

Draft
**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT/
FINDING OF NO PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE
FOR**

**TYNDALL AIR FORCE BASE COASTAL RESILIENCE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (*42 United States Code 4331 et seq.*), the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality that implement NEPA procedures (*40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500–1508*), and 32 CFR 989, “Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP)” for the Department of the Air Force (DAF), the DAF has prepared this Programmatic Environmental Assessment (EA) to analyze the potential environmental impacts of implementing the Tyndall Air Force Base (AFB) Coastal Resilience Implementation Plan (CRIP) and four associated nature-based solutions (NBS) pilot projects at Tyndall AFB, Florida.

Proposed Action

The Proposed Action is to implement the Tyndall AFB CRIP, which has been developed to improve the resilience of Tyndall AFB against coastal flooding impacts from strong storms and sea-level rise through traditional and NBS flood defense strategies. The CRIP analyzes long-term coastal resilience out to Year 2100 and identifies flood defense strategies that include traditional structural options such as constructing levees and floodwalls around flood-prone areas, nonstructural options such as elevating flood-prone facilities, and NBS options to be implemented where appropriate throughout Tyndall AFB and adjacent nearshore waters. The Proposed Action also includes implementing four NBS pilot projects in the nearshore waters of Tyndall AFB under the CRIP, which include the creation of a living shoreline breakwater, oyster reef breakwater, and shoreline stabilization breakwater, and the enhancement of seagrass habitat.

All the flood defense strategies recommended in the CRIP are conceptual and analyzed on a programmatic level in the attached EA. In contrast, the EA provides a detailed analysis of the four proposed pilot projects, which would be the first NBS projects implemented under the CRIP. These projects have defined locations, layouts, and materials and, therefore, are analyzed in detail in the EA. All the other traditional and NBS options under the CRIP that are analyzed programmatically in the EA would undergo separate environmental review by Tyndall AFB if they are proposed to be implemented in the future; the subsequent environmental reviews of proposed CRIP projects would be tiered off the analyses in the attached EA, as applicable.

Alternatives

Two action alternatives (Alternatives 1 and 2) for implementing the Tyndall AFB CRIP, two action alternatives (Alternatives 1 and 2) for implementing the four in-water NBS pilot projects, and the No Action Alternative are analyzed in the attached EA. Under Alternative 1 for CRIP implementation (preferred alternative), the flood defense strategies recommended for each district of Tyndall AFB in the final CRIP would be implemented. The specific projects identified in the final CRIP are the preferred flood defense options for the various districts of the base. Under Alternative 2, structural solutions that differ from the preferred structural solutions under Alternative 1 for certain districts would be implemented. Under Alternative 1, the preferred structural solutions are earthen levees. Under Alternative 2, concrete floodwalls instead of levees would be constructed. Floodwalls would serve the same purpose as levees but would differ from levees in their construction footprint, potential impacts to natural and cultural

resources, and overall cost. Alternative 2 would include the same nonstructural CRIP solutions as Alternative 1, which include constructing new buildings to the design flood elevation, floodproofing existing at-risk buildings, and incorporating NBS options for all seven districts of the base.

Under Alternative 1 for the four NBS pilot projects (preferred alternative), the breakwaters would be constructed based on the preferred design for each breakwater, which is a submerged quarry stone breakwater. Under Alternative 2, a submerged pile-mounted concrete disk breakwater would be installed for the living shoreline and oyster reef breakwater projects and a submerged geotube breakwater would be installed for the shoreline stabilization project. The designs under Alternative 2 would serve the same purpose as the quarry stone breakwater design under Alternative 1 but would differ in construction footprint, effectiveness, cost, and other factors. The Alternative 2 breakwaters would be constructed within the same footprints as the Alternative 1 breakwaters.

Under the No Action Alternative, none of the CRIP projects, NBS pilot projects, or strategies identified in the CRIP to reduce the coastal flood risk at Tyndall AFB would be implemented.

Environmental Consequences

Based on the findings of the attached EA, implementation of the Tyndall AFB CRIP under either Alternative 1 or 2 would have no effect on airspace and a less-than-significant impact on air quality, climate change, water resources, geological resources, cultural resources, biological resources, noise, infrastructure, land use, public health and safety, hazardous materials and wastes, and socioeconomics. Implementation of the CRIP under either Alternative 1 or 2 would not have disproportionate environmental or human health effects on minority or low-income populations, and would not result in disproportionate environmental health or safety risks to children. When combined with past, present, or future actions, neither alternative would have adverse cumulative impacts on any resource analyzed. The EA identifies the mitigation measures required to avoid, minimize, or offset potential impacts to air quality, water resources, cultural resources, and biological resources under both alternatives. Wetland impacts from constructing the Alternative 1 levees or Alternative 2 floodwalls would be offset by purchasing wetland mitigation credits from the Horseshoe Creek Mitigation Bank (HCMB). Based on the wetland mitigation plan developed for the EA, construction of all the Alternative 1 levees would require a total of 10.93 palustrine forested (PFO) credits and 1.94 palustrine emergent (PEM) credits, and construction of all the Alternative 2 floodwalls would require a total of 2.99 PFO credits and 0.6 PEM credit. Tyndall AFB commits to purchasing the estimated number of mitigation credits, or the actual number if different, to offset the wetland impacts from implementing the CRIP under the Proposed Action. Based on current HCMB credit prices, the credits required for all Alternative 1 levees would cost a total of \$1,052,050, and the credits required for all the Alternative 2 floodwalls would cost a total of \$299,150.

