

DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Environmental Assessment of Implementation of the Installation Development Plan at the 101st Air Refueling Wing, Bangor Air National Guard Base, Bangor, Maine

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The National Guard Bureau (NGB) prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) to consider the potential effects to the human and natural environment associated with required infrastructure improvement projects at the 101st Air Refueling Wing (ARW), Bangor Air National Guard Base (ANGB), Bangor, Maine. The EA also identifies applicable management actions and best management practices that would avoid or minimize effects relevant to the implementation of the Proposed Action, Alternative 1, and the No Action Alternative.

The NGB has prepared this EA pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (42 United States Code [U.S.C.] §§ 4321–4347), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500–1508), and the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) (32 CFR Part 989, formerly promulgated as Air Force Instruction 32-7061). The lead agency for this NEPA analysis is the NGB.

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to provide the 101 ARW with properly sized and configured facilities, infrastructure, and services outlined in the Installation Development Plan (IDP) that are needed to effectively accomplish its mission. The proposed construction and renovation projects, as well as the demolition of excess and inefficient structures, would conserve energy and resources through consolidation and modernization and are needed to enable the Bangor ANGB to maintain the level of readiness necessary to support its mission.

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, socioeconomics (including environmental justice and protection of children), and utilities. 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 air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hazardous materials and waste, noise, safety, transportation, and

water resources. Therefore, these resource areas were carried forward for detailed analysis in the EA.

2.0 PROPOSED ACTION

Under the Proposed Action, the 101 ARW 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 101 ARW's Preferred Alternative. There would be no appreciable changes in Bangor ANGB operations as a result of the Proposed Action. The 101 ARW notes that Project 9 is not carried forward for detailed analysis in the EA as it is not ripe for analysis. It will undergo future specific NEPA analyses, tiering off the EA, when specific project planning details are available.

Table 1. Proposed IDP Projects

IDP Project Number	Project Title (ANG Project Number)	
Short-Range Projects		
1	Alter AT/FP at Main Gate (outside the gate) (FKNN102003)	
	Project Type	Construction and Renovation
	Execution Year (short- or long-range)	2024 (short-range)
	Project Need	Meet DoD, Air Force, and ANG AT/FP measures.
	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquire 0.93 acres of land to the north of the gate. • Construct 2,200 square yards (SY) of entrance and exit traffic lanes for truck traffic inspection and install vehicle gate. • Repair 3,500 SY of existing road pavement. • Renovate main gate, boundary fencing, generator, and signage. • Install AT/FP traffic-calming measures (barriers, planters). • Relocate electrical service, storm drains, and fire hydrant. • Replace and relocate main base sign to include minor landscaping and utilities.
	Alternative 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as Proposed Action.
	No Action Alternative	Maintain existing gate configuration, road conditions, and AT/FP measures, which would not meet AT/FP requirements.
2	Repair Main Entrance AT/FP (inside the gate) (FKNN162349)	
	Project Type	Construction and Renovation
	Execution Year (short- or long-range)	2023 (short-range)
	Project Need	Meet DoD, Air Force, and ANG AT/FP measures and repair deteriorating pavement.
	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repair/replace 5,743 SY of existing road. • Construct 814 SY of sidewalk. • Install AT/FP barriers.
	Alternative 1	Same as Proposed Action.
	No Action Alternative	Do not repair/replace existing roads, construct sidewalk, or install barriers, which would not meet AT/FP requirements.

4	Demolish B510 (FKNN212001)	
	Project Type	Demolition
	Execution Year (short- or long-range)	2024 (short-range)
	Project Need	Remove unauthorized building space incurring unnecessary maintenance and utility costs.
	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	Demolish B510, a 34,551 square feet (SF), one-story heating facility building.
	Alternative 1	Same as Proposed Action.
	No Action Alternative	Maintain building in current condition and configuration, which would not support mission requirements.
5	Renovate B515 for Small Air Terminal (SAT) (FKNN212002; companion project to FKNN212001)	
	Project Type	Renovation
	Execution Year (short- or long-range)	2023 (short-range)
	Project Need	Renovations required to accommodate a new use of the SAT. The facility would continue to be used by the 101 ARW for national security activity and for processing branch, reserve, or active-duty military members arriving/departing Bangor ANGB.
	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	Interior renovations to B515, a 16,575 SF, one-story Aircraft Support Equipment (ASE) shop/storage building.
	Alternative 1	Same as Proposed Action.
	No Action Alternative	Maintain building in current condition and configuration, which would not as effectively accommodate the SAT.
6	Demolish B489 and B505 (FKNN232003)	
	Project Type	Demolition
	Execution Year (short- or long-range)	2024 (short-range)
	Project Need	Buildings do not meet AT/FP standoff requirements from base perimeter fence.
	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demolish B489, a 6,800 SF, one-story Reserve Forces Operational Training building. • Demolish B505, a 24,400 SF, one-story Reserve Forces Operational Training building.
	Alternative 1	Same as Proposed Action.
	No Action Alternative	Maintain buildings in current condition, which would not meet AT/FP requirements.
7	Additions or Alterations (ADAL) to B514 (FKNN192001)	
	Project Type	Construction
	Execution Year (short- or long-range)	2024 (short-range)
	Project Need	Building does not have large enough storage space or service bay to accommodate Communications Squadron equipment and vehicles.
	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct 2,140 SF, one-story addition to B514 (a communications facility building), increasing SF from 8,060 SF to 10,200 SF. • Addition would provide vehicle maintenance and storage space for the Communications Squadron.
	Alternative 1	Same as Proposed Action.
	No Action Alternative	Maintain and use B514 in current configuration, which would not support Communications Squadron mission requirements.

