

PUBLIC DRAFT

**PROPOSED FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
PROPOSED FINDING OF NO PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE
DREDGING OPERATIONS AT TYNDALL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA
Unique ID Number EAXX-007-57- UAF-1753182634**

The Department of the Air Force (DAF) has prepared the attached Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate the potential environmental consequences of the Proposed Action to conduct dredging operations at four locations at Tyndall Air Force Base (AFB), Florida. The attached EA is incorporated by reference in this proposed Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (42 United States Code [USC] § 4321 et seq.), as amended and the *Department of Defense (DoD) NEPA Implementing Procedures* (Federal Register 2025–12094).

Purpose and Need

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to improve navigational marine access at Tyndall AFB as part of basewide efforts to fully restore facilities, infrastructure, and operations at the base. The Proposed Action supports the overall natural disaster recovery efforts at Tyndall AFB following the damage caused by Hurricane Michael in 2018. The Proposed Action is needed to ensure that assets and activities of the 325th Fighter Wing (325 FW) mission and tenant units can continue safe marine operations through the waterways in and around Tyndall AFB and have access to Tyndall AFB docks and launches. Recreational and drone-recovery mission requirements at Tyndall AFB can only be met if water depths at Tyndall AFB boat docks and in navigable waterways meet or exceed those used by Tyndall AFB-based watercraft.

The Proposed Action consists of four individual dredging projects programmed for implementation in the next five fiscal years (Fiscal Year [FY] 2026 through FY 2031). These projects are evaluated collectively in this EA to streamline the NEPA compliance process; however, the projects are independent of one another and could be implemented separately from or concurrently with the other projects.

Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives

The Proposed Action assessed in the EA consists of the four projects listed in **Table 1**.

Proposed Action and Action Alternatives

The Proposed Action would implement the projects listed in Table 1. Projects 1, 2, and 4 each consist of four project-level alternatives; Projects 3 consists of three project-level alternatives. The DAF would determine which alternative to implement for all projects following completion of the NEPA process based on factors including mission, operational, and security requirements, potential environmental impacts, and projected cost.

The projects are independent of one another and could be implemented separately from or concurrently with the others. None of the projects would involve the demolition of existing facilities or disturbance of known historic properties, including archaeological sites, at Tyndall AFB.

No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, none of the projects listed in Table 1 would be implemented, and existing conditions at Tyndall AFB would continue. The No Action Alternative does not meet the purpose and need but provides a baseline for the evaluation of potential impacts from the Proposed Action and Action Alternatives and also represents a potential and viable decision to not implement the Proposed Action.

Table 1. Projects Composing the Proposed Action

EA Project Number	Project Name	FSRM Project Number	Project Description
1	53 WEG Large Boat Piers	XLW272001	Dredge and properly dispose of material from approximately 55,000 square feet at the 53 WEG Large Boat Piers via dredge pump or other approved industry standard dredge. Dredging would occur to a depth of up to 4 feet below the present bottom elevation. The total material dredged would be approximately 8,300 cubic yards.
2	325 FSS Bonita Bay Recreational Docks	XLWU272002	Dredge and properly dispose of material from approximately 38,500 square feet at the 325 FSS Bonita Bay Recreational Docks via dredge pump or other approved industry standard to a depth of approximately 4 feet below the present bottom elevation. The total material dredged would be approximately 2,000 cubic yards.
3	325 FSS Beacon Beach Marina Floating Docks	XLWU218128	Dredge and properly dispose of material from approximately 81,400 square feet the 325 FSS Beacon Beach Marina Floating Docks area via dredge pump or other approved industry standard to a depth of no more than 4 feet below the present bottom elevation. The total material dredged would be approximately 8,000 cubic yards
4	Crooked Island Sound Channel	XLWU281001	Dredge and properly dispose of material from approximately 354,200 square feet in the Crooked Island Sound Channel via dredge pump or other approved industry standard to a depth of no more than 5 feet below the present bottom elevation. The total material dredged would be approximately 39,000 cubic yards.

