e demonstrated that CO_2e emissions from the Proposed Action Alternatives would be low when compared to GHG emissions of 25,000 metric tons or more associated with large GHG sources.

Water Resources

No significant effects to water resources would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Surface Water and Stormwater – No surface waters are present on Luke AFB within the proposed project areas. Demolition and construction of buildings under the Proposed Action Alternatives would require a short-term use of additional water for dust control. Mitigation measures to control surface runoff from construction sites would minimize sedimentation in washes and opportunities for stormwater and groundwater contamination**.**

Groundwater – The demolition and construction projects under the Proposed Action Alternatives would have the potential to impact groundwater if stormwater runoff from demolition and construction sites contained contaminates and entered the underground aquifer. Stormwater is managed in accordance with the BMPs in the Base's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). These controls, combined with the relatively low rainfall in the region and groundwater resources that are 400–800 feet below the ground surface, would minimize the potential for groundwater contamination.

Floodplains – Under Alternative 1, the new MSA support and control building would be constructed on the east side of Ammo Road and north of the existing administration building, which would be demolished. The proposed building site would be partially located within a mapped 100-year floodplain (i.e., Zone A under the Federal Emergency Management Agency). However, this portion of the floodplain has been altered by previous development and contains parking areas. Existing stormwater runoff patterns would need to be evaluated during facility design in accordance with the SWPPP and Stormwater Management Plan (SMP).

Under Alternative 2, the new MSA support and control building proposed within the MSA would be constructed on the west side of Ammo Road within a mapped Zone A floodplain. Construction of the building would increase the amount of impervious surface within the floodplain. The potential risk of flooding exists on the proposed location. Additional evaluation of flood risk and potential mitigation measures in accordance with the SWPPP and SMP may be required for construction on this location. A finding of no practical alternative would be required for construction on this site.

Biological Resources

No significant effects to biological resources would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Vegetation – The areas designated for the proposed projects under Alternative 1 are highly disturbed or developed. Due to the lack of intact native vegetation in the areas proposed for development under Alternative 1 and the minimal vegetation clearing associated with construction and demolition activities that would occur under Alternative 1, no significant impacts to vegetation would be anticipated to occur. Under Alternative 2, the new MSA support and control building would be constructed west of the existing MSA administration building in an area just west of Ammo Road. This area is undeveloped and contains native vegetation and likely populations of native burrowing rodents that are common throughout the Sonoran Desert. The site contains no habitat for any threatened or endangered species. Construction on this site could disturb up to 1.5 acres of previously undisturbed land and would have a minor, but long-term impact to vegetation.

Terrestrial Wildlife – There is limited suitable habitat for wildlife in the areas on Luke AFB within the proposed project locations. The developed portion of Luke AFB, in which the projects proposed under Alternative 1 would be located, supports relatively common wildlife species such as small mammals and migratory birds. It is possible that birds may nest or bats may roost on some of the buildings scheduled for demolition. Buildings would be checked for nests unless work is conducted outside the primary nesting season, generally 1 April through 1 July in Arizona. Buildings also would be checked for roosting bats prior to demolition. The bat maternity season is generally from early May through mid- to late-August. Impacts to wildlife species under Alternative 2 would be similar to Alternative 1, except approximately 1.5 acres of habitat would be disturbed for the construction of the proposed new MSA support and control building west of the existing MSA administration building in an area just west of Ammo Road. This project would primarily affect small desert rodent and reptile species that are relatively common and abundant in the Sonoran Desert.

Wetlands and Aquatic Resources – No wetlands are present on Luke AFB; therefore, no impacts to wetlands and aquatic resources would be anticipated to occur under the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Threatened or Endangered Species and Other Protected Species – Luke AFB does not contain habitat for either the threatened, yellow-billed cuckoo or the endangered California least tern. The Air Force has determined that the Proposed Action Alternatives would have “No Effect” on Federally listed threatened or endangered species. In addition, no impacts to bald or golden eagles are expected because suitable habitat for these species does not exist on Luke AFB. Migratory birds would have the potential to nest in buildings proposed for demolition; however, all project areas would be checked for nesting birds prior to construction and demolition activities.

Invasive Species – Soil disturbance associated with either demolition or new construction could create seed beds conducive to the establishment of invasive plant species. Areas that are disturbed would be monitored for invasive plants after project completion. If invasive plants do become established, the site would be managed under the Base’s Integrated Pest Management Plan. Potential establishment of invasive species would be similar under Alternatives 1 and 2. Under Alternative 2, approximately a 1.5-acre area of previously undisturbed land would be used for the new MSA support and control building west of Ammo Road. Contractors would follow Luke AFB plans and procedures to prevent the spread of invasive plants. However, most of the construction area would be occupied by the new building and associated parking areas, limiting the potential for establishment of invasive plant species.

