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FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
FOR THE
CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY CAMPGROUND (FAMCAMP)
SHEPPARD AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS

AGENCY: Department of the Air Force, 82d Training Wing (82 TRW), Sheppard Air Force Base (AFB), Texas.

PURPOSE: The proposed action includes the construction of a Family Campground (FAMCAMP) with 20 recreational vehicle (RV) spaces, an office for transactions as well as shower and laundry facilities, connections for black and gray water tank emptying, and connections for potable water and electricity at Sheppard AFB. The current 82 TRW wants to provide more amenities to the greater DoD community who is traveling in the area and might use Sheppard as a stopping location as they pass through, whether it be for graduations or passing through on a family road trip. Currently Sheppard AFB does not have a location on base where families could set up an RV.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS: The assessment identified no impacts related to the FAMCAMP, land use or hazardous materials and waste. Potential impacts are summarized below:

Cultural/Historic/Archeological Resources: The proposed action will occur on previously disturbed areas. There are no historical buildings in the area and there are no cultural/archeological sites. There will be no impacts at this particular site.

Biological Resources: The proposed action will occur on previously disturbed areas. There will be no impacts to wetlands and the requirements of Executive Order (EO) 11990, Protection of Wetlands, are not applicable. Threatened and endangered species will not be affected and impacts to biological resources will not be significant.

Water Resources: The FAMCAMP project would disturb more than 5 acres, which would require Sheppard to comply with TCEQ’s Texas Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, the Construction General Permit along with the Storm Water Pollution Plans and follow Best Management practices. Impacts will not be significant.

Air Quality: During the construction phase there would be a temporary increase in air pollutants from dust emissions, construction activities, equipment and other related vehicles. This would be a minimal increase and would quickly dissipate. This would not impact Wichita County's ability to be an area of attainment for all national ambient air quality standards. Impacts will not be significant.

Socioeconomic and Environmental Justice Resources: Minor, temporary increases in employment are anticipated. The proposed action would not directly or indirectly impact minority or low-income populations. Impacts would be negligible.
Noise: Since there will be no change in aircraft operations, the only noise impact will be a temporary increase at the construction site which will attenuate to levels less than the thresholds of concern off-base. Noise impacts will not be significant.

Solid Waste and Hazardous Materials: There is no evidence of contamination or hazardous materials that was observed within the proposed project vicinity. Should hazardous materials be discovered as the result of the implementation of this project, they would be removed and disposed of by complying with applicable federal, state, and local laws. Impacts will not be significant.

Earth Resources (soil/geology): Implementation of best management practices by using native plants along with the water permits during construction will minimize erosion. Impacts will not be significant.

ALTERNATIVES: Three other sites were eliminated from consideration as they did not meet all the criteria needed for this construction project. The No-Action Alternative would result in the FAMPCAMP not being constructed and visitors and family members would continue to use off-base facilities.

FINDING OF NO PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE: Taking the above information into consideration, I find there is no practicable alternative to the proposed action and that the proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to the existing environment.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT: Based on information and analysis presented in the Environmental Assessment and no public comments submitted, I conclude that implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative would not constitute an action that significantly affects the quality of the human environment due to the findings listed above and expanded upon in the Environmental Assessment. Accordingly, the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations, and 32 Code of Federal Regulations 989 were fulfilled, and an environmental impact statement is not warranted.

MICHAEL A. FANTINI
Brigadier General, USAF
Commander, 82d Training Wing

JUL 24 2013
Date
1. Introduction

1.1 Introduction

The 82d Training Wing (82 TRW) proposes to construct a Family Campground (FAMCAMP) with 20 Recreational Vehicle (RV) spaces, an office for transactions as well as shower and laundry facilities, connections for black and gray water tank emptying, and connections for potable water and electricity at Sheppard Air Force Base (SAFB), Texas. This Environmental Assessment (EA) is an evaluation of the proposal to construct a FAMCAMP. The addition of this FAMCAMP would allow the United States Air Force (USAF) to provide more amenities to the greater DoD community who is traveling in the area and might use Sheppard as a stopping location as they pass through onto another location or if they come to Sheppard to attend one of the numerous yearly graduations or a local event.

SAFB encompasses approximately 5,297 acres in north-central Texas. It is located six miles south of the Texas/Oklahoma border at an elevation of approximately 1,015 feet above mean sea level (amsl). It is adjacent to, and north, of the city of Wichita Falls in Wichita County, Texas. The western and southern portions of the base are located within the Wichita Falls city limits, and the remainder of the installation lies within unincorporated Wichita County located midway between Dallas, Texas, and Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. Aerial imagery and project location maps of SAFB are provided in Appendix B.

The USAF and Sheppard AFB must maintain the highest level of quality education and training for its force structure. The Air Education and Training Command (AETC) is responsible for the training and education of USAF personnel. SAFB, an AETC installation, is the largest of four technical training wings within AETC and has the most diversified training mission. SAFB conducts technical training for the USAF, United States Army, United States Navy, United States Marine Corps, and several allied nations.

This EA has been prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA, 42 USC § 4321 to 4370e), the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (CEQ Regulations, 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), Environmental Impact Analysis Process (Air Force 32 CFR 989).

1.2 Purpose and Need

The purpose and need of the proposed action is to provide recreational vehicles and military campers with a safe and secure facility for all retirees, military and their families, or a FAMCAMP. This project has been in the plans for over a decade, but has never been awarded because funding has been unavailable. The FAMCAMP site would be available for primarily transient populations with a set time limit of 30 days to prevent “snowbirds” from taking residence here. The Force Support Squadron’s mission is to identify requirements affecting quality of life issues here at SAFB. The Force Support Squadron considers this an opportunity to help their customers with their greater needs and help generate more revenue for non-appropriated funds (NAF). Sheppard AFB is on the fork of two major roads that are widely used to travel throughout the United States and with Sheppard AFB’s training mission, families are coming to Sheppard continuously to attend graduations and other events. The addition of a FAMCAMP would give these families the opportunity to stay on base and would increase morale, welfare, and revenue at Sheppard’s recreation facilities.
1.3 Scope of the Analysis

This Environmental Assessment (EA) identifies, describes, and evaluates the potential environmental impacts that may result from the construction of the FAMCAMP in its preferred location, three alternative sites, and the No Action- alternative. As appropriate, the affected environment and environmental consequences of the proposed action and alternatives are described in terms of site-specific descriptions or a regional overview. Finally, the EA identifies measures to reduce impacts or best management practices to prevent or minimize less than significant environmental impacts, if required.