EA – Environmental Assessment; FSRM – Facility Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization; 53 WEG – 53rd Weapons Evaluation Group; 325 FSS – 325th Force Support Squadron

Summary of Findings

Potential impacts from the Proposed Action on resources analyzed in the EA are summarized below. The Proposed Action would have no significant impacts on resources analyzed in the EA. The following resources were dismissed from analysis in the EA because the Proposed Action would have no potential to affect them: airspace and airfield safety zones, land use, geology and topography, visual resources, infrastructure and utilities, and transportation. Throughout this proposed FONSI and the attached EA, the terms “impacts” and “effects” are used interchangeably and have the same meaning.

Noise. The Proposed Action would have no significant short-term or long-term impacts from noise. In the short term, the proposed dredging activities would generate elevated noise levels from workers’ commuting vehicles, dredging equipment, and heavy trucks traveling to and from the

dredging sites to transport dredged material to upland disposal locations; and generally, from increased levels of human activity. Elevated noise levels associated with each project would be highly localized, would diminish with increased distance from the source, and would be unnoticeable or indistinguishable from background noise to listeners outside the boundaries of the installation. Noise from aircraft operations would remain the predominant source of noise at and around Tyndall AFB during dredging activities, and all dredging-related noise would cease when the proposed projects are complete.

In the long term, none of the proposed dredging projects would create a new source of noise at Tyndall AFB. Noise associated with activities at and use of the 53rd Weapons Evaluation Group Large Boat Piers, 325 Force Support Squadron (325 FSS) Bonita Bay Recreation Docks, 325 FSS Beach Marina Floating Docks, and Crooked Island Sound Channel following the completion of dredging would be comparable to noise resulting from similar activities already occurring at these locations. Such noise would not be particularly unusual or distinct from other sources contributing to the ambient noise environment on and around the base and would likely be unnoticeable outside the installation's boundaries. Aircraft operations would continue to be the predominant source of noise at and around Tyndall AFB.

Air Quality. The Proposed Action would have no significant short-term or long-term impacts on air quality or greenhouse gases. Tyndall AFB is in Bay County, Florida, which is designated as attainment (or unclassifiable) for all criteria pollutants. The General Conformity Rule is therefore not applicable to emissions from the Proposed Action. The main source of short-term air quality impacts under the Proposed Action would be dredging activities, including operation of dredging equipment and vessels, and use of vehicles for disposal of dredged materials at an off-base location. These activities would not generate substantial criteria pollutant emissions and would not significantly affect air quality in the region.

Under the Proposed Action, emissions for each pollutant would increase, but the increase would be far less than insignificance indicator values. Impacts on air quality would be short term and minor, ending when dredging operations finish. There would be no long-term impacts on air quality. All construction activities are expected to comply with the emissions control provisions of Rule 62-296.32, Florida Administrative Code (FAC), *General Pollutant Emission Limiting Standards*, Section (4)(c)(c), *Unconfined Emissions of Particulate Matter*, which would reduce dust emissions even further than those estimated.

Soils. The Proposed Action would have no significant short-term or long-term impacts on soils. Dredging activities under Projects 1, 3, and 4 would have no impact on soils on Tyndall AFB. Project 2 would permanently impact approximately 2.67 cubic yards of Arents, 0 to 5 percent slopes soils within an 0.000015-acre area during dredging activities. Arents soils are a human-made mixture of various soil series, resulting from earthmoving operations such as dredging and filling, and are not prone to flooding or ponding. Because these soils are manmade or otherwise previously disturbed, negligible impacts on soils would occur from dredging activities under Project 2.

Disposal at Upland Location 1 would result in the placement of dredged material at the 8.52-acre disposal site, which is 100 percent composed of Kureb sand, 0 to 5 percent slopes soils. Soils at Upland Disposal Location 1 have been previously disturbed by various Tyndall AFB activities. Therefore, negligible impacts on soils would occur from disposal at Upland Location 1.

Disposal at Upland Location 2 would result in the placement of dredged material at the 10.08-acre disposal site, which is composed of 90 percent Resota fine sand, 0 to 5 percent slopes soils and 10 percent Kureb sand, 0 to 5 percent slopes soils. Soils at Upland Disposal Location 2 have been previously disturbed by various Tyndall AFB activities, and negligible impacts on soils would occur.