Cultural Resources

No significant effects to cultural resources would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Archaeological Sites – Under Alternative 1, the new MSA support and control building would be constructed east of Ammo Road in the vicinity of the existing MSA administrative facility. The new missile and conventional munitions consolidated facility would be constructed east of Ammo Road on the south end of Westbrook Lane. Both building sites were surveyed for cultural resources in 2021; neither site contains any archaeological sites or isolated occurrences (IOs). No archaeological sites were located during cultural resources surveys of the Base conducted in 2020. Two IOs were found during the surveys, but the depositional context of the two IOs is unknown because much of the fill in the EOD Range has been imported.

Impacts to archaeological sites would be the same under Alternative 2 as for Alternative 1 except for the proposed MSA support and control building. Under Alternative 2, the new MSA support and control building would be constructed west of Ammo Road, across from the existing MSA administrative facility. This proposed site would be in the southeast corner of Area 1 of the Area of Potential Effect that was surveyed in 2021 for cultural resources. The land surface is presently undisturbed. Fourteen IOs were found in survey Area 1, including one IO within the footprint of the proposed facility. No archaeological sites were recorded in the area. Although no archaeological sites or historic sites eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) would be affected by construction on this site, the cultural resources survey report recommended avoiding the area because the site is near the Falcon Landing archaeological site and the potential for subsurface archaeological artifacts is high.

Historic Architectural Properties – The demolition of Buildings 1234, 1236, 1240, 1242, and 1245 in the MSA would have no impact on cultural resources. These buildings were previously surveyed and determined ineligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Traditional Cultural Properties – No sacred sites, human remains, associated grave goods, unassociated grave goods, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony have been identified or recovered on Luke AFB. The Proposed Action Alternatives would not impact archaeological sites, historic properties, or Native American resources.

Infrastructure, Transportation, and Utilities

No significant adverse effects to infrastructure, transportation, or utilities would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Transportation – The construction and demolition projects in the MSA and in the EOD Range would not affect Base transportation systems. Proposed parking areas associated with the new buildings would provide necessary parking.

The construction of two pedestrian gates along the eastern boundary of the Installation would improve pedestrian access for military personnel and their dependents to Luke AFB, ease congestion at South Gate, and develop more sustainable communities that are less dependent on vehicle transportation while enhancing the multi-modal transportation network for Luke AFB.

Electricity and Natural Gas – The Proposed Action Alternatives would have no long-term impacts to either the electrical or natural gas supply systems. Removing older buildings through demolition and replacing them with larger, more energy-efficient buildings would result in a minor beneficial decrease in either electrical or natural gas demand. Both utility systems have the capacity to meet new demands from increases in building square footage. Any potential short-term disruptions to electrical or natural gas service within project areas during construction and demolition activities would be mitigated during project planning.

Potable Water Supply – Implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives would cause a minor decrease in demand for potable water. The existing potable water supply system has the capacity to meet any increase in demand. Short-term, negligible impacts on the potable water supply system could occur during construction and demolition when existing lines are disconnected from old buildings and new lines are constructed to serve new buildings. There would be a short-term increase in water use for dust control during demolition and construction.

Solid Waste – Construction and demolition of buildings, fences, and walls in the MSA, EOD Range, and for the pedestrian gates would generate solid waste. The Proposed Action Alternatives would result in an additional 63,240 ft^2 of construction and 30,686 ft^2 of demolition. Construction and demolition projects would generate approximately 277,624 and 4,848,388 pounds of solid waste, respectively. No long-term impacts on solid waste management would be expected to occur because the projects would not appreciably increase the amount of solid waste generated on the Base, and the total amount of waste would be less than one percent of the annual waste received at the City of Glendale Municipal Landfill.

Noise

No significant effects to noise would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives. The Proposed Action Alternatives would include construction and demolition activities that would occur entirely within the boundaries of Luke AFB. Noise associated with the proposed construction and demolition projects would not cause any significant direct or indirect impacts on noise-sensitive receptors. Operational noise at Luke AFB would not increase from implementation of the Project Action Alternatives.

Hazardous Materials and Wastes

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

Hazardous Materials and Wastes – Under the Proposed Action Alternatives, a limited use of certain hazardous materials would be required during construction and demolition. Associated HAZMAT could include paints, welding gases, solvents, preservatives, sealants, and pesticides. Additionally, hydraulic fluids and petroleum products, such as diesel and gasoline, would be used in construction and demolition equipment and vehicles. As such, the Proposed Action Alternatives would create the potential for the accidental discharge or spill of HAZMAT and wastes that could contaminate the environment or result in exposure of persons to such contaminants. With the applicable requirements and management plans in place for construction of the Proposed Action Alternatives and no contaminants at concentrations that would pose a risk to construction workers, potential HAZMAT effects would be minor and short term.

