

DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Environmental Assessment for Implementing the Installation Development Plan at the 132d Wing, Des Moines Air National Guard Base, Des Moines, Iowa

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The National Guard Bureau (NGB) has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) to consider the potential consequences to the human and natural environments associated with a proposed action at the 132d Wing (132 WG) of the Iowa Air National Guard (ANG) at Des Moines Air National Guard Base (ANGB) in Des Moines, IA. The EA also identifies applicable best management practices (BMPs) that would avoid or minimize effects resulting from implementing the Proposed Action or alternatives (to include the No Action Alternative). The NGB has prepared this EA pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (Title 42 *United States Code* [U.S.C.] §§ 4321–4347), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) *Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act* (Title 40 *Code of Federal Regulations* [CFR] Parts 1500–1508), and the *Environmental Impact Analysis Process* (EIAP), the U.S. Air Force (Air Force) NEPA-implementing regulations in 32 CFR Part 989. NGB is the lead agency for this NEPA analysis.

The Proposed Action is to adopt and implement the Des Moines ANGB Installation Development Plan (IDP). The IDP, which was finalized in May 2018, is the result of a comprehensive planning process and provides the 132 WG with a planning, programming, and development strategy that addresses current and programmed mission deficiencies and opportunities at the base.

The determination of environmental resource areas to be analyzed versus those not carried forward for detailed analysis was part of the EA scoping process as described in 40 CFR 1501.9(f)(1), which states that issues addressed in prior environmental reviews or that are not significant may be eliminated from discussion in the EA. The Proposed Action and No Action Alternative would have negligible effects on several resource areas. These include aesthetics and visual resources, airspace, geological resources, land use, and socioeconomics (including environmental justice and protection of children). Therefore, these resource areas were not carried forward for detailed analysis in the EA.

A preliminary analysis of environmental effects determined that the Proposed Action could have greater than negligible effects on several resource areas, including health and safety, air quality, noise, water resources, biological resources, transportation and circulation, cultural resources, hazardous materials and waste, and utility infrastructure. Therefore, these resource areas were carried forward for detailed analysis in the EA.

2.0 PROPOSED ACTION

Under the Proposed Action, the 132 WG would implement the IDP construction, demolition, and renovation projects listed in Table 1, sorted by short-range and long-range projects. The Proposed Action is the 132 WG's Preferred Alternative. The EA provides a full analysis of the environmental effects that could potentially result from the proposed short-range facility improvement projects which would be implemented within approximately 5 years. Long-range facility improvement projects, which would be implemented beyond 5 years, will receive a hard look as required by NEPA at an appropriate time, and ANG would prepare documentation for any projects requiring additional or updated NEPA analysis tiering off the EA, when specific project planning details are available. There would be no appreciable changes in Des Moines ANGB operations as a result of the Proposed Action.

Table 1. Proposed IDP Projects

EA project number	Project title (ANG project number)	
Short-Range Projects (implemented within approximately 5 years)		
7	Repair Grounds and Grading (FFAN212001)	
	Project Type	Renovation and Repair.
	Execution Year (short- or long-range)	2022 (short-range).
	Project Need	Mitigate ongoing washout damage to adjacent fencing and allow personnel and equipment accessibility for routine maintenance.
	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	Repair and regrading of approximately 19,000 SF adjacent to the flight line, including piping of approximately 1,504 linear feet of a jurisdictional WOTUS, to correct ongoing drainage washout issues.
	Alternative 1	Same as Proposed Action.
	No Action Alternative	Maintain existing grading conditions, which allow continued disrepair and damage to government property and contribute to a wildlife attractant directly adjacent to the flight line, which would not meet airport requirements.
8	Relocate/Construct a Fuel Station (FFAN012051, FFAN199280, FFAN162280) (Defense Logistics Agency [DLA] Projects)	
	Project Type	Construction.
	Execution Year (short- or long-range)	2022 (short-range).
	Project Need	The 132 WG requires a properly sized and configured vehicle fueling station to support the unit's mission.
	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	Install one 5,000-gallon unleaded aboveground storage tank (AST), one 5,000-gallon diesel AST, and all required supporting infrastructure (comm to pumps, overhang or cover, spill prevention, electric, etc). <i>Project note:</i> Coordination with DLA, A4O, and A4RMF would need to be conducted.
	Alternative 1	Same as Proposed Action, only sited at location 8b.
	No Action Alternative	Do not relocate existing fuel station, which would not support mission requirements.
Long-Range Projects (implementation beyond 5-7 years)		
1	Construct Consolidated Support Facility (FFAN189110)	
	Project Type	Construction and Demolition.
	Execution Year (short- or long-range)	2030 (long-range).