The resources that could be impacted are analyzed in the EA and include land use, noise, air resources, hazardous materials and waste, utilities and infrastructure, geology and soils, water resources, natural resources, cultural resources, socioeconomics (including environmental justice), and health and safety.

Other actions or potential actions that may be concurrent with the proposed action could contribute to cumulative impacts. The environmental impacts of these other actions are addressed in this EA only in the “impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of which agency (federal or non-federal) or person is undertaking such actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.”

Resources that will not be impacted by this project are: Climate

1.4 Public Involvement

On 2 December 2012, the Draft Environmental Assessment was sent to 13 governmental agencies with a formal letter requesting their review and comments. Responses were received from three agencies. (The formal letters and complete agency responses are provided in Appendix A). Summarized responses are below:

- Texas Parks and Wildlife Department - No anticipated significant adverse impacts to rare, threatened or endangered species, or other fish and wildlife resources.
- Texas Historical Commission (THC) - THC agrees with the U.S Air Force determination of No historic properties will be affected by this proposed project.
- Texas Commission on Environmental Quality - No anticipated significant long term environmental impacts from this project as long as construction and waste disposal activities associated with it are completed in accordance with applicable local, state and federal environmental permits, statues and regulations. Best Management Practices (BMP) are recommended to be used to control runoff from the construction sites to prevent detrimental impact to surface and ground water.

The draft EA was also placed in the Wichita Falls Public Library to give the citizens around the area a chance to review and comment on the project.

- No responses were received from the public.
2. Alternatives to the Proposed Action including No Action

2.1 Alternatives to the Proposed Action (Appendix B, Figure 1)

A number of screening criteria have been developed for the purpose of establishing suitable locations for the FAMCAMP. These screening criteria, all of which must be met for a location to be utilized are listed and discussed below:

SAFB developed screening Criteria (Table 1) to determine if the proposed action meets the projects purpose and need. This is a critical element in choosing the best potential site for the project. The formulation of alternatives was structured around the specific criteria required by the installation. Site not meeting the criteria were eliminated from further analyses.

The Criteria specify that the site must:

- Be within the SAFB installation.
- Be supportive of the installations mission.
- Be clear of topographical and other obstacles to the location (example: no existing structures)
- Be able to support utilities meaning that electricity and water resources are available through already existing conditions
- Be able to support the RV area without major compromises to the infrastructure such as having to build new roads or curbs for the RVs
- Be able to allow the RV’s easy access to the FAMCAMP area whether it is for gaining access to the site, moving to the specified RV lot and also easy exit.
- Be land that is owned by SAFB and not leased.
- Be able to support 20 RV lots.
- Be located outside the noise contour of 65dB
## 2.2 Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration

1. Constructing the FAMCAMP in the old Bunker Hill housing area,
2. Constructing the FAMCAMP in the Wind Creek housing area, or;
3. Constructing the FAMCAMP in the DRMO area

These alternatives are potentially practicable, but do not reasonably fulfill the purpose and need for the Proposed Action for reasons which include the following:

1. Constructing the FAMCAMP in the old Bunker Hill housing area (8.11 acres) would present issues to SAFB as the land is leased to Balfour Beatty Communities. SAFB would need to renegotiate a long term lease to have the land returned to base ownership.
to develop on this site. The site is also the location where family housing would be built as Balfour Beatty recapitalizes the housing in Freedom Estates. This site would not reduce or eliminate any known environmental impacts nor provide any benefits or better meet the FAMCAMP’s purpose and need.

2. Constructing the FAMCAMP in the Wind Creek housing area (6.19 acres) poses many of the same problems as the Bunker Hill site in terms of site ownership. In addition, this site would present access issues as RVs enter and exit the site, potentially requiring reconstruction of the intersection, and would not be aesthetically pleasing to senior base leadership living in close proximity to the site. The area would also exceed the noise contour ranging from 65-69dB. The FAMCAMP would not be a compatible land use with the single-family residential.

3. Constructing the FAMCAMP in the DRMO location would have several issues to overcome. The area would be located just outside the QD-ARC. This could be potentially dangerous as exploding material may cause debris to land outside the arc area. The entire site would be less than 8 acres. This small site would limit the number of lots and the maneuverability of the RV’s. All Utilities and infrastructure would have to be reworked and constructed to account for the FAMCAMP at this location.

2.3 The Proposed Action

SAFB proposes to construct a 20 Space FAMCAMP and earthen berm an area of approximately 8.275 acres (Appendix B, Figure 2). Implementation of the Proposed Action would require:

1. Construction of 20 Space FAMCAMP (Pavement for easy access),
2. A building with shower, laundry, and office facilities,
3. A black water dumping station,
4. Water and electrical hookups at each site,
5. Construction of an earthen berm to assist with providing the FAMCAMP users with a sense of place and providing SAFB a visual obstruction for aesthetic reasons,
6. Current landscaping would be used to the maximum extent practical; however, additional landscaping would include trees, rocks, and a variety of ground cover that meets the requirements in accordance with Department of Defense and Air Force Landscape Design criteria.

2.4 No Action

Under the no-action alternative, a FAMCAMP would not be constructed at SAFB. Military personnel traversing the area would be required to continue to use off-base camping or hotel facilities. Likewise, family members of students who are visiting the base would continue to use off-base facilities. The closest campground to SAFB is 8.6 miles from the installation.

The no-action alternative is, however, examined for environmental impacts as fully as the Proposed Action in accordance with Air Force NEPA guidance (32 CFR 989) as a baseline for comparing the effects of the other alternatives.
3. The Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

The affected environment is the baseline against which potential impacts caused by the Proposed Action and alternative actions (including the No Action - alternative) are assessed. This section focuses on the human environment that has the potential to be affected by the construction of a FAMCAMP. As stated in 40 CFR 1508.14, the potential affected human environment is interpreted comprehensively to include the natural and physical environment and the relationship of people with the environment. Relevant natural and physical resources were selected for description in this section based on categories that would be affected by this proposal of the FAMCAMP. Information is presented in this section to the level of detail necessary to support the analysis of potential impacts in Section 4, Environmental Consequences.

The following subsections describe the existing conditions of the Resource areas that would potentially be affected by the Proposed Action.

The no-action alternatives for all the categories below will have “No Impact” and these categories would stay the same.

3.1 Cultural/Historic/Archeological Resources

Cultural resource management at Air Force installations is established in AFI 32-7065, Cultural Resources Management. AFI 32-7065 details compliance requirements for protecting cultural resources through an Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP). Sheppard AFB updated the ICRMP February 2012.

