

**PROPOSED FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
PROPOSED FINDING OF NO PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE
CIVIL ENGINEER MAINTENANCE, INSPECTION AND REPAIR TEAM
FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
TYNDALL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA**

Pursuant to provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 United States Code §§ 4321-4370, and the DoD NEPA Implementing Procedures, the Department of Air Force (DAF) has prepared the attached Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts from the Proposed Action to implement facility and infrastructure improvements for the Civil Engineer Maintenance, Inspection and Repair Team (CEMIRT) facility at Tyndall Air Force Base (AFB), Florida. The attached EA is incorporated by reference in this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)/Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA).

Purpose and Need

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to provide facility and infrastructure improvements that support current and future CEMIRT operations at Tyndall AFB. The Proposed Action is needed because existing CEMIRT facilities and infrastructure at Tyndall AFB are not sufficient to meet mission requirements.

The proposed improvements are also needed to meet applicable DoD and DAF requirements specified in the most current versions of Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) 3-250-01, *Pavement Design for Roads and Parking Areas*, UFC 3-530-01, *Interior and Exterior Lighting Systems*, UFC 4-010-01, *DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings*, UFC 4-022-03, *Security Fences and Gates*, and Air Force Manual 32-1040, *Civil Engineer Airfield Infrastructure Systems*; and comply with applicable federal, state, local and DoD laws and regulations, including the Endangered Species Act, National Historic Preservation Act, Clean Water Act (CWA), Clean Air Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives

Under the Proposed Action, the DAF would construct, operate, and maintain a 60,000-square foot (SF) reinforced concrete slab and associated infrastructure improvements at Tyndall AFB to provide sufficient operational and storage space (equipment area) for CEMIRT and meet applicable DoD and DAF facility requirements. Construction of the proposed slab and associated improvements would cumulatively disturb up to 190,000 SF (4.4 acres) and would include site preparation, construction of a permanent access road from the existing CEMIRT facility to the equipment area, appropriate lighting, perimeter security fencing, pavement markings and signing, fire hydrants, and stormwater management features. The Proposed Action is proposed for implementation between fiscal years 2026 and 2028.

The DAF initially considered four alternatives for implementing the Proposed Action. Two alternatives were dismissed because they did not meet selection standards used to identify alternatives that would meet the purpose and need. Alternatives retained for detailed analysis in the attached EA are summarized below.

Alternative 1

Alternative 1 would implement the Proposed Action at an approximately 4.4-acre site adjacent to and immediately northeast of the existing CEMIRT facility. Available space for development near the CEMIRT facility is limited, and the location of Alternative 1 was identified to maximize adjacency to and efficiency with the existing facility and to minimize potential impacts on existing wetlands, floodplains, and other environmental resources. Alternative 1 would result in an estimated 190,000 SF (4.4 acres) of cumulative land disturbance, corresponding to approximately 19,233 cubic yards (CY) of soil disturbance.

Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would implement the Proposed Action at an approximately 3.6-acre site south of and directly across Mississippi Road from the existing CEMIRT facility. Although not adjacent to the existing CEMIRT facility, its location directly across Mississippi Road would nonetheless maximize mission adjacency and efficiency with the existing facility while minimizing potential impacts on existing wetlands, floodplains, and other environmental resources. Alternative 2 would result in an estimated 155,542 SF (3.6 acres) of cumulative land disturbance, corresponding to approximately 16,839 CY of soil disturbance.

No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Action would not be implemented and existing conditions at Tyndall AFB would continue. The No Action Alternative provides a baseline for the evaluation of potential impacts from the Proposed Action Alternative and also represents a potential and viable decision to not implement the Proposed Action.

Summary of Findings

The summary of findings presented below is based on the detailed analysis provided in the attached EA. Unless otherwise noted, potential impacts from Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 would be the same; these alternatives are collectively referred to as the Proposed Action. Throughout this FONSI and the attached EA, the terms “environmental consequences”, “impacts”, and “effects” are used interchangeably and have the same meaning.

