

DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI) AND FINDING OF NO PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE (FONPA)

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR FACILITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE CONSTRUCTION AND MODERNIZATION, MOODY AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA

Background

The 23d Wing (23 WG) and 23d Civil Engineer Squadron (23 CES) at Moody Air Force Base (AFB) prepared this Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate select facility and infrastructure construction and modernization projects to support installation development at Moody AFB for the 23 WG and tenant organizations that would be implemented over an approximately five-year period, from fiscal year (FY) 2025 through FY 2030 (i.e., the Proposed Action). The attached EA (EAXX-007-57-UAF-1739351981) was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as amended by Public Law 118-5, the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 (42 United States Code [USC] 4321 et seq.), and the DAF's *Environmental Impact Analysis Process* (EIAP; 32 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 989), to the extent they are consistent with NEPA as revised by the Fiscal Responsibility Act, and Executive Order (EO) 14154, *Unleashing American Energy*.

Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to address deficiencies of function and capabilities in Moody AFB facilities and infrastructure to ensure efficient, uninterrupted operations. These deficiencies would be remedied through an ongoing process of construction of new facilities and new infrastructure, the repair of existing facilities and infrastructure, and the demolition of obsolete and unneeded facilities. The Proposed Action is needed to conform with applicable antiterrorism/force protection (AT/FP) criteria, to meet DAF space optimization requirements, and to reduce wasted person-hours and risk to the mission due to inefficiencies.

The Guardian Angel Facility, Aircraft Fire Training Facility (AFTF), Davidson Road and Mitchell Boulevard gates, Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) complex, portions of Burma Road, airfield stormwater drainage system, Stone Road and associated Mission Lake water barrier, the western Moody AFB boundary fence, and underutilized buildings all have structural and organizational limitations. Additional military personnel and civilian staff time is unnecessarily used when mission-support facilities are not consolidated and scattered in various facilities across Moody AFB. Examples of scattered facilities and the subsequent loss of staff time and wasted resources include inadequate available parking at facilities, causing personnel to park in distant parking lots on a daily basis; visually obscured base boundary fencing, causing Base security personnel to walk along portions of the Moody AFB perimeter for security checks instead of driving; and lack of adequate facilities at base gates, requiring base security personnel to provide gate protection support from parked vehicles to meet AT/FP requirements.

Risks to the military mission at Moody AFB are caused by unconsolidated mission support facilities, which make communication among personnel and use of critical equipment more

difficult; by roadways and drainage structures located in the airfield Clear Zone (CZ) that generate risk to aircraft operations in the airfield; by a lack of access to the base boundary security fencing for patrols and facilities at gates for security personnel to respond to threats; and by potential failure of a water control structure at Mission Lake, which would increase flooding threats and damage a critical east-west roadway on Main Base.

Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives

The Proposed Action consists of 10 construction, demolition, and modernization projects that would be implemented on the Moody AFB Main Base within approximately the next five fiscal years (FY 2025 to FY 2030). This EA considers all 10 proposed projects as components of the overall Proposed Action and evaluates the 10 projects and their alternatives collectively. Individual projects analyzed in the EA should be considered independent of each other. The DAF could choose to implement all, none, or any combination of these projects.

The NEPA and the CEQ regulations mandate the consideration of reasonable alternatives for the Proposed Action. “Reasonable alternatives” are those that could also be utilized to meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. Per the DAF Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) regulations, selection standards are used to identify alternatives that meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. The 23 WG and 23 CES applied specific selection standards to all the proposed projects composing the Proposed Action. The screening of alternatives eliminated one alternative for Project 3 and determined that one alternative that was considered each for Projects 5 and 6 are design options for the proposed projects and do not constitute alternatives. All other proposed project alternatives were carried forward for further analysis in the EA.

The CEQ regulations require consideration of the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative serves as a baseline against which the impacts of the Proposed Action and other potential action alternatives can be evaluated. The No Action Alternative for each of the proposed projects was evaluated in the EA.