Surveys evaluating historic buildings, structures, and landscapes at Sheppard AFB were conducted in 1993 and 2002 and the Base recently completed an Inventory and Assessment of Select Building and Structures (Dating Through 1976) June 2012.

The archaeological assessment of the Base in 1993 covered the northwestern part of the base and open areas, including the area that was the parasail training area, the physical training area, civil engineering training area, and the pastures associated with the saddle club. Observations of existing developed areas and ongoing construction-related activities indicated that there was an extremely low probability of any intact cultural deposits within the Base.

The Base’s Real Property Inventory listing was reviewed for the period from 1928 to 1950 to identify any buildings or structures that might meet the eligibility requirements for listing on the NRHP. During this survey, the Kell Field Air Terminal Building was the only building determined eligible for both the NRHP and State register. The Kell Field Air Terminal was formerly listed as a Recorded Texas Historic Landmark by the Texas Historical Commission in 1981. No archaeological resources were identified and it was recommended no further archaeological investigations be required.

In 1994, a second archaeological survey was also conducted and focused on the Sheppard AFB Recreational Area (Sheppard AFBRA). An initial literature and archival search was conducted to establish the presence of any previously recorded sites on the Sheppard AFBRA property. Information was found on two previously recorded sites (41GSIIS and 41GS26). Both are usually completely submerged in Lake Texoma; consequently, they have not been investigated. No archaeological resource sites were located during the 1994 survey, and no sites eligible for nomination to the NRHP were found. SHPO concurred with these findings. If there are any inadvertent discoveries, the SHPO will be notified.
and impacts to any historic resources will be evaluated to determine if they are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP per AFI 32-7065.

A Cold War inventory was conducted in 2002. Of the 256 buildings and structures at Sheppard that were constructed on the Base during the Cold War period, only two (Buildings 2560 and 2130) were recommended eligible for NRHP listing as Cold War resources. Building 2130, also known as the Little Adobe, was built circa 1928, was dedicated as a recorded Texas Historical Landmark in November 1981, and is currently used as a historical museum (Heritage Center). Building 2560 and the Alert Apron were used during the Cold War as the Strategic Air Command (SAC) facilities.

The Inventory and Assessment of Select Building and Structures (Dating Through 1976) was conducted in June 2012. None of the 133 buildings were found to be eligible for NRHP.

No cultural resources are located adjacent to or in the vicinity of the Proposed Action. Building 2560 and the Alert Apron are located approximately two miles north northeast of the proposed FAMCAMP location. Therefore, the proposed action would have no impact on any cultural resources. The no-action alternative would also have no impact on cultural resources.

### 3.2 Natural Resources

The proposed action would occur on previously disturbed areas within the developed area of the base. The proposed project area is composed of grasses that are periodically mowed including Bermuda (Cynodon dactylon), buffalo grass (Buchloe dactyloides), Texas wintergrass (Stipa leucotricha), Johnson grass (Sorghum halepense), and purple three-awn (Aristida purpurea). Impacts to vegetation communities would be due to surface disturbance and the construction of the FAMCAMP. All proposed sites were previously developed and all vegetation communities will continue to be manmade and maintained. Re-vegetation of disturbed areas would be in compliance with the Executive Memorandum on Beneficial Landscaping (26/Apr/94) and the Executive Order on Invasive Species (EO 13112). Regionally native and non-invasive plants will be used to the extent practicable in landscaping and re-vegetation. On this project, re-vegetation will consist of approved mixtures of grass species. Periodically, herbicide would be applied as necessary to control undesirable plant species.

Therefore, impacts to terrestrial biota would be minimal. There are currently sixteen trees in the proposed site. Of those trees, only one is expected to be removed as it is dying due to a fungal infestation and drought conditions. However, several trees would be planted to make the area feel more secluded and to maintain a natural setting. There are fifteen protected species that potentially could be located in Wichita County, Texas. A survey of the proposed project was performed on 9 August 2012, by 82 CES/DS2 staff. Presence of listed species was not observed during the site inspection of the project area. The following table lists these 15 species, their protected status, and whether habitat is located within the proposed project area.
Table 2. Wichita County Threatened and Endangered Species.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Presence of Suitable Habitat</th>
<th>Federal Status</th>
<th>State Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bald Eagle</td>
<td>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Least Tern</td>
<td>Sterna antillarum athalassos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peregrine falcon</td>
<td>Falco peregrinus anatum (American)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Falco peregrinus tundrius (Arctic)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whooping crane</td>
<td>Grus Americana</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray wolf</td>
<td>Canis lupus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red wolf</td>
<td>Canis rufus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas horned lizard</td>
<td>Phrynosoma cornutum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas kangaroo rat</td>
<td>Dipodomys elator</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird’s sparrow</td>
<td>Ammodramus bairdii</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain plover</td>
<td>Charadrius montanus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western burrowing owl</td>
<td>Athene cunicularia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-tailed prairie dog</td>
<td>Cynomys ludovicianus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave myotis bat</td>
<td>Myotis velifer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains spotted skunk</td>
<td>Spilogale putorius interrupta</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


State: (T): Threatened, (E): Endangered, (SOC): Species of Concern

**Listed species whose migratory routes cross Wichita County; *winter residents of Wichita County**

The Texas horned lizard has been observed on the Base, primarily in the area of the northern ends of the airfields, but it has also been observed at the former Saddle Club area and a trend has been seen as the lizard has shown sign of slowly heading south. The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department Natural Diversity Database (TPWD NDD) comments provided in conjunction with the SAFB Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan dated March 2012, revealed occurrences of the Texas kangaroo rat (EOID 3126, EOID 8871) within 2 miles of the proposed project area. The site visit determined that the project area lacked suitable habitat to support the Texas horned lizard or the Texas kangaroo rat. No mesquite communities with dense clay soils were located within the project vicinity. The TPWD NDD data is used for potential presence data and cannot be interpreted as presence/absence data. There would be no potential to affect federal and state listed species occurring on or near the base from either the proposed action or the no-action alternative.

Representative mammal species occurring in the area include common small mammals include the Eastern Cottontail (Sylvilagus floridanus), Black-Tailed Jackrabbit (Lepus californicus), and Mexican...
Ground Squirrel (Spermophilus mexicanus). Representative avian species occurring in the geographical region include Red-Tailed Hawks (Buteo jamaicensis), and Mourning Dove (Zenaida macroura).

The proposed location would not interfere with the local wildlife, as the animals are able to adapt to change and would most likely be drawn to the area because of the landscape and vegetation added to the area. Therefore, the proposed action could have a minor positive impact on native mammal species. The No-Action Alternative would have no impacts to the local wildlife.