Air Quality

The Proposed Action would have no significant short- or long-term impacts on air quality and greenhouse gases. Tyndall AFB is in Bay County, Florida, which is designated as in attainment (or unclassifiable) for all criteria pollutants. As such, the General Conformity Rule is not applicable to emissions from the Proposed Action. The highest annual emission rate from construction-phase activities would be for particulate matter equal to or less than 10 microns (PM₁₀) (6.71 tons per year [tpy]), which would be below the insignificance indicator values of 250 tpy (25 tpy for lead). Contractors would comply with applicable regulations and take reasonable measures to prevent or minimize pollutant emissions during construction activities. In the long term, emissions of criteria air pollutants associated with the Proposed Action would remain well below applicable insignificance indicators and would result in a net reduction in pollutant emissions when combined with the reduction in commuting distance needed to transport equipment to and from a temporary storage area, thereby resulting in a beneficial effect on air quality.

Estimated greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the Proposed Action would be negligible relative to GHG emissions at both the state and national levels and therefore, would not result in a significant impact at a regional, national, or global scale.

Cultural Resources

The Proposed Action would have no significant short- or long-term impacts on cultural resources. No historic properties have been identified during previous cultural surveys within the Alternative 1 Area of Potential Effects (APE), and no unevaluated historic properties or historic properties that are listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places are within 1,000 feet of the APE. No historic properties are known to be present within the Alternative 2 APE and no Section 110 cultural resources surveys have been conducted within the Alternative 2 APE. Should the Alternative 2 site be selected for implementation of the Proposed Action, Tyndall AFB would perform cultural resources surveys and conduct additional Section 106 consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) as needed prior to construction to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential adverse effects on historic properties.

In accordance with 36 CFR § 800.5, the DAF has determined that the Proposed Action would have no adverse effect on historic properties. The Florida SHPO's concurrence with this determination is pending.

Biological Resources

The Proposed Action would have no significant short- or long-term impacts on biological resources. Construction of the proposed equipment area and associated infrastructure would permanently disturb up to 4.4 acres of vegetation and associated wildlife habitat on Tyndall AFB. Noise, vegetation clearing, and other human activity associated with construction would disturb or displace wildlife on or adjacent to the selected alternative site. Highly mobile animals would likely relocate to other areas of Tyndall AFB providing suitable habitat, while less-mobile animals could experience inadvertent injury or mortality.

Although the permanent removal of up to 4.4 acres of vegetation and associated habitat would represent an adverse impact, this impact would be small in the overall context of all vegetative cover (approximately 22,891 acres) on Tyndall AFB. Undeveloped areas of the project sites would be replanted with native vegetation to the extent possible, and all remaining vegetation in the Region of Influence (ROI) would be maintained in accordance with the applicable requirements of the Tyndall AFB *Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan* and other applicable guidance documents. Potential impacts on wildlife would occur at the individual rather than the community, population, or species level and would not jeopardize the continued existence of any species. Once operational, the proposed equipment area and associated infrastructure would be operated and maintained in accordance with applicable Tyndall AFB management plans to prevent or minimize impacts on vegetation and wildlife to the extent possible.

In accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, the DAF prepared a Biological Assessment (BA) to support the determination of effects from the Proposed Action on federally protected species known or having potential to occur on or adjacent to the selected alternative site. 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*); may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the Choctawhatchee beach mouse (*Peromyscus polionotus alloparys*) and its critical habitat, eastern indigo snake (*Drymarchon couperi*), Godfrey's butterwort (*Pinguicula ionantha*), 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*), St. Andrew beach mouse (*Peromyscus polionotus peninsularis*), telephus spurge (*Euphorbia telephioides*), and white birds-in-a-nest (*Macbridea alba*); and is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the monarch butterfly and tricolored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*). These determinations are summarized in **Table 1**. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service concurrence with these determinations is pending.

