

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)  
ESTABLISHMENT OF PERMANENT UNITED STATES SPACE COMMAND  
HEADQUARTERS**

Pursuant to provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 United States Code 4321 to 4370h; Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations, 40 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) 1500-1508 (2022); and the U.S. Department of the Air Force (DAF) and U.S. Department of the Army (Army) Environmental Impact Analysis Processes (32 C.F.R. Part 989 and 32 C.F.R. Part 651, respectively), the DAF prepared the attached Environmental Assessment (EA) to assess the potential environmental consequences associated with the Proposed Action to establish a permanent U.S. Space Command (USSPACECOM) Headquarters (HQ) facility at one of six Alternative sites in the U.S. The Army is a Cooperating Agency in this NEPA process.

**Purpose and Need**

USSPACECOM was activated as the nation's eleventh Unified Combatant Command on August 29, 2019. Its mission is to command and control all U.S. military forces and operations in the domain 62.1 miles (100 kilometers) above the earth's surface and beyond to deter conflict and, if necessary, defeat aggression, deliver space combat power for the Joint/Combined Force, and defend the vital interests of the U.S. with allies and partners. However, a permanent, centralized USSPACECOM HQ facility from which to coordinate this mission has not been established. The purpose of the Proposed Action, therefore, is to establish a permanent operational USSPACECOM HQ facility to facilitate an operationally efficient combatant command. The Proposed Action is needed because USSPACECOM currently lacks a centralized, permanent, purpose-built HQ facility.

**Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives**

The Proposed Action includes construction and operation of a HQ facility that would be specifically designed to accommodate the functional requirements of USSPACECOM. Approximately 1,450 personnel would be assigned to the proposed HQ facility, although staffing levels could vary depending on mission and operational requirements. Additionally, USSPACECOM may support contractors and mission partners who would be co-located with the permanent HQ and, therefore, the impact of 1,800 personnel is included in this EA. The attached EA analyzes the environmental impacts associated with approximately 1,800 personnel to provide analysis for a potential but not yet approved number of National Agency Representatives and contractor personnel supporting USSPACECOM missions who might be co-located with the permanent HQ. This number is used to provide for potential future personnel growth. Should there be a validated requirement to base personnel beyond 1,450, separate basing actions and associated approvals may need to occur before such basing could be considered reasonably foreseeable.

The proposed HQ would consist of approximately 464,000 square feet of office, administrative, and functional interior space across multiple stories. The main HQ building would be supported by approximately 402,000 square feet of vehicle parking in surface lots and/or parking structures. For both the main building and potential parking structures, stories may be constructed above and/or below ground; the final site layout would be determined according to site-specific characteristics during the design process. The facility would meet administrative space standards in accordance with Air Force Manual 32-1084, *Facility Requirements*.

Due to the critical nature of the proposed HQ facility, it would require Level 2 Force Protection. As such, it would be built within a secure, fenced perimeter at one of the six Alternative sites being considered. Access to the facility would be limited to authorized personnel and visitors, and would be continuously managed by DAF, Department of Defense (DoD), or other federal security personnel. The proposed facility would be

designed and built in accordance with applicable DoD antiterrorism/force protection requirements specified in Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) 4-010-01, *DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings* (December 2018), and UFC 4-023-03, *Design of Buildings to Resist Progressive Collapse* (Change 3, November 2016).

The Proposed Action would comply with all applicable federal and state laws and regulations, including consultation, permitting, and design requirements. For example, the project would comply with applicable requirements of Section 438 of the Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA) of 2007, which requires federal projects to incorporate into the design, to the maximum extent technically feasible, low impact development (LID) measures to maintain the pre-development hydrology of a site. Such concepts could include, but would not be limited to, permeable pavement, rain gardens, and enhancement of riparian buffers. Construction activities would also be conducted in accordance with the applicable requirements of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (USEPA) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and associated permits to manage the quantity and quality of stormwater discharged from the project site and minimize the pollution and sedimentation of receiving water bodies. The DAF would comply with each of these "regulatory compliance measures" and other design commitments applicable to this Proposed Action, including Alternative-specific requirements, if it selects one of the Action Alternatives for implementation.

Construction is expected to begin in fiscal year 2025 and take approximately 2 years to complete. Construction of the proposed facility would include site preparation; identification and extension of utility and infrastructure systems; installation of foundation piles and concrete foundation slab; erection of structural steel; establishment of vehicle parking areas; and modification or extension of existing roads and pedestrian sidewalks to the new facility. Once the site is prepared, excavation would begin for foundation footings and utilities using heavy excavation equipment. Vertical construction of the facility would occur after the foundation is complete. Finally, final grading and landscaping would occur.