Disposal at Upland Location 3 would result in the placement of dredged material at the 5.36-acre disposal site, which is 75 percent composed of Fripp-Corolla complex, 2 to 30 percent slopes soils and 25 percent composed of Pottsburg-Pottsburg, wet sand, 0 to 2 percent soils. Soils at Upland Disposal Location 3 have been previously disturbed by various Tyndall AFB activities. As these soils are previously disturbed, only negligible impacts on soils would occur.

Upland Location 4 is composed of approximately 0.12 acre of Fripp-Corolla complex, 2 to 30 percent slopes soils. Upland Location 5 is composed of approximately 0.90 acre of Fripp-Corolla complex, 2 to 30 percent slopes soils. Soils at both these upland disposal locations have been previously disturbed by various Tyndall AFB activities, and negligible impacts on soils would occur.

Dredged materials would be tested, and a hazardous waste determination would be made prior to any dredged materials being deposited onto land. If dredged materials are found to be nonhazardous, they would be pumped onto trucks and hauled to the selected upland disposal location on Tyndall AFB. Clean dredged materials would not require a containment structure or installation of any ground barrier.

Water Resources. The Proposed Action would have no significant short-term or long-term impacts on water resources. Dredging and disposal activities under the Proposed Action would have no impact on groundwater on Tyndall AFB. In the short term, dredging activities may cause impacts on water quality in the form of temporary and minor increases in turbidity during dredging. Dredging activities would increase the amount of suspended solids in the water column, leading to higher turbidity. Dredging could also disturb sediments that have accumulated pollutants and nutrients over time. These contaminants, including heavy metals, pesticides, and other pollutants, could be released into the water column. Turbidity levels would be monitored to ensure that applicable water quality standards are maintained and dredging methods would be in accordance with applicable regulatory permits and best management practices (BMPs). Appropriate measures would be in place to prevent or control spills of fuels, lubricants, or other contaminants from entering waterways or wetlands. All dredging activities would be consistent with state water quality standards and Clean Water Act, Section 401 certification requirements. Short-term adverse impacts on surface water and water quality would not be significant. Dredging impacts would be minor and temporary, not causing a long-term negative impact on the local water quality.

Construction of the proposed projects would have the potential to directly impact up 11.31 acres of federally regulated wetlands and 83.65 acres of Waters of the United States at Tyndall AFB.

The approximate functional loss of wetland values as a result of the Proposed Actions and alternatives would be up to 10.159 units, as determined through an evaluation prepared in accordance with the Florida Uniform Mitigation Assessment Method. The Proposed Action would also disturb up to 37.4 acres of 100-year floodplains on Tyndall AFB, depending on which alternatives are selected.

As project planning continues, each project in the Proposed Action would be designed to avoid or minimize impacts on regulated wetlands, surface waters, and floodplains to the extent possible. Prior to implementing each project, the DAF would coordinate with US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) to obtain a jurisdictional determination and applicable permits for federally and/or state-regulated wetlands and surface waters within each project's limits of disturbance that would be impacted during project implementation. Such permits could include an Environmental Resource Permit issued by the State of Florida. The DAF and its contractors would adhere to all applicable permit requirements to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse impacts on regulated wetlands and surface waters. Although adverse, the loss or reduction in function and values of 11.31 acre of wetlands would be small in the context of all wetlands on Tyndall AFB.

In the context of all 100-year floodplains on Tyndall AFB (approximately 16,047 acres), potential effects on floodplains from the Proposed Action would be relatively small and highly localized. Potential impacts on floodplains would represent approximately 0.23 percent of all floodplains on Tyndall AFB. Adherence to established BMPs, erosion and sediment control measures, and stormwater management practices during dredging and disposal activities would control the discharge of runoff from the project sites and minimize the displacement or increased volume of floodwaters elsewhere on Tyndall AFB. Any potential adverse effects from the localized displacement or increased volume of floodwaters from the proposed projects would be contained within the boundaries of Tyndall AFB.

Based on the security, mission, and operational requirements of the DAF, 325 FW, and other units based at Tyndall AFB, the DAF has determined that other than the projects and project-level alternatives analyzed in this EA, no practicable alternatives exist for implementing the proposed projects outside wetlands and floodplains on Tyndall AFB. Accordingly, the DAF has prepared a Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA) to document its decision to consider projects that would have the potential to affect 100-year floodplains at Tyndall AFB. Further, in accordance with EO 11988, *Floodplain Management*, and EO 11990, *Protection of Wetlands*, the DAF published an Early Public Notice in the *Panama City News Herald* in April 2025 requesting public and agency comments on its proposal to implement projects in or adjacent to wetlands on Tyndall AFB; no comments were received in response to this notice.