Table 1 Effects Determinations for Federally Protected Species and Critical Habitat

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	Determination
eastern indigo snake	<i>Drymarchon couperi</i>	T	May affect, not likely to adversely affect.
Choctawhatchee beach mouse	<i>Peromyscus polionotus alloparys</i>	E	May affect, not likely to adversely affect the species or its critical habitat.
Godfrey's butterwort	<i>Pinguicula ionantha</i>	T	May affect, not likely to adversely affect.
green sea turtle	<i>Chelonia mydas</i>	T	May affect, not likely to adversely affect.
hawksbill sea turtle	<i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i>	E	May affect, not likely to adversely affect.
Kemp's ridley sea turtle	<i>Lepidochelys kempii</i>	E	May affect, not likely to adversely affect.
leatherback sea turtle	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	E	May affect, not likely to adversely affect.
loggerhead sea turtle	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	T	May affect, not likely to adversely affect.

Table 1 Effects Determinations for Federally Protected Species and Critical Habitat

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	Determination
St. Andrew beach mouse	<i>Peromyscus polionotus peninsularis</i>	E	May affect, not likely to adversely affect.
telephus spurge	<i>Euphorbia telephioides</i>	T	May affect, not likely to adversely affect.
white birds-in-a-nest	<i>Macbridea alba</i>	T	May affect, not likely to adversely affect.
bald eagle	<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	BGEPA	No effect.
tricolored bat	<i>Perimyotis subflavus</i>	PE	Not likely to jeopardize the continued existence; if it becomes listed, the determination would be "may affect, not likely to adversely affect."
monarch butterfly	<i>Danaus plexippus</i>	PT	Not likely to jeopardize the continued existence; if it becomes listed, the determination would be "may affect, not likely to adversely affect."

Notes:

BGEPA = Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act; E = Endangered; PE = Proposed Endangered; PT = Proposed Threatened; T = Threatened

Water Resources

The Proposed Action would have no significant short-term or long-term impacts on water resources. Construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed equipment area and associated infrastructure would not require new or increased withdrawals of groundwater and would not involve intentional discharges to groundwater. Adherence to applicable best management practices (BMPs) and permitting requirements during construction would prevent or minimize the erosion of exposed soils and corresponding sedimentation and pollution in receiving water bodies. Any accidental spills or releases of hazardous substances during construction would be immediately contained and cleaned up in accordance with Tyndall AFB's *Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan* before the spilled substances could infiltrate groundwater underlying the base.

New impervious surface totaling approximately 1.4 acres on Tyndall AFB associated with the Proposed Action would result in corresponding increases in the volume of stormwater generated on the installation. Permanent on-site stormwater management BMPs included in the Proposed Action would help increase infiltration, limit stormwater runoff rates, and reduce the potential for downstream flooding. Stormwater generated on Tyndall AFB would continue to be managed in accordance with the applicable requirements of the installation's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and would not be expected to introduce new sources of pollutants, contribute to exceedances of applicable water quality standards, or prevent the achievement of water quality objectives established in applicable Total Maximum Daily Loads applicable to surface water bodies near the base. As applicable, Tyndall AFB would also obtain and adhere to the requirements of an Individual Environmental Resource Permit (Chapter 62-330.020, Florida Administrative Code) for stormwater generated by projects that would add more than 4,000 SF of impervious surface subject to vehicular activity or 9,000 SF of total impervious surface. No in-water activities or alteration of surface water bodies would occur during the operational phase of the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action would not establish a new permitted source of pollutant discharges, and any accidental spills or releases of hazardous substances, such as fuels, during construction and operation of the proposed equipment area would be immediately contained and cleaned up in accordance with the Tyndall AFB *SPCC Plan*. In the context of permeable surface that would remain on the base following implementation of the Proposed Action, as well as surrounding bodies of surface water that would continue to contribute to the recharge of groundwater underlying the base, increases in impervious surface from the Proposed Action would be small and would have no potential to impede or prevent regional groundwater infiltration and recharge.

Construction of the proposed equipment area and associated infrastructure would have the potential to directly impact up to 1.41 acres of wetlands subject to federal and/or state regulatory jurisdiction at Tyndall AFB under Alternative 1. These impacts would result in up to 0.85 functional loss units of wetland values, as determined through an evaluation prepared in accordance with the Florida Uniform Mitigation Assessment Method. Construction of the proposed equipment area and associated infrastructure under Alternative 2 would have the potential to directly impact up to 0.961 acres of wetlands subject to federal and/or state regulatory jurisdiction and would result in up to 0.74 functional loss units of wetland values.

