
DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI) FOR STARCOM DELTAS 10, 11, AND 12 BEDDOWN

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 (CFR) 1500-1508 (2022); and the U.S. Department of the Air Force (DAF) Environmental Impact Analysis Processes (32 C.F.R. Part 989), the DAF prepared the attached Environmental Assessment (EA) incorporated by reference to assess the potential environmental consequences associated with the Proposed Action to locate sub elements (Squadrons) of three Space Delta units (Delta 10, Delta 11, and Delta 12) of the Strategic Training and Readiness Command (STARCOM) at DAF installations in the U.S. The United States Space Force (USSF) is the lead agency in this NEPA process.

Purpose and Need

The Purpose of the Proposed Actions is to support Delta 10, 11 and 12 missions to develop operational tactical level doctrine, lead wargaming execution (Delta 10); operate the National Space Test and Training Complex, provide adversary training support (Delta 11); and plan and conduct space systems testing and evaluation to deliver war-winning combat enabling capability (Delta 12).

The Need for these Proposed Actions is that these Deltas currently lack for sufficient authorized facility and parking space to meet training, testing, and wargaming requirements as well as the ability to accommodate sensitive and classified data.

Description of Proposed Action

The Proposed Action includes construction and operation of permanent facilities for Delta 10 at Patrick Space Force Base (PaSFB) in Florida, and for selected Squadrons of Deltas 11 and 12 at Kirtland Air Force Base (KAFB) in New Mexico and Schriever SFB (SSFB) in Colorado.

Alternatives

The DAF initially considered multiple alternative sites for implementation of the Proposed Action; however, it was determined that PaSFB best met the mission requirements for Delta 10 and KAFB and SSFB best met the mission requirements for Deltas 11 and 12 (see Sections 2.2 and 2.3 of the EA for additional details regarding selection standards and alternatives eliminated from analysis). In total, the EA considered the following five alternatives for implementation of the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative:

- **Delta 10 Beddown Alternative 1 – PaSFB.** The Delta 10 Beddown Alternative 1 site at PaSFB covers approximately 13.7 acres, 5.7 of which are currently developed. Existing utility infrastructure would be accessed with minimal additional site disturbance and no major rerouting of utilities. Renovations to Building 991 would also be required.
- **Delta 11 Beddown Alternative 1a – KAFB.** The Delta 11 Beddown Alternative 1a site at KAFB includes existing buildings 20362, 20363, and 20364, which would be renovated and reused. No construction would be required under this alternative.
- **Delta 11 Beddown Alternative 1b – SSFB.** The Delta 11 Beddown Alternative 1b site at SSFB covers approximately six acres of vacant land. Connector roads and new utility connections within the 6-acre footprint would also be required.
- **Delta 12 Beddown Alternative 2a – SSFB.** The Delta 12 Beddown Alternative 2a site at SSFB is the same location proposed for Delta 11 Beddown, if Alternative 1b is not selected.

- **Delta 12 Beddown Alternative 2b – KAFB.** The Delta 12 Beddown Alternative 2b site at KAFB is the same location proposed for Delta 11 Beddown, if Alternative 1a is not selected. No construction would be required under this alternative.

Deltas 10, 11, and 12 Beddown No Action Alternative. Under the No Action Alternative, the proposed Delta 10 beddown at PaSFB and the proposed Deltas 11 and 12 beddown at KAFB or SSFB would not occur. Beddown of Deltas 11 and 12 would require DAF Strategic Basing reconsideration and potential further NEPA analysis.

Summary of Environmental Impacts

The EA evaluates the existing environmental conditions and potential environmental consequences of implementing the Proposed Action with regard to air quality and greenhouse gas/climate change, water resources, cultural resources, biological resources, noise, transportation, hazardous materials and waste, socioeconomics, and environmental justice. The DAF has concluded that the Proposed Action would not meaningfully or measurably affect land use and aesthetics, soil and geological resources, utilities and infrastructure, or public health and safety; thus, these resources were eliminated from detailed analysis in the EA. As shown in Table 1, implementation of the Proposed Action is not anticipated to result in significant adverse environmental impacts under any alternative. Under the No Action Alternative, no changes to baseline conditions would occur.

Table 1. Summary of Potential Environmental Effects from Baseline Conditions

Resource Area	Level of Impact (All Alternatives)	Cumulative Impact
Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas/Climate Change	Adverse construction impacts to local air quality and greenhouse gas emissions impacts to the climate would be short-term and less than significant. Operations impacts would be less than significant.	Less than significant
Water Resources	Adverse construction impacts would be short-term and less than significant. Operations impacts would be less than significant.	Less than significant
Cultural Resources	Adverse construction impacts would be less than significant (no adverse effect). Operations would have no adverse effect to cultural resources.	Less than significant
Biological Resources	Adverse construction and operational impacts would be less than significant (no adverse effect).	Less than significant
Noise	Adverse construction impacts would be short-term and less than significant. Operations impacts would be less than significant.	Less than significant
Transportation	Adverse construction and operational impacts would be less than significant.	Less than significant
Hazardous Materials and Waste	Adverse construction and operational impacts would be less than significant.	Less than significant
Socioeconomics	Adverse construction and operational impacts would be less than significant. Communities adjacent to alternative sites may benefit economically from the Proposed Action, as the increases in population resulting from the relocation of Delta personnel and their dependents would increase spending and tax revenues.	Less than significant
Environmental Justice	Adverse effects would be short-term and less than significant. Environmental justice communities in the vicinity of the installations may benefit from certain long-term effects of the Proposed Action, such as increased regional spending and increased job opportunities.	Less than significant

Regulatory Compliance Measures, Design Commitments, and Minimization Measures

Construction and operation of Delta 10 facilities at PaSFB, per protected species effect minimization measures, would incorporate required lighting management for listed sea turtles per U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinion 41910-2009-F-0087 and Space Launch Delta 45 Instruction 32-7001, Exterior Lighting Management. Section 3.4.2 of the EA presents specific measures that can be taken that will minimize impacts to wildlife. With implementation of these measures, the Proposed Action would have no significant adverse impacts.

Public Review

The DAF sent early notification letters to federal, state and local governments and federally recognized tribes that are historically affiliated with the geographic region of each AFB on June 2, 2023. DAF received comments from the following stakeholders: Brevard County Natural Resources Management Department, Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe, Florida Department of Transportation, Florida State Clearinghouse, National Nuclear Security Administration, Natural Resources Conservation Service, New Mexico Environment Department, New Mexico State Land Office, Pueblo of Zia, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the White Mountain Apache Tribe (see Appendix A for comments).

The DAF published a Notice of Availability of the Draft EA and Draft FONSI in local newspapers at each alternative site. These documents were available for a 30-day public review and comment period. During the Draft EA public review period, a total of X public comments, from X 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 A of the Final EA.

Finding of No Significant Effect

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 permanent beddown facilities for Deltas 10, 11, and 12 under any analyzed alternative will not have a significant impact on the quality of the natural, cultural or human environment. 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.

PAUL G. FILCEK, Col, USAF
Chief, Space Force Mission Sustainment
(Engineering, Logistics, & Force Protection)

Attachment:

Environmental Assessment for STARCOM Deltas 10, 11, and 12 Beddown

This Page Intentionally Left Blank