

<b>REQUEST FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS</b>		Report Control Symbol (RCS): REPI CM Park
INSTRUCTIONS: Section I to be completed by Proponent; Sections II and III to be completed by Environmental Planning Function. Continue on separate sheets as necessary. Reference appropriate item number(s).		
<b>SECTION I - PROPONENT INFORMATION</b>		
1. TO (Environmental Planning Function) 721 CES/CEN	2. FROM (Proponent organization and functional address symbol) Air Force - 21 CES OL-CM/CEF	2a. TELEPHONE NO. 719-474-3349
3. TITLE OF PROPOSED ACTION REPI Cheyenne Mountain State Park Wildfire Mitigation - Protection of Cheyenne Mountain Spaceforce Station		
4. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION (Identify decision to be made and need date) <div> <div>1. State the purpose of this action.</div> <div>The overall mitigation effort on the Cheyenne Mountain State Park (CMSP) will consist of initial mitigation efforts, followed by annual re-treatment on an as needed basis. The specific areas to be mitigated with this grant request is for the Blackmer area, consisting of 104 acres located immediately south of the Space Force Station, shown on the attached map. This area was identified in CMSP's Forest Management plan completed in 2016. This area was picked for this application because of its proximity to CMSFS fence line. Reducing the fuel load in this area will not only minimize risk of fires starting in this area from human or natural causes such as lightning strikes but it will create a defensible space should a large wildfire start south or east of CMSFS. A large portion of this area was affected in 2017 by tussock moth infestation, leaving dozens of acres of dead and dry trees. This area was mitigated by volunteers for years but is no longer safe to work in because of tall dead trees that pose a risk when being cut down. This is a prime area to maximize money spent on mitigation that Volunteers don't have the skills to accomplish. Fuels reduction in this area would consist of a combination of mastication, brush mowing and handwork. This work would focus on opening up the understory and removal of a significant amount of ladder fuels mostly in the form of oakbrush.</div> <div>2. State the need for this action.</div> <div>The area of interest is the fence lines directly bordering Cheyenne Mountain SFS on the South side, and the east side of the installation. This area was chosen for our efforts as it has not naturally burned in an estimated 100 years, and the growth density is high. On the East side fence line, housing boarders the installation, where the human factor is greatly increased for incidents that could potentially spread to landscape and further to the installation. The project focus of this effort is on fuels mitigation to create a stand off zone out from the fence line for a more defensible posture for a wild land fire response, should a wildfire happen in the state park. Hazardous fuels reduction has been a continued effort but resources and funding have been sporadic. Mitigation on both sides of the federal property line has been addressed, but with limited environmental funding.</div> <div>3. What do you intend to accomplish and why is the action necessary?</div> <div>Cheyenne Mountain Space Force Station (CMSFS), CO is perched 9500 feet above sea level and bordered by two significant wildfire risks. The first risk is the 2,700 acre CMSP that borders CMSFS to the South and is managed by Colorado Parks and Wildlife. The park has open fire pits and presents a significant human risk to federal properties. The area is also prone to lightning strikes which pose an additional risk of starting a wildfire on or near CMSFS. Any area of high human use produces risk, however the park implements numerous precautions to prevent wildfires from starting, such as having trained staff and fire fighting equipment, 24/7 staff or volunteers on the park, and maintaining a minimum distance from firepits to foliage. The second risk is a neighborhood community, Broadmoor Subdivision, bordering the East property line and presents a true Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) threat. CMSFS have also been classified as a Tier 1 Wildfire Threat in part due to the forested fuels and volume but also proximity to the community of Colorado Springs. The actions proposed is to aggressively mitigate this high risk area surrounding the federal property.</div> <div>4. Is the action identified in existing environmental management plans? If so please identify which one (e.g. INRMP, ICRMP, Wildland Fire, Other) and the status of that plan.</div> <div>CMSFS, CMSP, and CSFD Wildland Fire Plans which are current.</div> <div>5. What is currently being done to meet the need?</div> <div>Approved FY24 REPI Challenge project with grant money to mitigate 104 acres of CMSP tussock moth killed trees.</div> <div>6. Provide any additional details related to the Purpose and Need for Action.</div> <div>Need Date: 08/30/2024</div> </div>		
5. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES (DOPAA) (Provide sufficient details for evaluation of the total action.)		

**1. Describe the proposed action.**

Mitigation of Colorado State Parks for wildland fire.

**2. Describe alternatives to the proposed action.**

The no action alternative is to not mitigate the 104 acres of dead trees in CMSP and continue to hope that a wildland fire does not occur. The second alternative would be to continue to use volunteers to try and mitigate the 104 acres of dead trees. The third alternative is to execute the REPI Challenge grant already approved and mitigate the 104 acres of dead trees in CMSP.

**3. What alternatives were eliminated from consideration and why?**

The no action alternative would result in the continued exposure of both CMSFS and CMSP to wildland fire hazards that could spread further north into the city of Colorado Springs and so was not selected. The continued use of volunteers to perform wildland fire mitigation efforts in CMSP was also not selected due to the danger and risk to volunteers outlined in the attached REPI proposal below. The use of REPI and matching funds to perform wildland fire mitigation was selected and approved as the best course of action to get after this problem.

**4. Describe what will happen if no action is taken.**

It causes increased risk of wildland fire and diminished capability of the mission.

**5. Please provide a description of the environmental management action and timing when it will occur.**

Mitigate 104 acres of dead trees and brush in CMSP with FY24 REPI funds.