EA project number	Project title (ANG project number)	
1	Project Need	Currently Building (B) 110 and B231 do not meet space requirements, have inefficient configurations, high maintenance costs, and ongoing safety issues (foundation failure, no fire suppression system, and wildlife infiltration) and do not meet AT/FP standoff requirements. Additionally, the 132 WG is transferring 134,000 SF of facilities to the ARNG, creating a severe lack of on-base space for administrative and training functions. Construction of a new facility would improve operational efficiency by locating various administrative and training capabilities in one appropriately sized, configured, and modernized space that meets DoD standards and AT/FP standoff requirements.
	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct a new 27,250 SF consolidated support facility in the footprint of B231 compliant with AT/FP and ANG Handbook 32-1084 requirements. Demolish B110 (26,932 SF) and B231 (3,057 SF).
	Alternative 1	Same as Proposed Action.
	No Action Alternative	Maintain buildings in current condition and configuration, which would not address health and safety concerns, meet AT/FP requirements, or support mission requirements.
2	Addition or Alteration (ADAL) of DTOC (FFAN202180, companion project FFAN189180)	
	Project Type	Construction and Renovation.
	Execution Year (short- or long-range)	2030 (long-range).
	Project Need	Existing facility, B180, is undersized, lacks adequate storage for mission equipment, is located on the ARNG portion of the base, and does not meet AT/FP setback requirements.
	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct a 12,320 SF addition or alteration of existing B180. Renovate B180 to reconfigure the space to meet unique needs of the DTOC, provide on-site storage of mission equipment, and meet AT/FP requirements.
	Alternative 1	Construct a new 29,916 SF DTOC facility properly sized and configured within the footprint of Des Moines ANGB, compliant with AT/FP setback requirements, sited at location 2b.
	No Action Alternative	Maintain building in current condition and configuration, which would not as effectively accommodate the DTOC mission or meet AT/FP requirements.
3	Repair/Replace Base-Wide Utilities (FFAN082191 and FFAN982047)	
	Project Type	Renovation/Repair.
	Execution Year (short- or long-range)	2031 (long-range).
	Project Need	Existing water and natural gas infrastructure is outdated or has structural deficiencies, creating the potential for failure, health and safety issues, and increased operation and maintenance costs, and does not support mission requirements.
	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Repair/upgrade utility lines (water, sewer, electric, gas, communication). Repair/upgrade natural gas distribution system.
	Alternative 1	Same as Proposed Action.
No Action Alternative	Maintain and use utility infrastructure in current condition (water lines failing due to corrosion and systemic issues with natural gas service), which would lead to increased maintenance costs addressing known issues and fail to support mission requirements if utility services fail or are otherwise inoperable.	
4	Repair/Replace Base Roads (FFAN982044)	
	Project Type	Renovation/Repair.
	Execution Year (short- or long-range)	2031 (long-range).

EA project number	Project title (ANG project number)	
4	Project Need	Existing transportation infrastructure is outdated (adequate for A-7 mission requirements) or has structural deficiencies, creating the potential for failure and increased operation and maintenance costs, and does not support current (DTOC) mission requirements. 1,100 square yards (SY) of parking is slated for demolition due to AT/FP standards and will result in a parking shortfall.
	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct 1,000 SY of new parking compliant with AT/FP requirements. Demolish 1,100 SY of existing parking in compliance with AT/FP requirements. Assess and repair all base roads, damaged subbase, and pavements with Portland cement concrete. Repair, grade, and install stormwater drainage to address flooding issues.
	Alternative 1	Same as Proposed Action.
	No Action Alternative	Maintain and use current transportation infrastructure with inadequate parking (subbase failures, pavement degradation, and rutting due to heavy DTOC equipment and deficient stormwater management), which would lead to increased maintenance costs, continued health, safety, and flooding issues at B160, and failure to support mission requirements.
5	Construct a New Entry Control Facility (ECF) (FFAN189062)	
	Project Type	Construction.
	Execution Year (short- or long-range)	2030 (long-range).
	Project Need	The existing main ECF at McKinley Avenue does not meet AT/FP standoff or Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) requirements for vehicle inspection areas and does not provide adequate access for large commercial vehicles.
	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	Construct a new main ECF off McKinley Avenue at Shooting Star Road that meets AT/FP setback requirements and UFC vehicle inspection area standards and provides adequate access to large vehicles.
	Alternative 1	Same as Proposed Action.
No Action Alternative	Maintain and use existing main ECF in current location and condition, which would not address AT/FP requirements, UFC compliance, or security vulnerabilities.	
6	Construct a New Disaster Preparation/ Deployment Processing Center/ Gymnasium (FFAN209276)	
	Project Type	Construction and Demolition.
	Execution Year (short- or long-range)	2030 (long-range).
	Project Need	Due to a real property transfer of assets to the Iowa Army National Guard, Des Moines ANGB currently operates without a dedicated Deployment Processing facility or on-base gymnasium facilities; and the existing disaster preparation area is undersized.
	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct a new 14,600 SF combined facility for dedicated disaster preparation, deployment processing, and base gymnasium activities. Demolish B276 (2,317 SF) and B302 (57 SF).
	Alternative 1	Same as Proposed Action, only sited at location 6b.
No Action Alternative	Continue to operate without a dedicated Deployment Processing facility or on-base gymnasium facilities; and maintain and use the existing disaster preparation area in current condition, which would not support mission requirements, address safety concerns, or meet AT/FP requirements.	