3.2.1 Migratory Bird Treaty Act

The project area was investigated for any structures containing migratory birds or indications of nesting migratory birds. Migratory birds were not observed in the project area. Migratory birds may arrive in the project area to breed during construction of the proposed project. Measures would be taken to avoid the taking of migratory birds, their occupied nests, eggs, or young, in accordance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, through phasing of work or preventative measures. SAFB follows strict procedures to adhere with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

3.2.2 Visual

Aesthetic values would be emphasized on this project. It has always been the policy of SAFB to maintain visually pleasing facilities, coupling beauty with their functional capability. The aesthetic effect of this project would be equal to or better than the existing land use. The addition of a six-foot earthen berm planted with trees and shrubs will also block sightlines from the main portion of the base and would provide the FAMCAMP users with an outdoor area, effectively creating a natural sense of place for the users. (Appendix B, Figure 2).

3.3 Water Resources

The proposed project is located in the Red River Basin. Storm water runoff in the project area flows into the SAFB Storm Sewer System which flows into Plum Lake.

3.3.1 Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act

Runoff from this project would not discharge directly into Section 303(d) listed threatened or impaired water, or into a stream within 5 miles upstream of a Section 303(d) listed threatened or impaired water. The 2012 Clean Water Act 303(d) list was utilized in this assessment.

3.3.2 Section 402 of the Clean Water Act: TPDES, Construction General Permit

The FAMCAMP project would disturb more than 5 acres. SAFB would comply with TCEQ’s Texas Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (TPDES) Construction General Permit (CGP). Permit coverage would be required. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWP3) would be prepared and implemented. A Notice of Intent (NOI) would be submitted to TCEQ. The NOI and the site notice would also be posted at the FAMCAMP site where it can be seen easily by the public on base.
3.3.3 Section 402 of the Clean Water Act: TPDES, MS4

This project is located within the boundaries of Sheppard AFB's Phase II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), and would comply with the applicable MS4 requirements.

3.3.4 Floodplains

The FAMCAMP project is not located within the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated 100-year floodplain. The proposed project would not increase base flood elevation to a level that would violate applicable floodplain regulations and ordinances. Coordination with the local Floodplain Administrator would not be required.

3.3.5 Wetlands

Wetlands are defined as those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface water or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas (33 CFR 328.3,8b).

Under sections 301 and 502 of the Clean Water Act, any discharge of dredged or fill materials into "waters of the United States," including wetlands, is forbidden unless authorized by a permit issued by the USACE pursuant to section 404. Essentially, all discharges of fill or dredged material affecting the bottom elevation of a jurisdictional water of the U.S. require a permit from USACE. These permits are an essential part of protecting wetlands, which are often filled by land developers. Wetlands are vital to the ecosystem in filtering streams and rivers and providing habitat for wildlife.

There are no designated wetland areas within the project site. The closest wetlands are approximately two miles north from the proposed site and approximately a mile southeast of the site. Therefore, there would be no impacts on wetlands from the proposed action, and a Section 404 permit would not be required for this project. The no-action alternative would also have no impact on wetlands.

3.4 National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)

The ambient air quality in an area can be characterized in terms of whether or not it complies with the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) (40 CFR 50 and CAA §108). The EPA has established NAAQS for six air pollutants: Ozone, Lead, Carbon Monoxide, Sulfur Dioxide, Nitrogen Dioxide, and Respirable Particulate Matter. Texas has adopted the NAAQS as its state ambient air quality standards under TAC §30.1.101.21. The EPA is tasked with constantly reviewing the NAAQS and recommending changes based on improved scientific knowledge and understanding of how these pollutants impact health and the environment. The project is located in Wichita County, Texas, which is an area of attainment of all NAAQS; therefore, a conformity determination under the Clean Air Act conformity rules is not required.
3.4.1 Construction Impacts

During the construction phase of this project there could be temporary increases in air pollutant emissions from construction activities, equipment, and related vehicles. The primary construction related emissions are particulate matter (fugitive dust) from site preparation and construction and non-road mobile source air toxics (MSATs) from construction equipment and vehicles. The primary MSAT emission related to construction is diesel particulate matter from diesel powered construction equipment and vehicles. These emissions are temporary in nature (only occurring during actual construction and it is not reasonably possible to estimate impacts from these emissions due to limitations of the existing models). However, the potential impacts of particulate matter emissions will be minimized by using fugitive dust control measures such as covering or treating disturbed areas with dust suppression techniques, sprinkling, covering loaded trucks, and other dust abatement controls, as appropriate. The MSAT emissions will be minimized by measures to encourage use of USEPA required cleaner diesel fuels, limits on idling, increasing use of cleaner burning diesel engines, and other emission limitation techniques, as appropriate. However, considering the temporary and transient nature of construction related emissions as well as the mitigation actions to be utilized, emissions from construction of this project would have negligible impacts on air quality in the area.

Upon project completion, the FAMCAMP site would be populated by large recreational vehicles with diesel and gasoline engines. These vehicles are governed by federal and state laws for emissions and would not add an inordinate amount of emissions to the local area. The site is primarily an open area and any emissions would quickly dissipate and would not impact Wichita County’s ability to be an area of attainment of all NAAQS. Essentially military campers would be using the on-base site in lieu of traveling 8.6 miles to the closest off-base campsite. For those attending graduations and other events at Sheppard, the proposed action would result in a net decrease of miles driven, resulting in a very minor reduction in vehicle emissions, and consequently a negligible positive impact on air quality. The no-action alternative would have no impact on air quality.

3.5 Environmental Justice

Executive Order (EO) 12898 “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Population” requires each federal agency to make “achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies and activities on minority populations and low-income populations. The Proposed Action would not directly or indirectly impact minority or low-income populations; therefore, no further environmental justice analysis is warranted.
3.6 Socioeconomic Resources

The impact of the FAMCAMP on the 3 surrounding businesses would be negligible due to the small size of the FAMCAMP and the limited population that can access the FAMCAMP (DoD employees, retirees, and DoD dependants). However, the 20 space FAMCAMP would provide a great benefit to Sheppard as many people would stop at the FAMCAMP because of the close amenities. (BX, Pool, Shopette).

3.7 Community Impacts

Community cohesion is a term that refers to an aggregate quality of a residential area. Cohesion is a social attribute that indicates a sense of community, common responsibility, and social interaction within limited geographic areas. The project is located on a federal installation. There are no residences adjacent to the proposed project site. The proposed project would require no relocations. No adverse impacts to any neighborhoods, communities, or other social units are anticipated as a result of the proposed projects.