Project 1 – Guardian Angel Facility Construction and Renovation. To support the 38th Rescue Squadron (38 RQS) primary operations, which currently shares a building with the 41st Rescue Squadron (41 RQS), an adequately sized and properly configured squadron operations building would be constructed. The DAF carried forward two project-level alternatives for Project 1. Under Alternative 1, the DAF would construct a new 55,005-square-foot squadron operations facility near Sijan Street to support the relocation of the 41 RQS. Approximately 5,000 square feet of additional pavement would be constructed for emergency vehicle access and parking, as well as a retaining wall for slope stabilization at the building location. DAF would renovate Buildings 556 and 663, construct a 5,280-square-foot addition to Building 556, and construct a 62,414-square-foot addition to Building 663. DAF would renovate Buildings 606, 607, and 609. Under Project 1, Alternative 2, the DAF would construct the new 55,005-square-foot squadron operations facility south of the Project 1, Alternative 1, location to support the relocation of the 41 RQS. Approximately 30,000 square feet of additional pavement would be constructed for emergency vehicle access and parking. Trenching would be required to extend utilities (i.e., sewer, water, electric, gas, and communications) for the new 41 RQS squadron operations

building. DAF would renovate Buildings 556 and 663, construct a 5,280-square-foot addition to Building 556, and construct a 62,414-square-foot addition to Building 663. DAF would renovate Buildings 606, 607, and 609.

Project 1 – No Action Alternative. The DAF would not construct a new facility for the 41 RQS and would not renovate and construct an addition to Building 663 for the 38 RQS. The 38 RQS would continue to have functional operations scattered across several facilities at Moody AFB, sustaining inefficiencies in use of manpower, equipment, and materials that are not housed in a single location. The 41 RQS and 38 RQS would share Building 663 to support their primary squadron operations.

Project 2 – Aircraft Fire Training Facility Improvements. The DAF would modernize the existing AFTF at Moody AFB. The DAF carried forward two project-level alternatives for Project 2. Under Alternative 1, the DAF would construct an approximately 6-acre concrete pad around the AFTF and connect the concrete pad to North Perimeter Road. The DAF would remove and install a new mockup training aircraft for fire training. Five new fire hydrants would be installed replacing the existing fire hydrants. The DAF would install nine stadium-style lights to encompass all areas within the AFTF to allow for nighttime training. The existing retention pond would be renovated, the propane gas tank replaced at a location beyond the existing quantity-distance arc, and environmental concerns associated with hazardous materials (i.e., perfluorooctanoic acid [PFOA]) managed by capping those contaminated soils with concrete. The DAF would construct a 10,000-square-foot training facility and an approximately 3-acre pad for truck driving training using approximately 2,300 cubic yards of concrete. Under Alternative 2, the DAF would construct all the proposed facilities and infrastructure at the existing AFTF as described in Project 2, Alternative 1, except for the approximately 3-acre truck driving training pad; truck driver training would continue at a temporary pad set up elsewhere on Moody AFB.

Project 2 – No Action Alternative. The DAF would not construct new or renovate facilities at the AFTF. The AFTF is currently inoperable and temporary duty travel would continue to be required for all aircraft fire training. The propane gas tank would remain in an inappropriate location with an existing explosive quantity-distance arc, and environmental concerns associated with PFOA would not be properly managed. Truck driver training would continue at a temporary pad set up elsewhere on Moody AFB when needed.

Project 3 – Gate Overwatch Position Construction. The Davidson Road and Mitchell Boulevard gates do not meet the current AT/FP requirements. The DAF would construct two-story overwatch buildings at both the Davidson Road Gate and at the Mitchell Boulevard Gate. Each overwatch building would be approximately 1,250 square feet, with approximately 625 square feet of new ground disturbance. The overwatch buildings would be connected to utilities and communication systems, which are all located proximate to the gates.

Project 3 – No Action Alternative. The DAF would not construct new overwatch facilities. Gate security personnel would continue to operate from armored vehicles parked at each gate. The gate security features would not meet AT/FP requirements.

Project 4 – Aerospace Ground Equipment Facility Construction and Demolition. To consolidate AGE facilities and operations at Moody AFB, the DAF would renovate existing AGE facilities, and demolish existing AGE facilities within the existing AGE complex. The DAF carried forward two project-level alternatives for Project 4. Under Alternative 1, the DAF would demolish Buildings 732, 752, 755, and 756 and construct a new consolidated AGE facility with warehouse area, administrative space, and covered storage. Under Alternative 2, the DAF would demolish Buildings 732, and 756. Building 755 would be modified to create administrative areas (e.g., offices, break room, conference room), and Building 752 would be renovated for warehouse space. The DAF would construct a new parts-support section.