Sources: ANG 2021; Pond 2018; Osteraas 2021, email communication.

3.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION

Reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Action were considered to formulate alternatives for analysis. Some projects might not have any reasonable alternatives because they are identified in the IDP to be site-specific, mission-supportive, sustainable, and economical.

Alternative 1 includes implementing all projects listed under the Proposed Action without an identified alternative plus implementing any identified alternative projects. An alternative has been identified for Project 2: ADAL of DTOC (FFAN202180, companion project FFAN189180). Project 6: Construct a New Disaster Preparation/Deployment Processing Center/Gymnasium (FFAN209276) and Project 8: Relocate/Construct a Fuel Station (FFAN012051, FFAN199280, FFAN162280) have identified alternative locations to site the proposed facilities on Des Moines ANGB, all other project details are identical to the Proposed Action.

The proposed alternative for Project 2 would be to construct a new 29,916 SF DTOC facility within the Des Moines ANGB footprint. The 132 WG notes this project is in the early stages of development; design drawings have not been drafted, and implementation would be more than 5 years away. Therefore, this project is not carried forward for detailed analysis in this EA. Long-term facility improvement projects such as this will undergo future NEPA analyses, tiering to this EA, when specific project planning details become available.

3.1 NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The CEQ regulation in 40 CFR § 1502.14(c) requires analysis of the No Action Alternative in all NEPA documents. Under the No Action Alternative, the 132 WG would not implement the Proposed Action. It would not implement the facility improvement construction and renovation projects to meet mission or AT/FP requirements. Demolition of outdated, inefficient facilities also would not occur. Although the No Action Alternative does not meet the installation's needs or fulfill the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action, it was carried forward for detailed analysis in the EA as required under NEPA.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Health and Safety

The Proposed Action would result in short-term less-than-significant effects on construction site safety and long-term beneficial effects on ground safety. Short-term effects would be from inherent safety hazards associated with construction, demolition, and renovation activities. Long-term effects would be from implementing projects to meet AT/FP, flight line, and personnel safety requirements. The effects for Alternative 1 on health and safety from Projects 1 and 3–8 would be the same as those under the Proposed Action. The identified alternative for Project 2 is a long-range construction project and will undergo future specific NEPA analyses, tiering to this EA, when specific project planning details are available. The No Action Alternative would have no effects on health and safety.

Air Quality

The Proposed Action would have short- and long-term less-than-significant effects on air quality at Des Moines ANGB. Short-term effects would result from construction, demolition, and renovation activities. Long-term effects would result from increases in heating and cooling requirements at the installation. Emissions would not exceed the PSD major source thresholds and the Proposed Action would not contribute to a violation of any local, state, or federal air quality regulation. The Proposed Action consists of construction—including new construction, renovations, alterations, and additions, demolition of buildings and pavement, and administrative projects (see Table 1). There would be minor adverse effects on air quality from individual projects and project alternatives; however, none would have appreciable adverse effects on air quality. The Proposed Action is within a region that EPA has designated as an attainment area; therefore, the General Conformity Rule does not apply (USEPA 2021b). The PSD major source thresholds have been carried forward as an indicator of potential significance in an attainment area and used to determine the level of effects under NEPA. The effects for Alternative 1 on air quality from Projects 1 and 3-8 would be the same as those under the Proposed Action. The identified alternative for Project 2 is a long-range construction project and will undergo future specific NEPA analyses, tiering to this EA, when specific project planning details are available. No effects on air quality would be expected under the No Action Alternative.