The proposed project would be constructed in an area that is already partially developed. Given the nature of the project vicinity, this project would not divide, separate, or isolate any neighborhood or community, nor would it increase through traffic in the residential areas. No negative impact on community cohesion is expected from either the proposed action or the no-action alternative.

3.8 Noise

The minimal changes to the area will add low levels of noise. However, these low-levels would not reasonably increase the ambient noise level. Noise impacts related to construction would only be temporary and would not have any effect on the RV Campers once the site is completed. The Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) noise level zone for the proposed site according to the AICUZ maps would be under 65dB which is compared to laughter, office noise, or normal conversation at 3 feet away. This would be below the threshold to cause noise issues for potential RV campers and would allow the campers to rest at night without hearing excessive noise and hear very minimal noise from the day to day activity of a military installation.

3.9 Existing Hazardous Materials

Based on the proposed activity to construct a FAMCAMP an Initial Site Assessment (ISA) was conducted to identify potential hazardous materials in the project area. The ISA consisted of the following actions: design review, map review, regulatory database review, and a project site visit. This project does not involve known hazardous materials impacts that could be anticipated to adversely affect construction (e.g. cannot resolve before bidding or during construction).

The area surrounding the proposed FAMCAMP is composed of land that was at one time the site for the Non-Commission Officers Club (NCO). The NCO club was demolished in June 2009 because of economical and mechanical deterioration of the facility. The area was then allowed to go back to its natural state. A pool, a convenience gas station and warehouses are currently in the surrounding area. Surveys of the proposed project areas were performed on 9 August 2012. No evidence of contamination or hazardous materials was observed within the proposed project vicinity. The local Installation Restoration Program (IRP) site map was also reviewed and there are no such sites in the immediate area.
A check of the USEPA Enviromapper website revealed no toxic release sites, no hazardous waste sites, and no Superfund sites, in or adjacent, to the proposed project area. A review of the TCEQ petroleum storage tanks (PSTs) registration database revealed one PST facility located south of the FAMCAMP project site, but it is not leaking. The site survey and research into the historical land use did not reveal any abandoned and/or active gas stations on the site other than the existing and active gas station. No significant excavation is anticipated as the existing gas station is currently operational and not on the Leaking Underground Petroleum Storage Tank List.

Should hazardous materials be discovered as the result of the implementation of this project, they would be removed. The removal and disposal process would comply with applicable federal, state, and local laws.

The contractor will take appropriate measures to prevent, minimize, and control the spill of hazardous materials in the construction staging area. All spills, including those of less than 25 gallons would be cleaned immediately and any contaminated soil would be immediately removed from the site and disposed of properly.

### 3.10 Geology and Soils

Sheppard AFB is located in the Central Rolling Red Plains of the Redbeds Plains unit of the Central Lowland physiographic province. Much of the land at SAFB is characterized as semi-improved or improved. The soil belt formed here is known as the Kamay-Bluegrove-Deandale Association. This association consists of loamy soils that formed in red-bed clay, shale or sandstone, or in old alluvium derived from red-bed clay and shale. Common soil series include Kamay, Bluegrove, and Deandale.

Soils at Sheppard AFB are generally characterized as reddish-brown sandy loam, highly susceptible to wind and water erosion, underlain with red clay-to-clay loam. In certain areas, red-bed shale and sandstone are near the surface. The general area where the FAMCAMP location is likely to be is in area of Bluegrove-Urban land complex that are one to three percent slopes. (Appendix B, Figure 3). Adequate landscaping is required to maintain soil stability at the Base; regionally native and non-invasive plants will be used to the extent practicable in landscaping and re-vegetation. On this project, re-vegetation will consist of approved mixtures of grass species. Periodically, herbicide may be applied as necessary to control undesirable plant species.

Additional soil that was once located at the airfield will be used to make the 6-8ft earthen berm to make the area feel secluded.

### 4. Conclusion

The impact to the environment from the proposed construction of a FAMCAMP has been assessed. Two different alternatives (the Proposed Action, and the No Action Alternative) were examined. No cumulative impacts to the environment were identified for the Proposed Action, and the No-Action Alternative showed that "No Impact" would occur if the project was not supported.

No significant environmental issues were determined through this Environmental Assessment that indicates a requirement to publish an Environmental Impact Statement as required by 32 CFR 989, and the National Environmental Policy Act.
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Notice of Availability for Public Comment
Interagency/Intergovernmental Coordination

First, one of the worst years in Mexico's history. Per capita growth sharply rebounded in...
Construction of a FAMCAMP
December 6, 2012

82CES/DS2/CEV
231 9th Avenue, Bldg 1402
Sheppard AFB, TX 76311-3333

Brent Boydston
Attorney Advisor
82 TRW/JA
317 F Ave
Sheppard AFB TX 76354

Dear Brent,

The Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed construction of a Family Campground (FAMCAMP) at Sheppard Air Force Base (AFB) is attached for your review and comment. This document addresses the manner in which the base proposes to develop the base.

A copy of the Draft EA that analyzes the proposal and alternatives is attached for your review and comment. A listing of the other agencies contacted is also included. The comment period for this EA is 30 calendar days from the date of this letter. If we do not receive a response by 6 January 2012 we will proceed with signature of the Finding of No Significant Impact/Finding of No Practical Alternative associated with this EA. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (940) 676-7481.

Sincerely,

Leslie Peña
Environmental Tech II
EIAP Program Manager

Attachments:
1. EA for the proposed construction of FAMCAMP at Sheppard AFB
December 3, 2012

82CES/DS2/CEV
231 9th Avenue, Bldg 1402
Sheppard AFB, TX 76311-3333

Mr. Michael Burgess
Chairman
Comanche Nation
HC-35, Box 1720
Lawton, OK 73502

Dear Sir,

The Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed construction of a Family Campground (FAMCAMP) at Sheppard Air Force Base (AFB) is enclosed for your review and comment. This document addresses the manner in which the base proposes to develop the base.

A copy of the Draft EA that analyzes the proposal and alternatives is enclosed for your review and comment. A listing of the other agencies contacted is also included. The comment period for this EA is 30 calendar days from the date of this letter. If we do not receive a response by 3 January 2012, we will proceed with signature of the Finding of No Significant Impact/Finding of No Practical Alternative associated with this EA. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (940) 676-7481.

Sincerely,

Leslie Peña
Environmental Tech II
EIAP Program Manager

Attachments:
1. EA for the proposed construction of FAMCAMP at Sheppard AFB
2. List of agencies contacted
Dear Tom,

The Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed construction of a Family Campground (FAMCAMP) at Sheppard Air Force Base (AFB) is enclosed for your review and comment. This document addresses the manner in which the base proposes to develop the base.