Asbestos, Lead Based Paint, and Polychlorinated Biphenyls – Potential risk under the Proposed Action Alternatives would be associated with improper handling of construction and building materials. Improper handling of these materials has the potential to adversely affect HAZMAT and waste at Luke AFB. Concerns of asbestos-containing material (ACM), lead-based paint (LBP), and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) are related to the age of a building. Only Building 1236, which is proposed for demolition under the Proposed Action Alternatives, has the potential to contain LBP or PCBs. Procedures for managing LBP and PCBs would be followed as necessary. No facilities proposed for demolition under the Proposed Action Alternatives have the potential to contain ACM.

Perfluoroalkyl Substances and Aqueous Film Forming Foam – Perfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) may be present in soil and/or groundwater at aqueous film forming foam (AFFF) release sites FT007E and FT007W because of past firefighting training activities. These sites are approximately 0.5 mi northeast of the proposed EOD Range but outside the Northwest Mission District. Under the 2020 Site Investigation, these areas were recommended for remedial investigation. The Oil Water Separator Canal and Surface Impoundment Wash is located directly west of the proposed facilities in the MSA and has also been recommended for a remedial investigation. There are no AFFF release sites in the vicinity of the proposed pedestrian gates. Significant impacts to PFAS and AFFF sites would not be anticipated under the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Environmental Restoration Program Sites – There currently are no active Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) sites at Luke AFB, but there are several former sites that require further monitoring. Construction for Proposed Action Alternatives projects and buildings would take place near several ERP sites. However, due to the inactive status of these ERP sites, impacts to the project sites would not be anticipated. Several projects under the Proposed Action would be implemented in the vicinity of existing

aboveground storage tanks (ASTs). Although some projects would be located within proximity of an existing AST, work under the Proposed Action would not be expected to result in impacts to ASTs.

Safety

No significant effects to safety would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives. The construction and demolition projects would not change existing Flight Safety Clear Zones (CZs), Accident Protection Zones, or explosive safety quantity distance (ESQD) arcs; therefore, no adverse effects to Flight Safety or ESQD arcs would occur. Beneficial impacts would include bringing the EOD Range into compliance and addressing current airfield safety hazards by shifting the EOD Range north of the airfield's runway lateral CZ.

Short-term, negligible-to-minor impacts on contractor health and safety could occur during the proposed construction and demolition projects. To minimize health and safety risks, contractors would be required to use appropriate personal protective equipment and establish and maintain site-specific health and safety programs for their employees and follow all applicable Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations.

Socioeconomics

No significant effects to socioeconomics would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives. The proposed projects would not involve the addition of permanent military, contract, or civilian personnel or their families. Therefore, no impacts to the local or regional population would occur. The construction of new facilities and demolition of existing facilities would result in a temporary increase of 20–50 construction personnel, depending on the number of projects occurring simultaneously; any temporary increase would have a negligible beneficial impact on the socioeconomic condition on the region. Because there would be no permanent increase in military, contract, or civilian personnel, there would be no need for additional housing. Therefore, no adverse impacts on employment, housing, or educational resources would occur under the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Environmental Justice and Protection of Children

No significant effects to environmental justice populations and protection of children would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives. Access to Luke AFB is restricted to military personnel, civilian employees, and assigned contract workers. Demolishing existing buildings and constructing new facilities in the MSA and the EOD Range would be restricted to those areas. Impacts to residents living outside Luke AFB would not occur because the proposed activities are wholly contained within the Base. Therefore, there would be no disproportionate impacts to minority, low-income, or youth populations. The two pedestrian gates would be constructed on the perimeter of Luke AFB. Impacts to military personnel and members of the public would be short-term and limited to restricted traffic lanes and speed limits in construction zones. These impacts would not result in disproportionate impacts to minority, low-income, or youth populations.

Cumulative Impacts

The EA considered cumulative impacts that could result from the incremental impact of Proposed Action Alternatives 1 and 2 when added to other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions on Luke AFB. No potentially significant cumulative impacts were identified.

Mitigation

The EA analysis concluded that neither Alternative 1 nor 2 of the Proposed Action would result in significant environmental impacts; therefore, no mitigation measures are required. BMPs are described and recommended in the EA where applicable.

Conclusion

Finding of No Significant Impact*.* After review of the EA 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.

_____ _____

Commander DATE
USAF