Noise

The Proposed Action would have short- and long-term less-than-significant effects on the noise environment. Short-term effects would be the result of the use of heavy equipment during demolition and construction activities. Long-term effects would be caused by the potential use of backup generators at the proposed facilities and the relocation of the ECF along McKinley Avenue. The Proposed Action would not appreciably increase the size of the areas of incompatible land use surrounding the base or lead to a violation of any applicable local, state, or federal noise regulations. The effects for Alternative 1 on noise from Projects 1 and 3-8 would be the same as those under the Proposed Action. The identified alternative for Project 2 is a long-range construction project and will undergo future specific NEPA analyses, tiering to this EA, when specific project planning details are available. No effects on noise would be expected under the No Action Alternative.

Water Resources

The Proposed Action would have short- and long-term less-than-significant effects on water resources. Short-term minor adverse effects would be caused by site-specific temporary disturbance during construction, demolition, and renovation activities. Long-term minor adverse effects would be caused by culverting Stream 1. Proposed activities would not reduce water availability or supply; exceed safe annual yield of water supplies; adversely affect water quality; damage or threaten hydrology; or violate water resources laws, regulations, or permits. The effects for Alternative 1 on water resources from Projects 1 and 3–8 would be the same as those

under the Proposed Action. The identified alternative for Project 2 is a long-range construction project and will undergo future specific NEPA analyses, tiering to this EA, when specific project planning details are available. No effects on water resources would be expected under the No Action Alternative.

Biological Resources

The Proposed Action would have short-term less-than-significant effects on biological resources. Short-term minor adverse effects would be the result of site-specific temporary disturbance during construction. Proposed activities would not adversely affect existing vegetation or aquatic and terrestrial wildlife resources, including threatened and endangered species or rare species. Effects on biological resources would not reduce the distribution or viability of species or habitats of concern and would not violate biological resources laws or regulations. There would be less-than-significant loss, degradation, or fragmentation effects on wildlife habitat. In addition, the renovation of grounds and grading of the drainage area adjacent to the flight line to remove wildlife attractant (Project 7) would be beneficial to wildlife by keeping them away from aircraft areas. The effects for Alternative 1 on biological resources from Projects 1 and 3–8 would be the same as those under the Proposed Action. The identified alternative for Project 2 is a long-range construction project and will undergo future specific NEPA analyses, tiering to this EA, when specific project planning details are available. No effects on biological resources would be expected under the No Action Alternative.

Transportation and Circulation

The Proposed Action would have short-term less-than-significant effects and long-term beneficial effects on transportation, traffic, and circulation. Short-term effects would result from construction vehicles and small changes in localized traffic patterns caused by construction and demolition projects. Long-term beneficial effects would result from the construction of the new ECF (Project 5). The Proposed Action would not (1) require long-term closures of off-base roadways, (2) substantially increase congestion on any primary off-base roadways, or (3) otherwise interfere with the functionality of the regional transportation network. The effects for Alternative 1 on transportation and circulation from Projects 1 and 3–8 would be the same as those under the Proposed Action. The identified alternative for Project 2 is a long-range construction project and would undergo future specific NEPA analyses, tiering to this EA, when specific project planning details are available. No effects on transportation or circulation would be expected under the No Action Alternative.

Cultural Resources

The implementation of the Proposed Action, Alternative 1, or the No Action Alternative would not affect historic properties or tribal cultural resources. For cultural resources and Section 106 of the NHPA there would be no historic properties affected. The Proposed Action would have no effects

to resources listed in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. With regards to NEPA and cultural resources, there would be no significant impacts to cultural resources.

(PREPARER'S NOTE: Update if any tribal responses are received after the final draft of the EA.)

Hazardous Materials and Wastes, Solid Waste, and Other Contaminants

The Proposed Action would have short- and long-term less-than-significant effects on the presence and use of hazardous materials and wastes. Short-term minor adverse effects would be the result of increased use of hazardous materials and generation of wastes during construction, demolition, and renovation activities. Long term, the Proposed Action would cause a less-than-significant increase in the use of hazardous materials and generation of hazardous waste as a result of the additional operation and maintenance requirements of the new, expanded facilities. Overall, the Proposed Action would reduce the likelihood of exposure to or potential contamination from hazardous materials and waste through the removal of hazardous materials by demolition and renovation of outdated facilities and replacing them with upgraded facilities and systems; therefore, long-term effects would be less than significant on the use of hazardous materials and waste management at Des Moines ANGB. The effects for Alternative 1 on hazardous materials and wastes, solid waste, and other contaminants from Projects 1 and 3–8 would be the same as those under the Proposed Action. The identified alternative for Project 2 is a long-range construction project and will undergo future specific NEPA analyses, tiering to this EA, when specific project planning details are available. No effects on hazardous materials and wastes, solid waste, and other contaminants would be expected under the No Action Alternative.