Operation of the Proposed Action would generally include office and administrative work to accomplish the USSPACECOM mission. The facility would operate 24 hours per day, 7 days a week, although staffing levels would likely be highest during normal working hours (i.e., Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. local time).

The DAF considered six proposed Alternative sites for implementation of the Proposed Action. In addition to these six Alternative sites, the No Action Alternative was considered.

**Alternative 1 – Huntsville, AL (Redstone Arsenal).** The Alternative 1 site at Redstone Arsenal covers approximately 60 acres in the central portion of the installation. The site is currently undeveloped and is leased by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Real Estate Division for livestock grazing. The Redstone Arsenal site is the DAF's **Preferred Alternative** for implementation of the Proposed Action. (Final EA Pg. 10, § 2.3.1., et seq).

**Alternative 2 – Albuquerque, NM (Kirtland AFB).** The Alternative 2 site at Kirtland Air Force Base (AFB) covers approximately 59 acres along the west side of Pennsylvania Street SE in the northwestern corner of the installation. The site has been completely disturbed in the past; it previously contained a base housing neighborhood. No buildings or structures are present on the site, although the road network, laid out in a general north-south and east-west grid pattern, remains. Ground cover on the site between the existing roads consists of exposed dirt and scrub-shrub vegetation. (Final EA Pg. 12, § 2.3.2., et seq).

**Alternative 3 – Bellevue, NE (Offutt AFB).** The Alternative 3 site at Offutt AFB covers approximately 11 acres along the southeast side of Nelson Drive in the northeast corner of the installation. Previous disturbance on the site consists of four baseball fields and a paved area used for outdoor parking and

storage of vehicles and equipment. Existing vegetation consists of maintained grass and a small number of ornamental trees. No buildings or structures are present on the site. (Final EA Pg. 12, § 2.3.3., et seq).

**Alternative 4 – Colorado Springs, CO (Peterson SFB).** The Alternative 4 site at Peterson Space Force Base (SFB) covers approximately 13 acres along the east side of Vandenberg Street in the installation's Command Complex. Previous development on the site consists of a soft-surface running track. No buildings or structures are present on the parcel. Ground cover on the site primarily consists of maintained grass. (Final EA Pg. 12, § 2.3.4., et seq).

**Alternative 5 – San Antonio, TX (Port San Antonio).** The Alternative 5 site covers approximately 33 acres on the east side of Port San Antonio, an approximately 1,900-acre office, technology, and industrial campus that occupies the former Kelly AFB. Port San Antonio is approximately 5 miles southwest of downtown San Antonio. The site is bounded by General Hudnell Drive to the northwest, paved parking and storage areas to the north and south, and an existing rail yard outside Port San Antonio to the east. Previous disturbance on-site includes an existing multi-story building on the west side of the site and an adjacent surface parking lot; the Proposed Action would avoid disturbance to the multi-story building. The central and eastern portions of the site are currently undeveloped and consist of maintained grass and scattered ornamental trees. (Final EA Pg. 16, § 2.3.5., et seq).

**Alternative 6 – Brevard County, FL (Space Coast Spaceport).** The Alternative 6 site covers approximately 244 acres currently owned by Space Coast Regional Airport in Brevard County near Titusville, Florida. The site is bounded by State Road (SR) 407 (Challenger Memorial Parkway) to the west and by predominantly undeveloped, densely vegetated land within the airport property to the north, east, and south. Previous disturbance consists of multiple dirt roads and trails throughout the site. Except for these trails, the site is almost entirely vegetated with a variety of trees, shrubs, and grasses. A large wetland is present in the center of the site. Due to the size of this site, the DAF has identified a smaller, 103-acre area in the western portion of the overall site (adjacent to SR 407) that would contain all Proposed Action-related activities (i.e., a focused site boundary). The DAF has focused its Alternative 6 analysis on this smaller, 103-acre focused site. (Final EA Pg. 16, § 2.3.6., et seq).

**No Action Alternative.** Under the No Action Alternative, a single, permanent USSPACECOM HQ facility would not be built. The USSPACECOM HQ would continue to operate in interim facilities at Peterson SFB and other installations across the nation for the foreseeable future. The lack of a purpose-built HQ facility would prevent USSPACECOM from operating efficiently. (Final EA Pg. 19, § 2.3.7., et seq).