10	ADAL to B417	
	Project Type	Construction and Renovation
	Execution Year (short- or long-range)	2023 (short-range)
	Project Need	Building must be expanded to accommodate occupants of B489 and B505 (buildings to be demolished; see Project 6) in B417, which will facilitate right-sizing of the base; also, B417's aging barracks and dining facility need to be renovated.
	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct 2,100 SF, one-story addition to B417 (Troop Camp building). Interior renovations to B417's existing 30,653 SF (21,219 SF three-story troop barracks and 9,434 SF one-story dining facility).
	Alternative 1	Same as Proposed Action.
	No Action Alternative	Maintain building in current condition and configuration, which would not support mission requirements.
Long-Range Projects		
3	Construct Fuel Cell Hangar (FKNN159044)	
	Project Type	Construction
	Execution Year (short- or long-range)	2028 (long-range)
	Project Need	Accommodate the aircraft in the fleet and meet hangar safety requirements.
	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct 40,871 SF hangar on previously developed site. Would replace existing hangar, which is to be demolished (see Project 8).
	Alternative 1	Same as Proposed Action.
	No Action Alternative	Do not construct new hangar; instead, continue use of existing hangar (Building [B] 542), which is undersized and does not meet safety requirements or storage needs.
8	Demolish B542 (FKNN252001)	
	Project Type	Demolition
	Execution Year (short- or long-range)	2029 (long-range)
	Project Need	Building is undersized; hangar does not meet storage needs or allow for safe clearances around the aircraft during maintenance operations. The existing canopy is not large enough to protect personnel and assets from injury or damage from snow/ice sliding off the roof. The existing parking does not meet AT/FP requirements per UFC 4-010-01, <i>DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings</i> .
	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	Demolish B542, a 23,418 SF fuel systems maintenance dock hangar.
	Alternative 1	Same as Proposed Action.
	No Action Alternative	Maintain and use B542 in current condition, and do not construct new hangar, which would not support mission requirements, address safety concerns, or meet AT/FP requirements.
9	Construct Second AT/FP Compliant Gate (FKNN192006)	
	<i>Project note:</i> 101 ARW notes that this project is low on the Installation Priority List of projects. A traffic study would need to be conducted, as well as coordination with the City of Bangor and Maine Department of Transportation.	
	Project Type	Construction
	Execution Year (short- or long-range)	2029 (long-range)
	Project Need	Current alternate gate is within the Quantity-Distance (QD) arc of the Munitions Storage Area (MSA).

	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	Construct new gate off Union Street adjacent to the running track and connecting to Pesch Circle near B417.
	Alternative 1	Construct new gate at current alternate gate location off Downing Road, which would require rerouting of traffic once inside the base perimeter to avoid MSA QD arcs.
	No Action Alternative	Do not construct second AT/FP compliant gate, which would not address MSA QD arc safety concerns.

3.0 ALTERNATIVE 1

Alternative 1 includes implementation of all projects listed under the Proposed Action without an identified alternative plus implementation of any identified alternative projects. An alternative has been identified for **Project 9. Construct Second AT/FP Compliant Gate (FKNN192006)** detailed below.

The proposed alternative for Project 9 would be to construct a new second AT/FP gate at its current location off Downing Road in the northwestern area of Bangor ANGB. This would require rerouting of traffic once inside the base perimeter to avoid the MSA QD arcs. As noted earlier, this project is in the early stages of development; design drawings have not been drafted and implementation would be more than 5 years away. The project would require a traffic study and consultation with the City of Bangor and Maine Department of Transportation. 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 off this EA, when specific project planning details become available.

3.1 NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The CEQ regulation 40 CFR § 1502.14(c) specifically requires analysis of the No Action Alternative in all NEPA documents. Under the No Action Alternative, the 101 ARW would not implement the Proposed Action. The 101 ARW would not implement the facility improvement construction and renovation projects to meet mission requirements 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 and need of the Proposed Action, it was carried forward for detailed analysis in the EA as required under NEPA.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Air Quality

The Proposed Action would have short-term less-than-significant and long-term beneficial effects to air quality. Short-term effects would be from construction, demolition, and renovation activities. Long-term effects would be from decreases in heating and cooling requirements at the installation. Emissions would not exceed the prevention of significant deterioration major source thresholds in an attainment or maintenance area or the de minimis thresholds in a nonattainment area, and the Proposed Action would not contribute to a violation of any local, state, or federal air quality

regulation. Alternative 1 would have the same effects on air quality from Projects 1–8 and 10 as under the Proposed Action; Project 9's alternative is a long-range construction project and will undergo future specific NEPA analyses, tiering off this EA, when specific project planning details are available. The No Action Alternative would have no effects on air quality.