All the flood defense projects in the Tyndall AFB CRIP are conceptual and analyzed on a programmatic level in the attached EA. Any CRIP projects proposed in the future would undergo a separate environmental review that follows Air Force Form 813, *Request for Environmental Impact Analysis* (32 CFR 989.12), prior to implementation. Through this subsequent review, the DAF would reassess potential impacts and determine the associated mitigation and consultation requirements for the project; this review would be tiered off the programmatic impact analyses in the attached EA, as applicable.

Based on the findings of the attached EA, implementation of the four NBS pilot projects under either Alternative 1 or 2 would have no effect on airspace or infrastructure and a less-than-significant impact on air quality, climate change, water resources, geological resources, cultural resources, biological resources, noise, land use, public health and safety, hazardous materials and wastes, and socioeconomics. Implementation of the NBS projects under either Alternative 1 or 2 would not have disproportionate environmental or human health effects on minority or low-income populations, and would not result in disproportionate environmental health or safety risks to children. When combined with past, present, or future actions, neither alternative would have adverse cumulative impacts on any resource analyzed. The

EA identifies the mitigation measures required to avoid, minimize, or offset potential impacts to air quality, water resources, cultural resources, and biological resources under both alternatives.

Public Review and Stakeholder Consultation

A public notice was published in the *Panama City News Herald* to announce the 30-day early public review period for the Proposed Action to provide opportunity for early public review of proposed federal actions in wetlands or floodplains. A Notice of Availability is being published in the *Panama City News Herald* to announce the 30-day availability of the draft EA and this draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)/Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA) for public review and comment. Copies of the draft EA and FONSI/FONPA are being made available for public access at the Bay County Public Library in Panama City, Florida, and on the Tyndall AFB public website. The Florida State Clearinghouse is coordinating state review of the draft EA to determine consistency of the Proposed Action with the Florida Coastal Management Program.

The DAF is informally consulting under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act with NMFS, on the NBS projects under Alternative 1. The DAF is consulting with the State Historic Preservation Office under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) on the Proposed Action. The Native American tribes affiliated with the land encompassed by Tyndall AFB are being consulted on the Proposed Action through intergovernmental coordination between the tribes and base under Section 106 of the NHPA. Documentation of intergovernmental and interagency consultation on the Proposed Action is included in Appendix A of the attached EA. Documentation of public participation in the EA process is included in Appendix B of the attached EA.

Finding of No Practicable Alternative

Pursuant to Executive Order 11988, "Floodplain Management," and Executive Order 11990, "Protection of Wetlands," and considering all supporting information, the DAF finds that there is no practicable alternative to the Proposed Action being located in floodplains or wetlands, as discussed in the attached EA. The 7000 area is in the floodplain and surrounded by wetlands; therefore, no layout or design for a levee or floodwall could avoid floodplains or wetlands at this site. Portions of the original CRIP levee and floodwall alignments were modified to avoid floodplains and wetlands to the extent practicable while still allowing the levees and floodwalls to encompass all the assets within the protected area. Opportunities to further reduce floodplain and wetland impacts at some of the sites would be assessed during future actual design. Compensatory wetland mitigation would be provided for any unavoidable wetland impacts that result from CRIP implementation under Alternative 1 or 2, as discussed in the attached EA. The proposed NBS breakwaters must be located offshore, and other alternatives such as armoring the shoreline with riprap would result in excessive environmental damage and would not qualify as an NBS strategy. Compensatory mitigation is not expected to be required for the NBS projects under Alternative 1 or 2 based on their beneficial purpose and lack of seagrass impacts. The attached EA identifies all practicable measures to minimize harm to floodplains and wetlands.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based on my review of the facts and analysis in the attached EA, I conclude that implementation of the CRIP under Alternative 1 or 2 and implementation of the NBS projects under Alternative 1 or 2 would not have a significant impact on the natural or human environment, either by themselves or considering cumulative impacts. The requirements of NEPA, the President's Council on Environmental Quality, and 32 CFR Part 989 have been fulfilled. An Environmental Impact Statement is not required and will not be prepared.

ANDREW E. DEROSA, Colonel, USAF
Chief, Civil Engineer Division
HQ ACC/A4C, Director of Logistics, Engineering and Force Protection

Date