None of the community proposals included facility renovation as part of their project offers; therefore, the potential environmental consequences from renovation of existing facilities were not analyzed as part of this EA. In March 2020, the Secretary of Defense directed the DAF to follow a particular process involving community self-nominations as the fundamental means for determining which locations would be considered for the USSPACECOM HQ. The Secretary of Defense expressly directed this approach to expand the number of locations considered for the USSPACECOM HQ basing action. The July 13, 2022, Draft EA analyzed a reasonable number of alternatives predicated on the specific community proposals.

The DAF used the Secretary of Defense-directed process together with three key assumptions to select six candidate locations. The assumptions are: (1) 1,450 personnel, (2) facilities comprised of 464,000 square-foot of office space and 402,00 square feet of vehicle parking, and (3) community proposals.

During the Selection Phase of the Secretary of Defense-directed process (December 2020 through January 2021), the DAF Basing Office validated the six candidates' proposals. On November 24, 2020, Basing Office personnel contacted each of the six communities asking that any updates to its proposal be submitted to the DAF by December 4, 2020. The DAF asked each community to address, among other considerations,

whether its proposal included renovation of existing facilities. All of the six selected candidates analyzed as the preferred and reasonable alternatives in the EA were predicated upon new construction.

### **Summary of Environmental Impacts**

The EA evaluates the existing environmental conditions and potential environmental consequences of implementing the Proposed Action with regard to land use and zoning, noise, air quality and climate, earth resources, water resources, biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomics and environmental justice (EJ), transportation, and hazardous and toxic materials and waste (HTMW). The DAF has concluded that the Proposed Action would not meaningfully or measurably affect: occupational safety and health or utilities and infrastructure; thus, these resources were eliminated from detailed analysis in the EA. Environmental impacts are summarized below.

**Land Use and Zoning:** The DAF retained land use and zoning for detailed analysis under Alternatives 5 and 6, as the Port San Antonio and Cape Canaveral Spaceport sites are not on established DoD installations. The DAF dismissed land use and zoning from detailed analysis for Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 because the Proposed Action would have no potential to affect land use or zoning outside the established DoD installation associated with each of those Alternatives. At the Alternative 5 site, construction of the Proposed Action would be compatible with adjacent land uses and the site's existing zoning designation. It would also directly support the City of San Antonio and Port San Antonio mission by repurposing the site in a manner that creates approximately up to 1,800 permanent jobs. At the Alternative 6 site, the DAF would petition the City of Titusville to re-zone the 103-acre focused site, as the site currently contains several zoning designations, some of which conflict with the Proposed Action. However, implementation of Alternative 6 would be consistent and compatible with existing land uses in the Region of Influence (ROI) and would not meaningfully impact existing zoning on a regional scale. Overall, no significant impacts on land use and zoning are anticipated.

**Noise:** Construction of the Proposed Action would generate noise that may cause annoyance to sensitive receptors, such as private residences, schools, health clinics, and places of worship, near the selected site. Noise created during construction would be typical of other similar construction projects and associated primarily with heavy construction equipment. Areas that would be most affected by construction noise are those closest to the selected site footprint; they include the residential dwellings near Alternatives 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6; Marshall Space Flight Center Occupational Health Clinic near Alternative 1; Wherry Elementary School near Alternative 2; and the Offutt Child Development Center near Alternative 3. Remaining sensitive receptors that are 0.25 mile or greater from the selected site would likely experience some construction noise, particularly during outdoor activities. However, construction-related noise impacts would not be expected to substantially affect the normal operations of sensitive receptors in the ROI of the selected site. The DAF anticipates that it would adhere to stipulations included in the applicable local noise ordinance, such as limiting construction to daytime hours and avoiding construction on weekends and holidays.

Noise generated during operation of the proposed HQ facility would be primarily associated with vehicle traffic to and from the site, as well as occasional grounds maintenance. Overall, operational noise would be indiscernible from ambient levels.

No significant impacts on noise are anticipated.