Project 4 – No Action Alternative. The DAF would not demolish existing buildings and construct new facilities to consolidate AGE functions at a single AGE campus at Moody AFB. AGE operations would continue in incontinentuous, antiquated facilities and would not be able to accommodate newer aircraft equipment, which is larger than existing equipment for the A-10s, HH-60s, and C-130s. Future missions would require utilizing a different facility for AGE.

Project 5 – Burma Road Realignment. A portion of Burma Road and the associated airfield fence are located within the graded portion of the Runway 18R/36L CZ, causing a violation of Unified Facilities Criterion (UFC) 3-260-01, *Airfield and Heliport Planning and Design*, which requires a temporary airfield waiver. The temporary waiver was granted until the closure of an Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) site, which would allow for removal of trees in this area, which also violates airfield surfaces. After closure of the ERP site, the DAF would realign and repave approximately 6,000 linear feet of Burma Road with conventional asphalt and remove approximately 4.6 acres of trees from the realignment footprint.

Project 5 – No Action Alternative. The DAF would not realign and repave Burma Road. Trees and Burma Road would remain located within the graded portion of the CZ, and an airfield waiver would continue to be required as Burma Road and the trees would not meet the requirements of UFC 3-260-1.

Project 6 – 38th Rescue Squadron Parking Lot Construction. The DAF would construct a 20,000-square-foot parking lot for 125 personally operated vehicles (POVs) on an existing fitness track east of Building 663. The parking lot would be paved with either conventional or permeable asphalt. A total of 10 electric charging stations for POVs would be included at the parking lot.

Project 6 – No Action Alternative. The DAF would not construct a new parking lot to support the 38 RQS. No additional electric charging stations for POVs would be provided. There would continue to be inadequate parking for POVs at Building 663 to support the 38 RQS.

Project 7 – Airfield Stormwater Repair and Replacement. The Moody AFB airfield stormwater drainage system is mostly below ground. Portions of the drainage system have noticeably begun to fail, and deterioration of underground drainage structures has caused visible slumping of surface soils within the airfield. Additionally, two exposed concrete structures at the south end of the airfield are within the graded portion of the CZ for Runway 18R/36L and require an airfield

waiver from land use compatibility guidelines. The DAF would complete a condition survey of all stormwater structures previously located during the 2023 Ground Penetrating Radar Airfield Survey. An estimated 1,500 linear feet of belowground structures would be repaired or replaced with the same-sized stormwater drainage pipe, using concrete, high-density polyethylene, or corrugated metal stormwater pipes. Stormwater system repairs would require excavation within the airfield at select locations to access the belowground stormwater structures, disturbing approximately 7,500 square feet of airfield soils. Excavation, repair, and replacement activities would be coordinated with airfield operations to ensure that at least one Moody AFB runway would always remain operational. The DAF would remove two concrete stormwater outfall structures located in the graded portion of the CZ and replace them with approximately 700 linear feet of belowground concrete, high-density polyethylene, or corrugated metal stormwater pipes to disperse stormwater flows passing from the airfield surface through existing culverts located beneath Burma Road.

Project 7 – No Action Alternative. The DAF would not conduct a study to determine where belowground stormwater features require repair and replacement. Damaged and failing stormwater structures in the airfield would remain unchanged. Surface slumping of soils and ground disturbance from the failure of belowground drainage feature would persist on the ground surface at the airfield. Concrete structures would remain in the CZ, and an airfield waiver with the land use compatibility guidelines for the CZ would continue to be required.