Utility Resources

The Proposed Action impacts on utility infrastructure would be considered significant if implementation increased demand on utilities so that systems were unable to keep up with the demand. Less-than-significant impacts would occur if demands were increased on local utilities, but the systems had sufficient capacity to handle the increased demand, or the increased demand could be mitigated or managed by implementing BMPs. Under the Proposed Action, the following projects would involve modifying and improving the existing utility infrastructure:

- Project 1 would involve demolition of B110 and B231. A new consolidated support facility occupying 27,250 SF would be built in the footprint of B231, in accordance with UFC 1-200-02, *High Performance and Sustainable Building Requirements*. Numerous energy saving measures would be realized through an energy-efficient heat, ventilation, and air conditioning system. The project would also include necessary exterior utilities upgrades/repairs, access pavements, fire protection, and site-related support work.
- Project 2 would involve renovating and constructing an addition to existing B180 to provide an additional 12,320 SF of space for on-site storage of mission equipment and to house

operations. The project would also include necessary exterior utility upgrades/repairs, access pavements, fire protection, and site-related support work.

- Project 3 would involve base-wide repair and upgrade of utility lines (for water, gas, and sewer). During construction activities, temporary and localized disruption of service would occur. The disruptions, however, would be short term and minor.
- Project 4 would involve base-wide construction and demolition of parking, repair of base roads, and repair of grade and stormwater drainage to address flooding issues.
- Project 6 would involve constructing a new 14,600 SF combined facility for dedicated disaster preparation, deployment processing, and base gymnasium activities.
- Project 7 would involve site grading to improve surface water drainage near the flight line.
- Project 8 would involve installing one 5,000-gallon unleaded fuel AST and one 5,000-gallon diesel AST and all required supporting infrastructure.

Overall, the projects under the Proposed Action would beneficially impact the base's infrastructure. Effects on utility infrastructure from Projects 1 and 3–8 would be the same as those under the Proposed Action. The Project 2 alternative entails new construction of a stand-alone, 29,916 SF DTOC facility to provide on-site storage of mission equipment and house operations, as opposed to adding onto and renovating B180 as in the Proposed Action. Impacts from implementing Alternative 1, however, would be similar to those from the Proposed Action in that utility upgrades/repairs, access pavements, fire protection, site work, and related support would be performed. Long-term beneficial impacts would be expected on the local infrastructure (particularly the water, sewer, and natural gas systems) because renovation and improvements would be made to support those systems. There are no expected issues with infrastructure capacity since demand on infrastructure resources is not expected to increase significantly during operations and because infrastructure would be improved during implementation of Project 3 to help meet operational requirements. Under the No Action Alternative, the 132 WG would not implement the Proposed Action. The 132 WG would not implement the facility improvement construction and renovation projects to meet mission requirements or AT/FP standards. Demolition of outdated, inefficient facilities also would not occur. Existing conditions would remain unchanged and potential impacts would be associated with the aging utility systems and facilities with identified deficiencies that require repair and upgrade to ensure safety and continued operation. Both continued use and additional demand on the infrastructure without renovation would lead to eventual system failure and mission requirements not being met, while potential health and safety risks would increase. Current and planned activities at the ANGB would continue as required to support various missions.

5.0 PUBLIC NOTICE

NEPA, 40 CFR §§1500-1508, and 32 CFR Part 989 require public review of the EA before approval of the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and implementation of the Proposed

Action. The Draft EA and FONSI are available for public review and comment for 30 days, beginning with publication of the Notice of Availability in the *Des Moines Register* on July 8, 2022, with the comment period ending on August 7, 2022. The Draft EA and FONSI was made available for public review at the Des Moines Public Library, Central Location, 1000 Grand Avenue, Des Moines, IA 50309; and in electronic form at <https://www.132dwing.ang.af.mil/>. Written comments should be sent no later than August 7, 2022 to National Guard Bureau, Ms. Christine Yott, NEPA Program Manager, ATTN: 132 WG EA, NGB/A4AM, Sheppard Hall, 3501 Fetchet Ave., Joint Base Andrews, MD 20762-5157, or email to NGB.A4.A4A.NEPA.COMMENTS.org@us.af.mil with the subject line ATTN: 132 WG EA.

6.0 FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

After careful review of the potential effects of this Proposed Action, I have concluded that the Proposed Action would not have a significant impact on the quality of the human or natural environment or generate significant controversy. Accordingly, the requirements of the NEPA, CEQ regulations, and 32 CFR Part 989, et seq. have been fulfilled, and an Environmental Impact Statement is not necessary and will not be prepared.

MARC V. HEWETT, P.E., GS-15, DAF
Chief, Asset Management Division

Date