**Air Quality and Climate:** Construction activities would temporarily increase air emissions from the use of construction equipment and vehicles. During operation, emissions would be caused by employees commuting and by the facility's heating, ventilation, and air condition system and emergency generators. The DAF's Air Conformity Applicability Model (ACAM) was used to analyze the potential air quality impacts associated with the Proposed Action. The ACAM results indicate emissions associated with the Proposed

Action would not exceed regulatory or insignificance indicators for criteria pollutants under any Alternative. In the short-term, construction of the Proposed Action would produce between 772.0 and 814 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent. In the long-term, steady state GHG emissions would result in a slight increase over the national baseline, ranging from 0.000091 percent to 0.000118 percent. The proposed HQ facility would be designed to have enhanced resiliency to long-term climate impacts according to the site-specific risks for each Alternative.

No significant impacts on air quality are anticipated.

**Earth Resources:** Construction of the Proposed Action could affect geology if the selected site requires a deep foundation. The extent and nature of these effects would be determined by site-specific soil properties and depth to bedrock. Geotechnical studies would be conducted following selection of the site, and as design of the facility continues, to determine the extent of foundation support required. Even if a deep foundation is required, foundation elements would not be expected to penetrate unique or noteworthy geologic strata, because none are present under any of the Alternative sites. The facility would be designed to applicable, location-specific standards to be resilient to geological hazards (e.g., susceptibility to seismic events and potential for indoor buildup of radon to unacceptable levels) and on-site soil characteristics (e.g., high shrink-swell potential at the Alternative 5 site).

Ground-disturbing activities would alter existing topography to provide generally level construction surfaces; however, all of the proposed sites are relatively flat, and do not contain unique, pristine, or noteworthy topographic features. Generally, changes to existing topography from construction of the Proposed Action would be minimal, and no potential topographic hazards (e.g., steep slopes) would be present.

Ground disturbance associated with construction of the Proposed Action would range between 11 and 74 acres, depending on the site; no ground disturbance would occur off-site. Ground-disturbing activities would remove vegetation and increase the potential for erosion of exposed soils by wind and water. To minimize these impacts, best management practices (BMPs) would be used to prevent and reduce potential erosion and sedimentation during construction. Since all Alternatives would exceed 1 acre of land disturbance, a NPDES Construction General Permit (CGP) would be obtained for the selected site pursuant to the Clean Water Act of 1972. Coverage under the CGP would require development of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which would identify potential sources of pollutants, describe all pollution prevention activities that would be implemented on the site, and establish erosion and sediment controls to manage stormwater discharges and minimize sedimentation to the extent practicable. Alternatives 1, 5, and 6 may also result in no significant adverse impacts on existing prime or unique farmland.

Overall, no significant impacts on earth resources are anticipated.

**Water Resources:** No surface waters occur on the proposed Alternative sites. However, proposed construction activities would disturb the soil and could result in increased runoff from the sites, consequently increasing pollution, sedimentation, and turbidity to nearby surface waters. The DAF would obtain a NPDES CGP and develop or update a SWPPP, which would identify erosion controls and BMPs to manage stormwater discharges. The permanent increase in impervious surfaces at the site could increase runoff, as stormwater would not be able to infiltrate into the ground. However, the site would be designed in compliance with Section 438 of the EISA to restore the pre-development hydrology of the site to the maximum extent technically feasible, such as through use of green infrastructure/low impact development features to minimize stormwater runoff and improve absorption.

Construction of the Proposed Action would not involve groundwater withdrawals or the intentional release or injection of pollutants or contaminants into groundwater resources and aquifers. Potential impacts to groundwater may still occur, however, from the accidental spill or release of petroleum products or other

liquids used during construction activities. These impacts would be managed through implementation of a site-specific Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures Plan (SPCCP).

There would be no impacts to wetlands under any Alternative. Alternative 6 is the only site that contains wetlands; however, the DAF would design the Alternative 6 site layout to exclude all wetlands from the limits of disturbance, and would avoid any temporary or permanent impacts to wetlands in accordance with Executive Order 11990. Additionally, no 100-year or 500-year floodplains are present on any of the Alternative sites, so there would be no impacts to floodplains under any Alternative.

Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 are located outside of the coastal zone. Proposed construction activities under Alternative 6 may disturb coastal resources from onshore ground and soil disturbances, which could lead to increased erosion and sedimentation. However, the Proposed Action would be consistent with the maximum extent practicable with Florida's enforceable policies with compliance with applicable regulations and appropriate agency coordination. The DAF submitted its Federal Consistency Determination for implementation of the Proposed Action at Cape Canaveral Spaceport to the FDEP on August 10, 2021. In an email dated August 10, 2021, the FDEP concurred the Proposed Action would be consistent with Florida's Coastal Management Program.