Project 8 – Mission Lake Water Barrier and Stone Road Repairs. The water barrier for Mission Lake underlies a portion of Stone Road; both show signs of aging and degradation, and approximately 300 feet of Stone Road adjacent to Mission Lake lacks shoulders, which poses a safety risk for vehicles. The DAF carried forward three project-level alternatives for Project 8. Under Alternative 1, the DAF would extend the shoulders of Stone Road both to the north and south along an approximately 300-foot section of road currently lacking shoulders. The water barrier for Mission Lake would be strengthened by installing 3,500 cubic yards of riprap at the toe of slope on both sides of the water barrier. It is estimated that 20 feet of riprap would be placed on both sides of the water barrier, and a total of 4,000 cubic yards of clay would be used to backfill over the water barrier to support new shoulders for Stone Road. Stone Road would be closed during the construction of shoulder and water barrier improvements and then repaved prior to reopening the road for travel. Alternative 2 would be the same as Alternative 1, except a new shoulder would be constructed only on the north side (Mission Lake side) of Stone Road and not on the south side of Stone Road, where a parallel drainage channel would potentially be impacted by fill material. Approximately 2,000 cubic yards of clay fill would be required to construct the shoulder on the north side of Stone Road. Under Alternative 3, the DAF would strengthen the water barrier as described for Alternative 1. However, instead of widening 300 feet of Stone Road, Stone Road would be realigned to no longer pass over the top of the Mission Lake water barrier. Approximately 1,800 linear feet of a new two-lane road with shoulders would be constructed to realign Stone Road south of the Mission Lake water barrier and south of the stream channel that originates as the outfall from Mission Lake. This would require approximately 1.6 acres of tree removal, grading, and new pavement placement to realign Stone Road. The former Stone Road alignment would be decommissioned, old

pavement removed, and the surface covered in turf grasses or gravel, as necessary to support the Mission Lake water barrier.

Project 8 – No Action Alternative. The Mission Lake water barrier would not be strengthened. The water barrier to Mission Lake would require ongoing maintenance, with a risk of potential future failure, draining Mission Lake. Further, there would be no shoulders on either side of approximately 300 feet of Stone Road along Mission Lake, continuing to make this portion of Stone Road a safety hazard for vehicular travel.

Project 9 – Boundary Fence Repair. Portions of the Moody AFB boundary fence along the western Moody AFB boundary contain mature woody vegetation that extends to the fence line. There is no perimeter driving lane parallel to the western base boundary fence because of this vegetation. Required fence maintenance is difficult without proper access to the fence. Further, the lack of a clear line-of-sight at the boundary fence does not meet AT/FP requirements. The DAF carried forward three project-level alternatives for Project 9. Under Alternative 1, the DAF would remove vegetation along approximately 10,000 linear feet of the Moody AFB boundary fence to create a 16-foot-wide corridor by clearing approximately 3.4 acres of vegetation on both sides of the fence. Stumps would be removed, and a driving lane would be constructed within the 16-foot-wide corridor. This would include grading the roadway through an existing wetland area, placing a culvert in Beatty Branch, and building the driving lane over the culverted Beatty Branch. The driving lane would be approximately 10 feet wide with an unimproved (i.e., dirt) surface. The boundary fence would be repaired in all areas that have been previously inaccessible due to thick vegetation growth. Under Alternative 2, the DAF would remove all aboveground vegetation along approximately 10,000 linear feet of the Moody AFB boundary fence to create a 16-foot-wide corridor, removing approximately 1.7 acres of vegetation only on the Moody AFB side of the fence. Stumps and other belowground vegetation material would be left in place, and no driving lane would be constructed. The boundary fence would be repaired in all areas that have been previously inaccessible due to thick vegetation growth. Under Alternative 3, the DAF would remove all aboveground vegetation along approximately 10,000 linear feet of the Moody AFB boundary fence, removing approximately 3.4 acres of vegetation, to create a 16-foot-wide corridor clear of vegetation on both sides of the Moody AFB boundary fence. Stumps and other belowground vegetation material would be left in place, and no driving lane would be constructed. The boundary fence would be repaired in all areas that have been previously inaccessible due to thick vegetation growth.

Project 9 – No Action Alternative. Vegetation growth would remain along portions of the Moody AFB boundary fence on the west side of Main Base obscuring line-of-sight for security personnel. There would be limited to no access along the entire length of the fence line, and there would be no vehicle access for Moody AFB security officers to patrol the western base boundary perimeter. Portions of the base boundary fence would remain in disrepair because those areas cannot be accessed due to dense vegetation.