DAF has determined that the Proposed Action would be consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the Florida Coastal Management Program (FCMP). In an email dated 7 May 2025, FDEP noted that the State has no objections to the Proposed Action and, therefore, the Proposed Action is consistent with the FCMP.

Biological Resources. The Proposed Action would have no significant short-term or long-term impacts on biological resources. Dredging activities under Project 1 would have no effect on vegetation, as there is none present within the proposed dredging area. Dredging activities under Project 2 could directly impact up to 74.23 square feet (0.002 acre) of submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV). Dredging activities under Project 3 could directly impact up to 582.59 square feet (0.01 acre) of SAV. Under Project 3, direct impacts via burial may be avoided during project design by shifting the proposed dredging area to the west to avoid the SAV. Dredging activities under Project 4 could directly impact up to 411.22 square feet (0.009 acre) of SAV. Nearby dredging activities may induce increased turbidity, which could cause indirect impacts on SAV under Projects 2, 3, and 4. Temporary indirect effects on SAV due to sediment suspension and turbidity may also occur during dredging activities under Projects 2, 3, and 4.

Disposal of dredged material in the proposed in-water location under Project 1, Alternative 4, and Project 2, Alternative 4, could directly impact up to 3,464.17 square feet (0.08 acre) of SAV. Direct impacts via burial may be able to be avoided during project design by shifting the proposed in-water disposal area to north or by avoiding disposal within southeasternmost corner of the currently proposed area where SAV is present.

If impacts on SAV are unavoidable, then mitigation will be required to ensure no net loss of functions, pursuant to Section 373.414(1)(b), 18-21(2)(i), FAC. During the design process, exact project impact areas will be refined, and the actions would be subject to the permitting process. Additional avoidance and minimization measures may be required, including pre- and post-disposal SAV surveys and installation of turbidity curtains around disposal areas to prevent or minimize indirect effects on SAV. Development and implementation of a Turbidity Control and Monitoring Plan could be required by FDEP to ensure that turbidity does not exceed 29 Nephelometric Turbidity Units, a measure of water quality that generally represents a significant level of turbidity impacts on SAV, and that nearby SAV beds will not be affected by turbidity.

Disposal of dredged material at Upland Location 1 would permanently impact up to approximately 8.5 acres of previously disturbed vegetation. Disposal of dredged material at Upland Location 2 would permanently impact up to approximately 10 acres of previously disturbed vegetation. Disposal of dredged material at Upland Locations 4 and 5 would permanently impact up to approximately 1.02 acres of previously disturbed vegetation. While impacts on ruderal vegetation from the proposed projects would be adverse, they would be small within the overall context of all vegetative cover (approximately 22,891 acres) on Tyndall AFB; therefore, adverse impacts on vegetation from dredged material disposal would not be significant.

In the short term, noise and other human activity associated with dredging activities would disturb or displace wildlife. Highly mobile animals would likely relocate to other areas of Tyndall AFB that provide suitable habitat, while less-mobile animals could experience inadvertent injury or mortality. While these short-term impacts would be adverse, they would occur at the individual rather than the community, population, or species level and would not jeopardize the continued existence of any wildlife species. Therefore, adverse short-term impacts on wildlife would not be significant.

The Proposed Action would not introduce or contribute to the spread of invasive species at Tyndall AFB. During all dredging and disposal activities, DAF and all its contractors would adhere to applicable requirements of the Tyndall AFB Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan and Nuisance and Invasive Species Component Plan to prevent the introduction and spread of invasive species on the installation.

In accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the DAF prepared a Biological Assessment (BA) to support the determination of effects from the Proposed Action on federally protected species known to or having the potential to occur in the region of influence (ROI) and Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) within the ROI. Section 7 consultation between the DAF and US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) National Marine Fisheries Service (Fisheries) is ongoing.