Overall, no significant impacts to water resources are anticipated.

**Biological Resources:** The DAF assumes that all vegetation on the Alternative sites would be cleared during construction of the Proposed Action. Vegetation removal and/or replacement would be conducted in accordance with the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) or local regulations applicable to the site, as well as time of year restrictions necessary to minimize or prevent impacts on wildlife and their habitat. Overall, the Alternative 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 sites contain marginal vegetative communities due to existing agricultural use, disturbance, active grounds maintenance, and/or extensive invasive species populations. Alternative 6 would have the largest impact to vegetation for this Proposed Action due to the removal of approximately 105 acres of existing natural vegetative communities. However, these vegetative communities, and the scale of the proposed development, are locally common.

Construction of the Proposed Action would permanently remove all existing habitat (i.e., primarily vegetation) from the selected site; this impact would be minor since existing on-site habitat at most of the Alternative sites is generally small in size and low quality, and similar habitats are abundant near the proposed sites. The common wildlife species occurring on the selected site would be physically displaced, and construction noise and increased human activity may also disturb wildlife species located within 0.5 mile of the selected site. Mobile wildlife species, such as birds and mammals, would likely relocate to areas of similar habitat near the site, although less-mobile species (e.g., some reptiles and amphibians) could be inadvertently destroyed by construction activities. Operation of the Proposed Action would cause minor disturbance to wildlife near the selected site due to increased human presence and noise. Over time, many wildlife species would adapt to these new conditions or relocate to other areas.

In general, potential adverse impacts to special status species, if present, would be similar to those described for vegetation and wildlife: habitat loss, displacement, disturbance, and/or mortality. With implementation of applicable BMPs, as well as adherence to measures identified in applicable INRMPs and/or regulations to protect special status species, the Proposed Action may affect, but would not be likely to adversely affect, up to four federally listed species and up to five state listed species. To date, the USFWS has concurred with all of DAF's effect determinations for this Proposed Action. The Proposed Action would not adversely affect the recovery of a federally or state-listed species.

Overall, no significant impacts on biological resources are anticipated.

**Cultural Resources:** No National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-eligible archaeological resources are known to exist at any of the Alternative sites. NRHP-eligible architectural resources are present near the

Alternative 2 and 5 sites; however, the DAF has determined that construction of the Proposed Action at either of these alternatives would have no adverse effect on these resources under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). No significant impacts on cultural resources are anticipated and the State Historic Preservation Officers of the relevant states have concurred with DAF's NHPA effects determinations. However, if Alternative 4 is selected for the Proposed Action, the DAF would continue its Section 106 consultation with the Colorado State Historic Preservation Office in accordance with the 2019 Programmatic Agreement between the parties.

**Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice:** As no EJ communities of concern with respect to race or income are present surrounding any of the six Alternative sites, there is no potential for the Proposed Action to disproportionately impact EJ communities. No significant impacts on EJ communities of concern are anticipated.

Implementation of the Proposed Action at any of the six Alternative sites would be anticipated to have beneficial impacts on the surrounding communities. Proposed construction activities would likely be completed by local contractors, increasing employment opportunities, personal incomes, and materials purchases within the community. Operation of the Proposed Action would create up to 1,800 new permanent jobs. These personnel would pay taxes and spend their income locally, benefitting nearby businesses. As part of the DAF's initial Alternative site screening process, all potential sites were evaluated for their capacity to support population increases associated with a new work force. Each of the six Alternative sites were determined to have adequate existing community resources and sufficient infrastructure, or capacity to accommodate new infrastructure. No significant impacts on socioeconomics are anticipated.

**Transportation:** Construction of the Proposed Action would result in temporary increases in construction-related traffic at the selected Alternative site that would include workers' personal commuting vehicles and heavy construction vehicles. To manage construction-related traffic, the contractor would implement and adhere to a project-specific transportation management plan (TMP) that would specify appropriate routes for construction-related vehicles to follow to and from the selected Alternative site. Routes in the TMP would follow major highways and roads, and would avoid local, residential, and neighborhood roads, to the extent practicable. Overall, increases in traffic near the Alternative site due to construction would be temporary, within the capacity of the existing vehicular transportation network, and would not contribute to a noticeable degradation of traffic conditions. During operation, approximately up to 1,800 personnel would work at the USSPACECOM HQ facility, which would increase traffic and congestion locally to varying degrees. Major roads surrounding Alternative 2 are expected to have sufficient capacity to handle the increase in traffic; however, due to several recent, large developments in the area, a traffic study may be completed should this site be selected. Alternative 6 would likely result in the largest relative increase in traffic and congestion among the Alternatives. If this site is selected, the DAF would develop an operational TMP for its personnel to manage the number and circumstances of commuters, and would coordinate the transportation component of the facility site plan with the Florida Department of Transportation during the design phase. Overall, the DAF anticipates that the existing vehicular transportation network would be able to accommodate the Proposed Action under any Alternative.