Project 10 – Building Demolition. DAF would demolish 11 buildings that have been determined to be underutilized or no longer needed (Buildings 153, 200, 656, 707, 720, 760, 762, 763, 798, 961, and 1145). All demolished materials and solid waste would be removed from Moody AFB

using dump trucks and haul-off debris containers. All demolition debris and other associated solid waste would be transported to the Evergreen Landfill in Valdosta, Georgia. Demolished building locations would either be left with the foundation building pad in place, or the building foundations removed, and the soils revegetated and maintained as grass-covered space.

Project 10 – No Action Alternative. None of the 11 underutilized buildings would be demolished. The DAF would either mothball the buildings or continue to maintain these underutilized or unneeded facilities, pay for utility costs for heating and air conditioning of the facilities, and manage the overall space utilization of the underperforming facilities.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The analysis of environmental impacts focused on the following environmental resources: land use (EA Section 3.4); noise (EA Section 3.5); air quality, climate change, and greenhouse gases (EA Section 3.6); soils (EA Section 3.7); water resources (EA Section 3.8); biological resources (EA Section 3.9); cultural resources (EA Section 3.10); infrastructure (EA Section 3.11); hazardous materials and wastes, Environmental Restoration Program, and toxic substances (EA Section 3.12); socioeconomics – income and employment (EA Section 3.13); and health and safety (EA Section 3.14). Details of the environmental consequences are provided in the EA. The analysis in the EA for each environmental resource area listed above identified negligible to minor adverse or beneficial impacts under the Proposed Action; environmental impacts would not be significant.

Notice of Potential Wetlands and Floodplain Involvement

As required by EO 11990, *Protection of Wetlands*; EO 11988, *Floodplain Management*, as amended by EO 13690, *Establishing a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard and a Process for Further Soliciting and Considering Stakeholder Input*; and Air Force Manual 32-7003, *Environmental Conservation*, the DAF hereby provides notice of the potential for wetland and floodplain impacts.

A wetland delineation was conducted at Moody AFB in the Project 1, Project 8, and Project 9 action areas. According to the *Wetland Delineation Report, Facility and Infrastructure Construction and Modernization, Moody Air Force Base, Georgia*, potentially jurisdictional surface waters and wetlands are present in all three project areas. The results of this delineation were reviewed and verified in writing by the USACE on 27 June 2024. Additionally, Buildings 762 and 763 under Project 10 would occur in the 100-year floodplain (1 percent annual exceedance probability).

Project 1. Potentially jurisdictional surface waters and wetlands are located proximate to the Project 1, Alternative 2, proposed construction area. Although no direct impacts on wetlands would occur because of this proposed project alternative, indirect impacts could occur from sediment and pollution runoff from construction areas. However, best management practices would be implemented during Project 1, Alternative 2, construction to prevent any pollutant or sediment from entering the wetlands and surface waters. Therefore, there would be no direct or indirect impacts on wetlands.

Project 8. All three alternatives for Project 8 would impact potentially jurisdictional surface waters of Mission Lake and the Mission Lake outfall channel to make repairs to the Mission Lake water barrier. In addition to impacts on potentially jurisdictional surface waters, Project 8, Alternative 3, would impact 0.18 acre of potentially jurisdictional wetlands. Because repairs to the Mission Lake water barrier require fill in Mission Lake and the Mission Lake outfall channel, there are no alternatives to impacts on potentially jurisdictional surface waters for Project 8. The DAF would acquire a Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404/401 permit for any fill activities in jurisdictional surface waters or wetlands associated with Project 8. By meeting the wetland impact minimization measures and any required mitigation for loss of potential waters of the United States, including wetlands as a condition of the CWA permit, there would be no net loss of wetlands from Project 8.

Project 9. All three alternatives for Project 9 have the potential to impact potentially jurisdictional surface waters and wetlands. The removal of aboveground and belowground vegetation and construction of a driving lane under Project 9, Alternative 1, would permanently impact 0.8 acre of potentially jurisdictional surface waters and 0.18 acre of potentially jurisdictional wetlands. Under Project 9, Alternatives 2 and 3, only aboveground vegetation would be removed (i.e., stumps would be left in place), and vegetation removal in potentially jurisdictional wetlands would be completed with hand tools (e.g., chainsaws); therefore, there would be no permanent impacts on wetlands. The DAF would acquire a CWA Section 404/401 permit for any fill activities in jurisdictional surface waters or wetlands associated with Project 9, Alternative 1. By meeting the wetland impact minimization measures and any required mitigation for loss of potential waters of the US, including wetlands as a condition of the CWA permit, there would be no net loss of wetlands from Project 9.