Based on the analysis presented in the BA and EA, the DAF has determined that the Proposed Action would have no effect on the bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), Choctawhatchee beach mouse (*Peromyscus polionotus allophrys*), Eastern indigo snake (*Drymarchon corais couperi*), monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*), Godfrey's butterwort (*Pinguicula ionantha*), and white

birds-in-a-nest (*Macbridea alba*). However, it may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, the West Indian manatee (*Trichechus manatus*), Florida manatee (*Trichechus manatus latirostris*), bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*), eastern black rail (*Laterallus jamaicensis jamaicensis*), rufa red knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*), green sea turtle (*Chelonia mydas*), hawksbill sea turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*), Kemp's ridley sea turtle (*Lepidochelys kempii*), leatherback sea turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*), loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*), Gulf sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus desotoi*), and telephus spurge (*Euphorbia telephoides*).

DAF has made a *may affect, and is likely to adversely affect* determination for the St. Andrew beach mouse (*Peromyscus polionotus peninsularis*). DAF anticipates that a total of approximately 9.42 acres of potentially occupied suitable habitat for the St. Andrew beach mouse will be lost by the placement of dredged material within the proposed barrier island disposal area. DAF has made a *may affect and is likely to adversely affect* determination for the piping plover (*Charadrius melanotos*). DAF anticipates that a total of approximately 9.42 acres of potentially occupied, designated critical habitat will be lost by the placement of dredged material within the proposed barrier island disposal area, which would require mitigation.

The Proposed Action would have no effect on any other marine mammals protected under the Marine Mammal Protection with the potential to occur on Tyndall AFB and would have no effect on the tricolored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*) or alligator snapping turtle (*Macroclemys temminckii*) were either to become listed under the ESA.

Based on the analysis presented in the BA and EA, the DAF has determined that Proposed Action does not have the potential to cause significant adverse effects on EFH. In accordance with Section 7 of the ESA and 16 USC Section 1855(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, the DAF has initiated consultation with USFWS and NOAA Fisheries regarding the Proposed Action's potential effects on federally listed species and EFH. USFWS and NOAA Fisheries concurrence with the DAF's determination is pending.

Cultural Resources. The Proposed Action would have no significant short-term or long-term impacts on cultural resources. No known historic properties are within the Area of Potential Effect for any of the proposed project alternatives. Should inadvertent discovery of archaeological deposits be made during dredging or disposal operations, the DAF will follow "Consultation Procedures for Inadvertent Archaeological Discoveries" as detailed in Tyndall AFB's Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan.

Hazardous Materials and Wastes, Environmental Restoration Program, and Toxic Substances. The Proposed Action would have no significant short-term or long-term impacts on or from hazardous materials and waste. All hazardous materials, hazardous waste, and nonhazardous solid waste associated with the Proposed Action would be used, handled, stored, and disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local requirements and would not exceed Tyndall AFB's capacity to manage such materials and waste. All proposed projects would be reviewed by the 325th Civil Engineer Squadron to identify potential contaminants in soils and groundwater underlying the project sites. Contractors would adhere to project-specific health and safety plans and the applicable requirements of Tyndall AFB's Environmental Restoration Program and Aqueous Film Forming Foam Guidelines to ensure the health and safety of workers at each site. The proposed projects would not disturb, delay, prevent, or otherwise interfere with the ongoing monitoring and remediation of active Environmental Restoration Program sites at Tyndall AFB or prevent the achievement of long-term objectives for those sites.

Safety. The Proposed Action would have no significant short-term or long-term adverse impacts on safety. Potential adverse effects on the health and safety of construction workers would be minimized to acceptable levels through adherence to applicable Occupational Safety and Health Administration and Air Force Occupational Safety and Health requirements, as well as requirements specified in project and site-specific health and safety plans. The review of project and site plans by the 325th Civil Engineer Squadron prior to beginning dredging activities would further prevent or minimize potential health and safety risks to construction workers. All projects would be compatible with the requirements of existing Explosives Safety Quantity-Distance zones, and none would be implemented in or near active Explosives Ordnance Disposal ranges or firing ranges on Tyndall AFB or within active Military Munitions Response Program sites. Therefore, the proposed project alternatives would have no adverse short-term or long-term effects on explosives safety or from unexploded ordnance at Tyndall AFB.

The dredging projects would remove sediment and debris deposited during Hurricane Micheal, thereby improving safety for recreational boaters and DAF personnel. Therefore, the Proposed Action would have beneficial short-term to long-term impacts on safety, lasting until additional sediment and debris accumulate.