A copy of the Draft EA that analyzes the proposal and alternatives is enclosed for your review and comment. A listing of the other agencies contacted is also included. The comment period for this EA is 30 calendar days from the date of this letter. If we do not receive a response by 3 January 2012, we will proceed with signature of the Finding of No Significant Impact/Finding of No Practical Alternative associated with this EA. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (940) 676-7481.

Sincerely,

Leslie Peña  
Environmental Tech II  
EIAP Program Manager

Attachments:
1. EA for the proposed construction of FAMCAMP at Sheppard AFB  
2. List of agencies contacted
December 3, 2012

82CES/DS2/CEV
231 9th Avenue, Bldg 1402
Sheppard AFB, TX 76311-3333

Denise S. Francis
Director, State Grants Team
Governor's Office of Budget and Planning
P.O. Box 12428
Austin, Texas 78711

Dear Madam,

The Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed construction of a Family Campground (FAMCAMP) at Sheppard Air Force Base (AFB) is enclosed for your review and comment. This document addresses the manner in which the base proposes to develop the base.

A copy of the Draft EA that analyzes the proposal and alternatives is enclosed for your review and comment. A listing of the other agencies contacted is also included. The comment period for this EA is 30 calendar days from the date of this letter. If we do not receive a response by 3 January 2012 we will proceed with signature of the Finding of No Significant Impact/Finding of No Practical Alternative associated with this EA. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (940) 676-7481.

Sincerely,

Leslie Peña
Environmental Tech II
EIAP Program Manager

Attachments:
1. EA for the proposed construction of FAMCAMP at Sheppard AFB
2. List of agencies contacted
Dear Sir,

The Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed construction of a Family Campground (FAMCAMP) at Sheppard Air Force Base (AFB) is enclosed for your review and comment. This document addresses the manner in which the base proposes to develop the base.

A copy of the Draft EA that analyzes the proposal and alternatives is enclosed for your review and comment. A listing of the other agencies contacted is also included. The comment period for this EA is 30 calendar days from the date of this letter. If we do not receive a response by 3 January 2012 we will proceed with signature of the Finding of No Significant Impact/Finding of No Practical Alternative associated with this EA. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (940) 676-7481.

Sincerely,

Leslie Peña
Environmental Tech II
EIAP Program Manager

Attachments:
1. EA for the proposed construction of FAMCAMP at Sheppard AFB
2. List of agencies contacted
December 3, 2012

82CES/DS2/CEV
231 9th Avenue, Bldg 1402
Sheppard AFB, TX 76311-3333

Jim Harrison, MC119
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

Dear Sir,

The Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed construction of a Family Campground (FAMCAMP) at Sheppard Air Force Base (AFB) is enclosed for your review and comment. This document addresses the manner in which the base proposes to develop the base.

A copy of the Draft EA that analyzes the proposal and alternatives is enclosed for your review and comment. A listing of the other agencies contacted is also included. The comment period for this EA is 30 calendar days from the date of this letter. If we do not receive a response by 3 January 2012 we will proceed with signature of the Finding of No Significant Impact/Finding of No Practical Alternative associated with this EA. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (940) 676-7481.

Sincerely,

Leslie Peña
Environmental Tech II
EIAP Program Manager

Attachments:
1. EA for the proposed construction of FAMCAMP at Sheppard AFB
2. List of agencies contacted
December 3, 2012

82CES/DS2/CEV
231 9th Avenue, Bldg 1402
Sheppard AFB, TX 76311-3333

Mr. Jeff Houser
Chairman
Fort Sill Apache Tribe of Oklahoma
RT. 2, Box 121
Apache, OK 73006

Dear Sir,

The Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed construction of a Family Campground (FAMCAMP) at Sheppard Air Force Base (AFB) is enclosed for your review and comment. This document addresses the manner in which the base proposes to develop the base.

A copy of the Draft EA that analyzes the proposal and alternatives is enclosed for your review and comment. A listing of the other agencies contacted is also included. The comment period for this EA is 30 calendar days from the date of this letter. If we do not receive a response by 3 January 2012, we will proceed with signature of the Finding of No Significant Impact/Finding of No Practical Alternative associated with this EA. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (940) 676-7481.

Sincerely,

Leslie Peña
Environmental Tech II
EIAP Program Manager

Attachments:
1. EA for the proposed construction of FAMCAMP at Sheppard AFB
2. List of agencies contacted
December 3, 2012

82CES/DS2/CEV
231 9th Avenue, Bldg 1402
Sheppard AFB, TX 76311-3333

Mr. Donald Patterson
President
Tonkawa Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma
1 Rush Buffalo Road
Tonkawa, OK 74653-4449

Dear Sir,

The Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed construction of a Family Campground (FAMCAMP) at Sheppard Air Force Base (AFB) is enclosed for your review and comment. This document addresses the manner in which the base proposes to develop the base.

A copy of the Draft EA that analyzes the proposal and alternatives is enclosed for your review and comment. A listing of the other agencies contacted is also included. The comment period for this EA is 30 calendar days from the date of this letter. If we do not receive a response by 3 January 2012, we will proceed with signature of the Finding of No Significant Impact/Finding of No Practical Alternative associated with this EA. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (940) 676-7481.

Sincerely,

Leslie Peña
Environmental Tech II
EIAP Program Manager

Attachments:
1. EA for the proposed construction of FAMCAMP at Sheppard AFB
2. List of agencies contacted
December 3, 2012

82CES/DS2/CEV
231 9th Avenue, Bldg 1402
Sheppard AFB, TX 76311-3333

Russell Schreiber
Director of Public Works
1300 7th St. Room 402
Wichita Falls, Texas 76301

Dear Sir,

The Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed construction of a Family Campground (FAMCAMP) at Sheppard Air Force Base (AFB) is enclosed for your review and comment. This document addresses the manner in which the base proposes to develop the base.

A copy of the Draft EA that analyzes the proposal and alternatives is enclosed for your review and comment. A listing of the other agencies contacted is also included. The comment period for this EA is 30 calendar days from the date of this letter. If we do not receive a response by 3 January 2012 we will proceed with signature of the Finding of No Significant Impact/Finding of No Practical Alternative associated with this EA. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (940) 676-7481.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Leslie Peña
Environmental Tech II
EIAP Program Manager

Attachments:
1. EA for the proposed construction of FAMCAMP at Sheppard AFB
2. List of agencies contacted
December 3, 2012

82CES/DS2/CEV
231 9th Avenue, Bldg 1402
Sheppard AFB, TX 76311-3333

Ms. Leslie Standing
Wichita and Affiliated Tribes
P.O. Box 729
Anadarko, OK 73005

Dear Madam,

The Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed construction of a Family Campground (FAMCAMP) at Sheppard Air Force Base (AFB) is enclosed for your review and comment. This document addresses the manner in which the base proposes to develop the base.