As project planning continues, the Proposed Action would be designed to avoid or minimize impacts on regulated wetlands and floodplains to the extent possible. Prior to implementing the Proposed Action, the DAF would coordinate with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) to obtain a jurisdictional determination and applicable permits for federal and/or state-regulated wetlands within the Proposed Action's limits of disturbance that would be impacted during project construction. 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. Although adverse, the loss or reduction in function and values of up to 1.41 of wetlands would be small in the context of all wetlands on Tyndall AFB, representing less than 0.1 percent of wetlands on the base.

The Proposed Action would disturb up to 2.74 acres of 100-year floodplains and up to 0.23 acres of 500-year floodplains on Tyndall AFB, depending on which alternative is selected. In the context of all 100-year floodplains on Tyndall AFB (approximately 16,047 acres), and 500-year floodplains on Tyndall AFB (approximately 2,085 acres) potential effects on floodplains from the Proposed Action would be small and highly localized. Total impacts on floodplains from the Proposed Action would represent less than 0.1 percent of all floodplains on Tyndall AFB. Adherence to established BMPs, erosion and sediment control measures, and stormwater management practices during construction would control the discharge of runoff from the project site and minimize the displacement or increased volume of floodwaters on Tyndall AFB. Any potential adverse effects from the localized displacement or increased volume of floodwaters from the Proposed Action would be contained within the boundaries of Tyndall AFB and would not increase the risk of downstream property damage or human injury.

Based on the security, mission, and operational requirements of the DAF, 325th Fighter Wing, and other units based at Tyndall AFB, the DAF has determined that other than the two locations proposed for implementing the Proposed Action analyzed in the attached EA, no practicable alternatives exist for implementing the Proposed Action outside wetlands and floodplains on Tyndall AFB. Accordingly, the DAF has prepared a 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 Executive Order (E.O.) 11988, Floodplain Management and E.O. 11990, Protection of Wetlands, the DAF published an Early Public Notice in the *Panama City News Herald* in May 2025 requesting public and agency comments on its proposal to implement the project in or adjacent to wetlands and floodplains on Tyndall AFB; no comments in response to this notice were received.

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 June 16, 2025, FDEP noted that the State has no objections to the Proposed Action and therefore, the Proposed Action is consistent with the FCMP.

Hazardous Materials and Waste

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 non-hazardous 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. Any accidental spills of hazardous materials would be immediately contained, controlled, and cleaned up in accordance with the Tyndall AFB *SPCC Plan* and applicable project- or site-specific plans. The selected site would be reviewed by the 325th Civil Engineer Squadron (325 CES) to

identify potential contaminants in soils and groundwater underlying the site, and 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. Soil and groundwater contamination is not anticipated at either site because both sites are outside of a 500-foot soil and groundwater contamination buffer for nearby active Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) sites. The construction and operation of the Proposed Action would not disturb, delay, prevent, or otherwise interfere with the ongoing monitoring and remediation of active ERP sites at Tyndall AFB or prevent the achievement of long-term objectives for those sites.

Infrastructure / Utilities

The Proposed Action would have no significant short-term or long-term impacts on infrastructure and utilities. Infrastructure and utility systems underlying the project sites would be identified and avoided, rerouted, or abandoned in place in accordance with applicable federal and state requirements prior to beginning construction activities. Advance notice would be provided to any facilities that would potentially be affected by temporary utility shutdowns during construction, and utility systems would be temporarily rerouted or relocated as needed to avoid any such shutdowns to the extent possible. The Proposed Action does not include increases in the number of personnel assigned to Tyndall AFB, nor does it involve the construction and operation of human-occupied facilities on the installation. Additional utility demand generated by the Proposed Action would primarily be limited to electricity to power security lighting, electric security gates and surveillance systems associated with the proposed fencing. Such demand would be well within the existing capacity of existing utility systems at Tyndall AFB.

