

DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Supplemental Environmental Assessment for Construction of a New Entry Control Complex Homestead Air Reserve Base, Miami-Dade County, Florida

Federal actions that potentially involve significant impacts on the environment must be reviewed in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and all other applicable laws. The United States Air Force (USAF) has completed a Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA) to address the potential environmental consequences associated with construction of a new entry control complex (ECC) at Homestead Air Reserve Base (HARB) in Miami-Dade County, Florida.

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to provide a new permanent ECC for HARB that would accommodate the current mission/tenants and anticipated future increases in gate traffic. The Old Main Gate on Southwest 127th Avenue was closed when it was determined to be highly vulnerable to antiterrorism/force protection concerns due to the proximity of base lodging. The current HARB entry gate on Westover Street, known as the Westover Gate, serves as the only fully operational gate for the base. This gate was not designed to handle the current volume of base traffic, the configuration is constricted and the design is inadequate to maintain acceptable traffic flows through the gate. The new ECC would minimize congestion and related traffic hazards and delays.

The SEA evaluates the impacts associated with the current Preferred Alternative for the Proposed Action. In 2010, an Environmental Assessment (EA) was completed that analyzed the former Preferred Alternative for the Proposed Action and three action alternatives. The 2010 EA Preferred Alternative was never implemented and, as a result, the current Preferred Alternative (2015 SEA) to implement the Proposed Action was subsequently developed. It is important to note that the 2010 EA and the 2015 SEA analyze the same Proposed Action, but the Preferred Alternative to implement the Proposed Action has changed based on revisions in project details. The 2010 EA can be found online at <http://www.homestead.afrc.af.mil/shared/media/document/AFD-100513-043.pdf>.

The impacts associated with the SEA Preferred Alternative and the SEA No Action Alternative have been reviewed in accordance with NEPA as implemented by the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] §1500-1508) and Air Force Instruction (AFI) (32-7061), *The Environmental Impact Analysis Process*, as codified in 32 CFR Part 989. In addition, alternatives previously evaluated in detail as part of the 2010 EA were reevaluated in the 2015 SEA for those resources where baseline conditions had changed substantially in the past 5 years. For the SEA, five resource categories were addressed to identify potential impacts: traffic, socioeconomics, environmental justice, threatened and endangered species, and hazardous materials and waste management. Details of the potential environmental consequences can be found in the attached SEA.

Public Review and Comment

The NEPA process is designed to involve the public in the federal decision-making process. Formal notification and opportunities for public participation were provided during the preparation of this SEA. Formal and informal coordination and consultation with government agencies and planners was also conducted.

The Draft SEA and the Draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) were provided to federal, state, and local officials and other interested parties as identified in Appendix A of the SEA. The Draft SEA and the Draft FONSI were made available for public review during a 30-day comment period at the Homestead Branch Library in Homestead, Florida, and at <http://www.homestead.afrc.af.mil/library/susops/index.asp>. All relevant comments from the public and government agencies were addressed in the Final SEA and this FONSI.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based on the information and analysis presented in the SEA conducted in accordance with the requirements of the NEPA, the CEQ regulations, and the AFI 32-7061, and after a review of the agency comments submitted during the 30-day public comment period, I conclude that implementation of the 2015 Proposed Action, under the Preferred Alternative and the No Action Alternative, will not have a significant impact on the quality of the human and natural environment and, therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement is not warranted. This decision has been made after taking into account all the submitted information, and considering a full range of practicable alternatives that will meet project requirements and are within the legal authority of the USAF.

CHRISTIAN B. FUNK
Brigadier General, USAFR Commander, 482 FW

Date