A copy of the Draft EA that analyzes the proposal and alternatives is enclosed for your review and comment. A listing of the other agencies contacted is also included. The comment period for this EA is 30 calendar days from the date of this letter. If we do not receive a response by 3 January 2012, we will proceed with signature of the Finding of No Significant Impact/Finding of No Practical Alternative associated with this EA. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (940) 676-7481.

Sincerely,

Leslie Peña
Environmental Tech II
EIAP Program Manager

Attachments:
1. EA for the proposed construction of FAMCAMP at Sheppard AFB
2. List of agencies contacted
December 3, 2012

82CES/DS2/CEV
231 9th Avenue, Bldg 1402
Sheppard AFB, TX 76311-3333

Dr. Donald Tofpi
Chairman
Kiowa Indian Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 369
Carnegie, OK 73015

Dear Sir,

The Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed construction of a Family Campground (FAMCAMP) at Sheppard Air Force Base (AFB) is enclosed for your review and comment. This document addresses the manner in which the base proposes to develop the base.

A copy of the Draft EA that analyzes the proposal and alternatives is enclosed for your review and comment. A listing of the other agencies contacted is also included. The comment period for this EA is 30 calendar days from the date of this letter. If we do not receive a response by 3 January 2012, we will proceed with signature of the Finding of No Significant Impact/Finding of No Practical Alternative associated with this EA. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (940) 676-7481.

Sincerely,

Leslie Peña
Environmental Tech II
EIAP Program Manager

Attachments:
1. EA for the proposed construction of FAMCAMP at Sheppard AFB
2. List of agencies contacted
Dear Julie,

The Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed construction of a Family Campground (FAMCAMP) at Sheppard Air Force Base (AFB) is enclosed for your review and comment. This document addresses the manner in which the base proposes to develop the base.

A copy of the Draft EA that analyzes the proposal and alternatives is enclosed for your review and comment. A listing of the other agencies contacted is also included. The comment period for this EA is 30 calendar days from the date of this letter. If we do not receive a response by 3 January 2012, we will proceed with signature of the Finding of No Significant Impact/Finding of No Practical Alternative associated with this EA. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (940) 676-7481.

Sincerely,

Leslie Peña
Environmental Tech II
EIAP Program Manager

Attachments:
1. EA for the proposed construction of FAMCAMP at Sheppard AFB
2. List of agencies contacted
Dec 3, 2011

82CES/DS2/CEV
231 9th Avenue, Bldg 1402
Sheppard AFB, TX 76311-3333

Dennis Wilde
Nortex Regional Planning Commission
4309 Jacksboro Hwy,
Suite 200
Wichita Falls, TX 76302

Dear Sir,

The Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed construction of a Family Campground (FAMCAMP) at Sheppard Air Force Base (AFB) is enclosed for your review and comment. This document addresses the manner in which the base proposes to develop the base.

A copy of the Draft EA that analyzes the proposal and alternatives is enclosed for your review and comment. A listing of the other agencies contacted is also included. The comment period for this EA is 30 calendar days from the date of this letter. If we do not receive a response by 3 January 2012, we will proceed with signature of the Finding of No Significant Impact/Finding of No Practical Alternative associated with this EA. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (940) 676-7481.

Sincerely,

Leslie Peña
Environmental Tech II
EIAP Program Manager

Attachments:
1. EA for the proposed construction of FAMCAMP at Sheppard AFB
2. List of agencies contacted
December 3, 2012

82CES/DS2/CEV
231 9th Avenue, Bldg 1402
Sheppard AFB, TX 76311-3333

William A. McWhorter
Program Coordinator
Military Sites Program
History Programs Division
Texas Historical Commission
P.O. Box 12276
Austin, TX 78711-2276

Dear William,

The Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed construction of a Family Campground (FAMCAMP) at Sheppard Air Force Base (AFB) is enclosed for your review and comment. This document addresses the manner in which the base proposes to develop the base.

A copy of the Draft EA that analyzes the proposal and alternatives is enclosed for your review and comment. A listing of the other agencies contacted is also included. The comment period for this EA is 30 calendar days from the date of this letter. If we do not receive a response by 3 January 2012, we will proceed with signature of the Finding of No Significant Impact/Finding of No Practical Alternative associated with this EA. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (940) 676-7481.

Sincerely,

Leslie Peña
Environmental Tech II
EIAP Program Manager

Attachments:
1. EA for the proposed construction of FAMCAMP at Sheppard AFB
2. List of agencies contacted
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Figures

Construction of a FAMCAMP
FIGURE 1- ALTERNATIVES AND PROPOSED AREAS

FIGURE 2, DRAFT OF VISUAL CONCEPT FOR FAMPCAMP. GREEN = RV LOTS; WAVY LINE = EARTHEN BERM
### Map Unit Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Unit Symbol</th>
<th>Map Unit Name</th>
<th>Acres in AOI</th>
<th>Percent of AOI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BuB</td>
<td>Bluegrove-Urban land complex, 1 to 3 percent slopes</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KcB</td>
<td>Kamay-Urban land complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals for Area of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 3-SOIL MAP OF FAMCAMP LOCATION**
APPENDIX C

Governmental Agency/Public Comments

PENA, LESLIE L CTR USAF AETC 82 CES/DS2/CEIV

From: BOYDSTON, MICHAEL R GS-12 USAF AETC 82 TRW/JAC
Sent: Thursday, January 03, 2013 3:45 PM
To: PENA, LESLIE L CTR USAF AETC 82 CES/DS2/CEIV
Subject: KF FAMCAMP EA Review
Signed By: michael.boydston.3@us.af.mil

Leslie:

I have reviewed the Preliminary Draft of the Environmental Assessment pertaining to the FAMCAMP Project Proposal. It appears in order and well on its way. I stand ready to provide further review and assistance at your request for the next stages of this process.

Thanks,

v/r

R. Brent Boydston
Attorney/Counselor

-----Original message-----
From: PENA, LESLIE L CTR USAF AETC 82 CES/DS2/CEIV
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2012 10:10 AM
To: BOYDSTON, MICHAEL R GS-12 USAF AETC 82 TRW/JAC
Cc: ARELLADO, JAVIER L GS-05 USAF AETC 82 TRW/JAC
Subject: FAMCAMP EA Review
Importance: High

Sent,

I have attached a formal letter and the newest EA for your review.