Soils

The Proposed Action would have no significant short-term or long-term impacts on soils. Construction of the equipment area and associated infrastructure would disturb up to 19,233 CY of soils on Tyndall AFB under Alternative 1, and up to 16,839 CY of soils on Tyndall AFB under Alternative 2. As needed, clean fill soils would be imported to the selected site if site-specific engineering analysis determines that existing soils would not be suitable to support construction of the proposed equipment area. Approximately 2,590 CY of clean fill soils could be needed under Alternative 1 or approximately 2,570 CY under Alternative 2. Fill soils would either be obtained from on-base soil stockpiles or from a location off-base and certified as clean before placement on the selected alternative site. Contractors would implement and adhere to the applicable requirements of site-specific erosion and sediment control plans and stormwater pollution prevention plans to prevent or minimize soil erosion and the migration of sediments and pollutants to receiving water bodies. The Proposed Action does not involve the intentional release of pollutants or hazardous substances to soils on the project sites; any accidental spills would be immediately contained and cleaned up to minimize soil impacts. Adherence to site- and project-specific health and safety plans by construction contractors would minimize potential risks to workers involved in ground-disturbing activities. Soils determined to contain pollutants or other hazardous substances would be removed and disposed of at a permitted off-base facility in accordance with applicable DoD and DAF requirements.

Any soils remaining exposed or otherwise not built on would be revegetated with native species in accordance with applicable operational and security requirements to prevent or minimize the potential for ongoing erosion of exposed soils. Other than soil disturbance associated with periodic maintenance activities, such as periodic vegetation trimming and removal to maintain visual sight lines along the fence line, ongoing soil disturbance would not occur; any such soil disturbance occurring as part of these activities would remain small in the context of Tyndall AFB.

Safety

The Proposed Action would have no significant short- or long-term impacts on safety. Potential adverse effects on the health and safety of construction workers would be minimized and managed to acceptable levels through adherence to applicable Occupational Safety and Health Administration and Air Force Occupational Safety and Health requirements and requirements specified in a project- and site-specific health and safety plan. The review of project and site plans by the 325 CES prior to beginning construction activities would further prevent or minimize potential health and safety risks to construction workers.

The Proposed Action would not require the establishment of new or the modification of existing Explosives Safety Quantity-Distance zones. Neither of the alternative sites are in or near active explosives ordnance disposal ranges or firing ranges on Tyndall AFB, or within active Military Munitions Response Program sites. The Alternative 1 site is located outside of, but would be compatible with a nearby existing explosives safety quantity-distance zone associated with the storage of small-caliber munitions.

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 construct the proposed project, or from local purchases of construction materials, meals, lodging, and equipment. Any such effects would be small given the small scale of the Proposed Action 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 construction of the proposed facility is completed. These short-term beneficial effects 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, age, employment, tax revenue, or other social or economic activity in the ROI.

Noise

The Proposed Action would have no significant short-term or long-term impacts from noise. In the short term, construction of the proposed project would generate elevated noise levels from workers' commuting vehicles and heavy trucks traveling to and from the project sites; heavy equipment and tools used to construct the project, and generally increased levels of human activity. Elevated noise levels associated with the proposed project would be highly localized, would diminish with increased distance from the source, and would be unnoticeable or indistinguishable 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 construction activities, and all construction-related noise would cease when construction of the proposed equipment area and associated infrastructure is completed.

In the long term, the proposed project would not create a new source of noise at Tyndall AFB. Noise associated with the operation and periodic maintenance of the proposed equipment area would be infrequent and similar to noise resulting from similar activities already occurring at Tyndall AFB. Aircraft operations would continue to be the predominant source of noise at and around Tyndall AFB once the proposed facility is operational.