No significant impacts on transportation are anticipated.

**Hazardous and Toxic Materials and Waste:** No existing HTMW contamination has been identified at any of the six Alternative sites. Construction of the Proposed Action would involve the handling, use, and storage of hazardous materials, and the generation of hazardous waste, including paints, thinners, solvents, and petroleum-based products (e.g., fuels and lubricants for construction vehicles and equipment). These materials would be handled and used by authorized personnel in accordance with label directions and would be stored in appropriate containers when not in use. Safety data sheets would be maintained on the

construction sites for all hazardous materials in use. Hazardous wastes generated would be stored on-site in secured containers in accordance with the installation's Hazardous Waste Management Plan (HWMP), as available, and applicable federal and state regulations. Operation of the Proposed Action would involve the use of HTMW typical of administrative operations and facility maintenance, such as solvents, paints, thinners, cleaning products, pesticides/herbicides, and petroleum-based products. The DAF would operate the facility in accordance with the existing HTMW plans (e.g., HWMP and SPCCP) for the site; if an Alternative site is selected for which such plans do not exist, a new HTMW management plan would be developed.

No significant adverse impacts on HTMW are anticipated.

### **Regulatory Compliance Measures, Design Commitments, and Mitigation Measures**

The DAF will comply with all applicable federal and state laws and regulations, including consultation and permitting requirements. With implementation of these measures and other design commitments identified for each Alternative, as applicable, in Table 3-24 in the Final EA, the Proposed Action would be anticipated to have no significant impacts. As such, no resource-specific mitigation measures are recommended.

### **Cumulative Effects**

The DAF identified past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects at each location, then reviewed potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Action with these other reasonably foreseeable actions and existing environmental trends in the ROI. Baseline conditions at each Alternative site generally include trending development, with a focus on expanding or upgrading outdated facilities and providing improved transportation and utility systems. Environmental trends indicate increased utility and optimization of land by providing more efficient and appealing spaces, long-term air quality improvements from new energy standards and road improvements, and economic growth from temporary and permanent employment opportunities and improved public services.

Implementation of any Alternative when taken into consideration with reasonably foreseeable future projects could lead to short-term impacts to air emissions, hazardous and solid waste generation, soil erosion, stormwater runoff, and traffic congestion. Additionally, implementation of Alternatives 2, 3, 5, and 6 would result in short-term impacts to noise, and Alternative 6 could lead to impacts to Florida's coastal zone. No significant adverse impacts would occur.

### **Public Review**

The DAF published a Notice of Availability of the Draft EA and Draft FONSI in six newspapers serving the local community at each Alternative site on July 13, 2022. These documents were available for public review and comment through August 12, 2022. During the Draft EA public review period, a total of 21 public comments, from 14 distinct commenters, were received by the DAF. Copies of all comments received as well as the DAF's response to each comment are provided in Appendix G of the Final EA.

The Final EA and FONSI are available online at <https://www.afcec.af.mil/Home/Environment/National-Environmental-Policy-Act-Center/>.

### **Finding of No Significant Impact.**

After review of the Final EA prepared in accordance with the requirements of NEPA, CEQ regulations, 32 C.F.R. Part 989, and 32 C.F.R. Part 651, and which is attached, I have determined that the proposed establishment of a permanent USSPACECOM HQ facility under any analyzed Alternative will not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment with implementation of the enforceable regulatory compliance measures and design commitments identified, as applicable, for each Alternative. Accordingly, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. This decision has been made after taking



into account all submitted information, and considering a full range of reasonable alternatives that meet the purpose and need. The signing of this FONSI completes the environmental impact analysis process.

The final basing decision will be documented in a subsequent basing decision memorandum.

---

**ROBERT E. MORIARTY, P.E., SES**  
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Installations)

---

Date

Attachment:  
Environmental Assessment for Establishment of Permanent United States Space Command  
Headquarters