Thanks,

Leslie

Leslie Peña
Defense Support Services, LLC (DS2)
EJAP/ENPP/Cultural/natural Resource Program Manager
Tel: (340) 676-7461
DSN: 735-7461
Shippard AFB, Texas
leslie.peña.c2@us.af.mil
Draft

Environmental Assessment

To

Construct a FAMCAMP

Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas

Prepared by:
Defense Support Services, LLC (DS2)
Sheppard AFB, TX

August 2012
Ms. Leslie Pena
8aCES/DS2/CEV
231 5th Avenue, Blq, 1402
Sheppard AFB, Texas, 79115-333

Re: TCRQ Grant and Texas Review and Comment System (TRACS) #2012-509, Sheppard AFB, Wichita County, Family Campground

Dear Ms. Pena:

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) has reviewed the above-referenced project and offers the following comments:

A review of the project for general conformity impact in accordance with 40 CFR Part 93 indicates that the proposed action is located in Wichita County, which is currently unclassified or in attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for all six criteria air pollutants. Therefore, general conformity rules do not apply.

Although any demolition, construction, rehabilitation or repair project may produce dust and particulate emissions, these actions are not anticipated to result in a significant impact upon air quality standards. Any dust and particulate emission should be easily controlled by using standard dust mitigation techniques.

We do not anticipate significant long term environmental impacts from this project as long as construction and waste disposal activities associated with it are completed in accordance with applicable local, state, and federal environmental permits, statutes, and regulations. We recommend that the applicant take necessary steps to ensure that best management practices are used to control runoff from construction sites to prevent detrimental impact to surface and ground water.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project. If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Melanie Aldana at (512) 230-1622 or melanie.aldana@tceq.texas.gov.

Sincerely,

Susana A. Hildebrand, P.E.
Chief Engineer
MS. Leslie Pena 
Environmental Tech II 
EHAP Program Manager 
82CES/DS2/CRV 
231 9th Avenue, Building 1402 
Sheppard AFB, TX 76311-3333 

Re: Draft Environmental Assessment for the proposed construction of a Family Campground at Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas (Wichita County) 

Dear Ms. Pena: 

Thank you for your correspondence describing the above referenced project. This letter serves as comment on the proposed undertaking from the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Executive Director of the Texas Historical Commission (THC). 

Our review staff, led by Mr. William McWhorter, has reviewed the above mentioned consultation from your office and the THC agrees with the U.S. Air Force’s determination of NO HISTORIC PROPERTIES AFFECTED for this project’s proposed undertaking to construct a Family Campground at Sheppard Air Force Base. 

Thank you for your cooperation in this state and federal review process, and for your efforts to preserve the irreplaceable heritage of Texas. If you have any questions concerning our review or if we may be of further assistance, please contact Mr. William McWhorter at 512/463-5833. 

Sincerely, 

Mark Wolfe 
Executive Director 
State Historic Preservation Office 

RICK FERREY, GOVERNOR • MATTHEW F. KREIBLE, III, CHAIRMAN • MARK WOLFE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR 
P.O. BOX 12276 • AUSTIN, TEXAS • 78711-2276 • P. 512.463.6160 • F. 512.475.6972 • TDD: 1.800.735.2889 • WWW.THC.TEXAS.TX.US
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
AIR EDUCATION AND TRAINING COMMAND

MEMORANDUM FOR 82 TRW/CES

FROM: 82 FTW/JA

SUBJECT: Review of EA for FAMCAMP Construction

23 May 2013

1. BLUF: This office has reviewed the above titled proposed Environmental Assessment action and finds that contingent upon addressing the concerns identified herein is it legally sufficient.

2. 82 TRW/CES has proffered the Environmental Assessment of a proposed action which entails the construction of a Family RV Camping Facility. The primary purpose for this proposed action is to enhance the quality of life for air force retiree’s and other vacationers/travelers who may be coming to and through the Wichita Falls, Texas area.

3. Applicable Law and Guidance: Environmental Assessments of Proposed Actions on Sheppard AFB, Texas are governed by AFI 32-7064, AFI 32-7065 and 32 CFR 989 as well as related case law.

4. Specific Assessments: This proposed action has been reviewed regarding its impact on wetland and or flood plain; public interest or controversy; and its requirement of significant mitigation in order to obtain insignificant impact status. The Environmental Assessment has been reviewed for "structural" sufficiency such as whether or not there is a stated "purpose and need" for the action; the identification and analysis of Alternatives to the proposed action; the presence of an analysis regarding the affected environment including the necessary discussions and consultations; a full assessment of the the Environmental Impact has been accomplished including direct effects, indirect effects, cumulative effects, human/occupational safety*, required pollution prevention measures*, and environmental justice IAW EO. All necessary notifications have been accomplished or are in the process of obtaining substantial compliance*. Furthermore, the propose FONSI has been extensively reviewed in the following areas: does the FONSI explain why the proposed action would have an insignificant impact; does it incorporate by reference the EA*; does it list the name of the action; does it discuss necessary mitigation requirements and has it been made available for adequate public review. The items asterisked will be discussed more specifically as issues of concern.

5. Areas Requiring Specific Mentioning: The EA fails to speak to occupational safety. Admittedly this is an area or issue which one would expect that a project of this nature would pose little if any additional concern. Occupational safety is the issue as to whether or not this project poses significant risk of injury to the persons conducting the project. There is nothing...
about this project which is novel or inherently risky so as to pose a greater risk to employees/workers than any other general construction project. Finally, much discussion has taken place regarding the difference between the concept of notification and consultation. Suffice to say at this point any concerns are being addressed by additional attempts and documentation of said attempts to insure that the lack of response we have received from a number of outside but possibly affected entities is properly interpreted as "no interest". This is being accomplished by simple telephone calls to document receipt of our earlier correspondence as well as inquiry as to the party’s interest in further consultation. The FONSI should be amended so as to “incorporate by reference it’s Environmental Analysis”. UPDATE: As of 28 May 2013, the telephone contacts have been initiated and completed; accordingly, the requirement for notification and consultation has been accomplished.

6. Recommendation: This reviewer finds the proposed EA legally sufficient contingent upon revisions as described above. If you have any questions, please contact me at 676-4262

M. Brent Boydston, GS-12 DAF
Attorney Advisor

Attachments:
MFR: Telephone Communication with the Tribes with regards to the Headwall and FAMCAMP EA’s dtd: 21 May 2013,