Transportation

The Proposed Action would have no significant short-term or long-term impacts on transportation. In the short term, construction workers' commuting vehicles and other construction-related vehicles (such as heavy trucks delivering materials and equipment) would increase traffic traveling to and from Tyndall AFB and could contribute to additional traffic congestion in the ROI. Approximately 173 truck trips would be needed to import clean fill soils to the Alternative 1 site or 171 truck trips to the Alternative 2 site. Fewer truck trips would be needed on off-base roads if suitable fill soils could be obtained from on-base soil stockpiles. These traffic increases and any additional congestion would be small in the context of existing traffic volumes traveling to and from Tyndall AFB and would vary throughout the construction phase. The on-base road network is considered sufficient to handle existing and future traffic volumes, including traffic associated with current and planned construction projects and the ongoing military mission at Tyndall AFB. Following the completion of the proposed project, construction-related impacts on the transportation network would end.

In the long term, the Proposed Action would not change the number of personnel assigned to Tyndall AFB and would have no potential to result in changes to commuting patterns, require improvements to on-base and off-base transportation networks, permanently increase traffic volumes on on-base and off-base roads, or otherwise increase demands on or the capacity of existing on-base and off-base transportation networks.

and infrastructure. The Proposed Action would have a small but beneficial impact on the on-base transportation network because there would no longer be a need to transport CEMIRT's mobile aircraft arresting equipment to and from temporary storage locations in areas of the base that are geographically separated from the existing CEMIRT facility.

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 Measures

Construction of the proposed project would have the potential to directly impact up to 1.410 acres of wetlands subject to federal and/or state regulatory jurisdiction at Tyndall AFB. These impacts would result in up to 0.85 functional loss units of wetland values, as determined through an evaluation prepared in accordance with the Florida Uniform Mitigation Assessment Method. The Proposed Action would also disturb up to 2.74 acres of 100-year floodplains and 0.23 acres of 500-year floodplains on Tyndall AFB, depending on which alternative is selected. 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 on Tyndall AFB. Potential impacts on wetlands would be avoided, minimized, or mitigated in accordance with all applicable permit requirements. It is anticipated that the following permits and associated mitigations or other requirements would be applicable to the Proposed Action evaluated in this EA:

- Acquire all necessary wetland and water resource permits for the Proposed Action, including but not limited to an USACE Section 404 CWA Permit Authorization, NPDES permit, FDEP Environmental Resource Permit (Chapter 62-330.020 Florida Administrative Code, for wetlands and stormwater), and FDEP Section 401 CWA water quality certification.
- Provide mitigation for up to approximately 1.410 acres of wetland impacts (0.85 functional loss units of wetland values) at the Alternative 1 site or up to 0.961 acres of wetland impacts (0.74 functional loss units) at the Alternative 2 site. Compensatory mitigation would be confirmed during the required USACE and FDEP permitting process.
- Mitigate for the loss of up to approximately 2.74 acres of 100-year floodplain at the Alternative 1 site or up to 2.54 acres of 100-year floodplains and up to 0.23 acres of 500-year floodplains at the Alternative 2 site by providing compensatory storage.

Public Involvement

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 May 4, 2025, and May 7, 2025. Letters were sent to federal and state agencies and Native American tribes on May 1, 2025, requesting comments on the Proposed Action and potentially affected resources. Letters to the Florida SHPO and Native American tribes also requested consultation in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. No comments requiring changes to the Proposed Action, alternatives, or resources evaluated in the EA were received.

The Draft EA is available for a 30-day public comment period. The Draft EA is also available to Florida state agencies for a concurrent 60-day review period through the FDEP State Clearinghouse process. 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. 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/>. Printed copies of the Draft EA and proposed FONSI/FONPA are also available for public review at the Bay County Public Library, 898 W 11th St., Panama City, FL 32401. Comments received during the Draft EA public comment period will be considered in the Final EA and FONSI/FONPA, as applicable.

Finding of No Significant Impact

After review of the attached EA, which was prepared in accordance with the requirements of NEPA and the DoD NEPA Implementing Procedures, I have determined that the Proposed Action to provide facility and infrastructure improvements that support current and future CEMIRT operations 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.

Finding of No Practicable Alternative

Pursuant to E.O. 11988 and E.O. 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 project 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 E.O.'s for a FONPA.

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

DATE