Socioeconomics. The Proposed Action would have no significant short-term or long-term impacts on socioeconomics. In the short term, the Proposed Action could have beneficial economic effects if local contractors are hired to design and implement dredging activities and to haul dredged material to its disposal location, or from local purchases of construction materials, meals, lodging, and equipment. However, any such effects would be small given the relatively small scale of the proposed project in the context of the local economy of Bay County and the overall economic output of Tyndall AFB. All beneficial economic effects would end after the project is completed. These short-term beneficial effects on socioeconomics would not be significant.

The Proposed Action would have no long-term effects on socioeconomics because it would not increase or decrease the number of personnel at Tyndall AFB and would have no potential to affect local socioeconomic conditions such as population, employment, or tax revenue.

Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions

When considered with other reasonably foreseeable future actions occurring on and near Tyndall AFB, the Proposed Action would not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on resources analyzed in the EA.

Mitigation

The precise extent of potential impacts on designated critical habitat for the federally threatened piping plover and on federally and state-regulated wetlands and surface waters from the Proposed Action is not currently known. The DAF prepared a BA for consultation with the USFWS and NOAA Fisheries under Section 7 of the ESA regarding potential impacts on the piping plover and its designated critical habitat. For potential impacts on federally and state-regulated wetlands and surface waters, the DAF would acquire all necessary permits from USACE and FDEP prior to implementing projects that would have the potential to impact federally and state-regulated wetlands and surface waters on Tyndall AFB. Potential impacts on wetlands and surface waters would be avoided, minimized, or mitigated in accordance with all applicable permit requirements.

Project-specific BMPs and environmental commitments are not identified for resources analyzed in the EA; however, the use of standard BMPs is assumed, when applicable, in the discussion of environmental consequences presented in the EA.

Public Involvement

A 30-day public and agency scoping period for the Proposed Action was conducted in April and May 2025. An Early Public Notice announcing the Proposed Action's potential to affect wetlands and floodplains and requesting public comments was published in the *Panama City News Herald* on 13 April 2025. Letters were sent to federal and state agencies and Native American tribes on 11 April 2025, requesting comments on the Proposed Action and potentially affected resources. No comments requiring changes to the Proposed Action, alternatives, or resources evaluated in the EA were received during the scoping period.

The Draft EA is being made available for a 30-day public review period. A Notice of Availability was published in the *Panama City News Herald* inviting the public to review and comment on the Draft EA during the 30-day public comment period. Electronic copies of the Draft EA and proposed FONSI/FONPA are available for public review and download on the Tyndall AFB website at <https://www.tyndall.af.mil/About/Environmental/AboutUs/Home/Contact.aspx>.

Conclusion

Finding of No Significant Impact. After review of the attached EA, which was prepared in accordance with the requirements of NEPA, I have determined that the Proposed Action to implement four dredging projects at Tyndall AFB would not have a significant impact on the quality of the human or natural environment. Accordingly, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. This decision has been made after considering all submitted information, including a review of any public and agency comments received during the 30-day public comment period, and considering a full range of reasonable alternatives that meet project requirements and are within the legal authority of the DAF. I hereby certify that this PEA represents DoD's good-faith effort to fulfill NEPA's requirements while prioritizing documentation of the most important considerations required by the Congressionally mandated page limits and timeline; that such effort is substantially complete; and that, in the DoD's expert opinion, it has thoroughly considered the factors mandated by NEPA; and that, in the DoD's judgment, the analysis contained therein is adequate to inform and reasonably explain DoD's final decision regarding the proposed federal action.

Finding of No Practicable Alternative. Pursuant to EO 11988 and EO 11990, and considering all supporting information, I find there is no practicable alternative to implementing elements of the Proposed Action entirely outside of floodplains and wetlands, as described in the attached EA. The DAF will plan, design, and implement the proposed projects to avoid or minimize potential impacts on floodplains and wetlands to the extent possible, and will adhere to all applicable permitting requirements to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any potential impacts that cannot be prevented through project planning and design. This finding fulfills the requirements of the referenced EOs for a FONPA.

MATTHEW T. OLSON, Col, USAF Chief,
Civil Engineer Division
HQ ACC/A4C, JBLE

DATE