Project 10. The proposed demolition of Buildings 762 and 763 under Project 10 would occur in the 100-year floodplain (1 percent annual exceedance probability). There would be short-term, adverse impacts on the 100-year floodplain during demolition activities; however, the demolition and removal of these two buildings would provide long-term benefits to the 100-year floodplain as there would be fewer impermeable surfaces and physical structures located within the floodplain on Main Base.

Stakeholder Involvement

Based on the description of the Proposed Action as set forth in the EA, all activities have been found to comply with the criteria or standards of environmental quality. Coordination with appropriate federal, state, and local agencies regarding this EA has been completed. The DAF initiated National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 consultation with the Georgia State Historic Preservation Office on 18 November 2024. Concurrence from the SHPO on the DAF's no effect to historic properties determination was received on 9 and 10 December 2024, and 24 March 2025. The DAF initiated Endangered Species Act Section 7 consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on 13 November 2024. Concurrence from the USFWS on the DAF's determination on federally listed species was received on 29 January 2025. The attached EA and this Finding of No Significant Impact/Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONSI/FONPA) are being made available to the public for a 30-day review period. Agency and

public comments will be addressed as part of the analysis of potential environmental effects performed in the EA.

Conclusion

Finding of No Practicable Alternative. EO 11990 directs federal agencies to avoid to the extent possible the long- and short-term adverse impacts on wetlands and direct or indirect support of new construction in wetlands wherever a practicable alternative is available. EO 11988 requires federal agencies to avoid, to the maximum extent possible, the short- and long-term adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of floodplains, and to avoid direct and indirect support of development in a floodplain wherever there is a practicable alternative. If it is found that there is no practicable alternative, the agency must minimize potential harm to the floodplain and circulate a notice explaining why the action is to be located in the floodplain prior to taking action.

The DAF published an Early Public Notice that the Proposed Action would occur in a floodplain in the *Valdosta Daily Times* and the *Lanier County Advocate*. No comments were received in response to this notice.

The direct impacts from building demolition within the 100-year floodplain would be unavoidable, and there is no practicable alternative to demolishing and removing Buildings 762 and 763 without encroaching on the 100-year floodplain. Further, the removal of those two buildings would be a long-term benefit to the 100-year floodplain.

Project 1, Alternative 2, would implement best management practices to avoid indirect impacts on wetlands.

All three alternatives evaluated for Project 8 would result in impacts on potentially jurisdictional waters of the United States. However, Project 8, Alternatives 1 and 2, avoid impacts on wetlands and limit impacts to surface waters, including Mission Lake and the Mission Lake outfall channel. There are no other practicable alternatives to stabilizing the Mission Lake water barrier and constructing shoulders on Stone Road as this work directly involves Mission Lake and its associated outfall channel. All impacts on waters of the United States will be minimized through the CWA permitting process.

Project 9, Alternative 1, would have direct impacts on potentially jurisdictional waters of the United States, including wetlands. The proposed construction of a driving lane along the western base boundary fence would require crossing Beatty Branch and impacting its associated wetlands. There are no practicable alternatives to that stream crossing if a driving lane is to be constructed to meet AT/FP requirements. All impacts on waters of the United States will be minimized through the CWA permitting process.

Pursuant to EO 11990 and EO 11988 and the authority delegated in Headquarters Air Force Mission Directive 1-18, and in consideration of the findings of the EA, I find that there is no practicable alternative to this action and that these projects include all practicable measures to minimize harm to the environment. This decision has been made after considering all submitted

information and considering a range of reasonable alternatives that would meet project requirements and are within the legal authority of the DAF.

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, EIAP, which are hereby incorporated by reference, I have determined that the proposed 10 facility and infrastructure improvement projects at Moody AFB composing the Proposed Action, would not have a significant impact on the quality of the human or natural environment under any of the analyzed alternatives. Accordingly, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will not be prepared. This decision has been made after considering all submitted information, including a review of all 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.

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

Date

Attachment: Environmental Assessment for Facility and Infrastructure Construction and Modernization, Moody Air Force Base, Georgia (EAXX-007-57-UAF-1739351981)