Biological Resources

The Proposed Action would have short-term less-than-significant effects to biological resources. Short-term minor adverse effects would be due to 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 to biological resources would not reduce the distribution or viability of species or habitats of concern and would not violate biological resources laws or regulations. Alternative 1 would have the same effects on biological resources from Projects 1–8 and 10 as under the Proposed Action; Project 9's alternative is a long-range construction project and will undergo future specific NEPA analyses, tiering off this EA, when specific project planning details are available. The No Action Alternative would have no effects on biological resources.

Cultural Resources

The implementation of the Proposed Action, Alternative 1, or the No Action Alternative would not affect historic properties or Tribal cultural and spiritual 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.

Hazardous Materials and Wastes, Solid Waste, and Other Contaminants

The Proposed Action would have short- and long-term less-than-significant effects with regard to the presence and use of hazardous materials and wastes, solid waste, and other contaminants. Short-term minor adverse effects would be due to increased use of hazardous materials and generation of wastes during construction, demolition, and renovation activities. The 101 ARW would evaluate all investigative findings up to the initiation of construction activities and develop a Media Management Plan (MMP) to identify, contain, and properly dispose of PFAS, if needed, for projects located at PFAS areas of interest. Long-term, the Proposed Action would cause a less-than-significant increase in the use of hazardous materials and generation of hazardous waste due to the additional operation and maintenance requirements of the new 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 through the replacement with upgraded facilities and systems; therefore, long-term effects would be less than significant on the use of hazardous materials and waste management at Bangor ANGB. Alternative 1 would have the same effects

on hazardous materials and wastes from Projects 1–8 and 10 as under the Proposed Action; Project 9’s alternative is a long-range construction project and will undergo future specific NEPA analyses, tiering off this EA, when specific project planning details are available. The No Action Alternative would have no effects on hazardous materials and wastes.

Health and Safety

The Proposed Action would have short-term less-than-significant effects to construction site safety and long-term beneficial effects to 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 and safety clearance requirements. Alternative 1 would have the same effects on safety from Projects 1–8 and 10 as under the Proposed Action; Project 9’s alternative is a long-range construction project and will undergo future specific NEPA analyses, tiering off this EA, when specific project planning details are available. Under the No Action Alternative, the 101 ARW would continue to operate with adverse effects on safety from AT/FP noncompliance and QD arcs at entry control facilities and where standoff setbacks cannot be achieved.

Noise

The Proposed Action would have short- and long-term less-than-significant effects on the noise environment. Short-term effects would be due to the use of heavy equipment during construction and demolition activities. Long-term effects would be due to the potential use of backup generators at the proposed facilities. The Proposed Action would not appreciably increase areas of incompatible land use surrounding the base, or lead to a violation of any applicable local, state, or federal noise regulations. Alternative 1 would have the same effects on noise from Projects 1–8 and 10 as under the Proposed Action; Project 9’s alternative is a long-range construction project and will undergo future specific NEPA analyses, tiering off this EA, when specific project planning details are available. The No Action Alternative would have no effects on the noise environment.

Transportation

The Proposed Action would have short-term less-than-significant adverse effects and long-term beneficial effects on transportation and traffic. Short-term effects would result from construction vehicles and from small changes in localized traffic patterns due to the construction and demolition projects. Long-term beneficial effects would result from upgrades to the main gate and establishment of an additional gate. The Proposed Action would not (1) require long-term closures of off-post roadways, (2) substantially increase congestion on any primary off-post roadways, or (3) otherwise interfere with the functionality of the regional transportation network. Alternative 1 would have the same effects on transportation from Projects 1–8 and 10 as under the Proposed Action; Project 9’s alternative is a long-range construction project and will undergo future specific NEPA analyses, tiering off this EA, when specific project planning details are available. The No Action Alternative would have no effects on transportation.

Water Resources

The Proposed Action would have short- and long-term less-than-significant effects to water resources. Short-term minor adverse effects would be due to site-specific temporary disturbance during construction, demolition, and renovation. Long-term minor adverse effects would be due to ongoing activities at the base. 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 or regulations. Alternative 1 would have the same effects on water resources from Projects 1–8 and 10 as under the Proposed Action; Project 9's alternative is a long-range construction project and will undergo future specific NEPA analyses, tiering off this EA, when specific project planning details are available. The No Action Alternative would have no effects on water resources.

5.0 PUBLIC NOTICE

NEPA, 40 CFR Parts 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 *Bangor Daily News* on July 5, 2022, with the comment period ending on August 5, 2022. The Draft EA and FONSI are available for public review at the Bangor Public Library, 145 Harlow Street, Bangor, ME 04401, and in electronic form at <https://www.101arw.ang.af.mil>. Written comments should be sent no later than August 5, 2022 to National Guard Bureau, Christine Yott, NEPA Program Manager, ATTN: Bangor EA, 3501 Fetchet Avenue, Joint Base Andrews, MD 20762-5157, or by email to NGB.A4.A4A.NEPA.COMMENTS.Org@us.af.mil with the subject line ATTN: Bangor 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