**6. Describe the project location. Attach map(s)/diagram(s) – make sure to include an overview map of where your requested project area is on the installation.**

Large wildland fire mitigation zone just to the south of CMSFS adjacent to the South Portal entrance to the Cheyenne Mountain Complex. See attached map.

**7. What external coordination has occurred with environmental management stakeholders and what coordination remains before the action can be implemented?**

An additional amount of \$506,000 is anticipated to be spent by the City of Colorado Springs Fire Department for mitigation on the Cheyenne Mountain State Park between 2024 and 2027. These expenditures will consist of a combination of local funding and Colorado State funding. The City funds are being matched with the State funds, and it remains to be determined if they could also be used as match to the REPI funds. If they are not able to be used as match, it is still useful to point out how these expenditures provide wildfire resiliency to the Spaceforce Station.

**8. Provide any additional details related to the Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives (e.g., outline mitigation measures and other issues).****Map Attachments:**

[State Park chm 2022 forest mgmt status.pdf](#)

**Additional POCs:**

Kozak Michael DOD - michael.p.kozak

**Location Description / Justification:**

Large wildland fire mitigation zone just to the south of CMSFS adjacent to the South Portal entrance to the Cheyenne Mountain Complex.

6. PROPONENT APPROVAL ( <i>Name and Grade</i> ) Kozak Michael DOD - michael.p.kozak	6a. SIGNATURE Submitted on behalf of: Arcilla, David GS-12 (david.arcilla@spaceforce.mil - 719-474-3349) //Kozak Michael DOD - michael.p.kozak i:0e.t fedvis michael.p.kozak//	6b. DATE 08/06/2024
<b>SECTION II - PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL SURVEY</b> ( <i>Check appropriate box and describe potential environmental effects including cumulative effects.</i> ) (+ = positive effect; 0 = no effect; - = adverse effect; U = unknown effect)		<b>+</b> <b>0</b> <b>-</b> <b>U</b>
7. AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBLE LAND USE/ZONE USE ( <i>Noise, accident potential, encroachment, etc.</i> )		<b>X</b>
8. AIR QUALITY ( <i>Emissions, Attainment status, state implementation plan, etc.</i> )		<b>X</b>
9. WATER RESOURCES ( <i>Drinking water, wastewater, quality, quantity, source, water features, etc.</i> )		<b>X</b>

10. SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH ( <i>Asbestos/lead-based paint/radiation/chemical exposure, explosives safety quantity distance, bird/wildlife aircraft hazard, etc.</i> )	<b>X</b>
11. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/WASTE ( <i>Use/storage/generation, solid waste, toxic materials, etc.</i> )	<b>X</b>
12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES ( <i>Wetlands/floodplains, threatened or endangered species, etc.</i> )	<b>X</b>
13. CULTURAL RESOURCES ( <i>Burial sites, archaeological, historical, etc.</i> )	<b>X</b>
14. GEOLOGY AND SOILS ( <i>Topography, minerals, geothermal, Installation Restoration Program, seismicity, etc.</i> )	<b>X</b>
15. SOCIOECONOMIC ( <i>Employment/population projections, school and local fiscal impacts, etc.</i> )	<b>X</b>
16. OTHER ( <i>Potential impacts not addressed above, such as Host Nation considerations/concerns for non-US locations.</i> )	<b>X</b>
<b>SECTION III - ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS DETERMINATION</b>	
17. <input checked="" type="radio"/> PROPOSED ACTION QUALIFIES FOR CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION (CATEX) #DON-(f)(45) ; OR <input type="radio"/> PROPOSED ACTION DOES NOT QUALIFY FOR A CATEX; FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS IS REQUIRED.	
18. REMARKS <p>The proposed action qualifies for applications CATEX DON-(f)(45) because it involves fire mitigation on land zones owned by the State of Colorado. Project is public health and safety management from wildfires and authorized through the FY2025 REPI America's Mountain Front Range Resiliency Project. USDA Forest Service is managing responsibility and authority over the project to mitigates 400 acres in Pike National Forest. Project does not include construction of permanent roads or other infrastructure. The proposed action does not fall within CMSFS property and thus does not need to be consistent with the INRMP established property management procedures. Additionally, the proposed action has been determined to have insignificant impact as established in an Environmental Assessment resulting in a FONSI. Specifically, the Final Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Catamount Forest Health and Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project, Pikes Peak Ranger District, Pike and San Isabel National Forest, Feb 2011. The EA was reviewed and determined a re-evaluation was not necessary. The REPI proposal has been phased since the EA completion and is now requesting Phase 4 implementation to include fire mitigation efforts near CMSFS at Old Stage Rd (see FY25 America's Mountain Front Range Resiliency Project REPI Challenge Proposal, pg. 3). Proposed action is still accurate of location description and prevalent concerns and comply with current regulations. The largest concern, prescribed burning and air quality, complies with state regulations through FWS (EA, sect. 2.3.3). Proposed action will be organized, maintained, and completed by FWS and USFS outside of CMSFS and has completed required formal consultation.</p> <p>The DAF extraordinary circumstances pursuant to appendix B to 32 CFR part 989—Categorical Exclusions, § A2.2. Additional Analysis has been reviewed and no circumstances have arisen in A2.2.1 thru A2.2.8. CATEX DON-(f)(45) is still available and part of the owning agency's regulation and the DON extraordinary circumstances pursuant to appendix B to 32 CFR part 775.6—Planning Considerations, § (e) Categorical Exclusions has been reviewed and no circumstances have arisen in 1(i) thru 1(v)(E) (concurrent by FONSI, pg. 4-5). Proposed action improves overall human and environment health with well established methods adhering to all applicable laws, and site was analyzed to confirm no adverse effect on wilderness areas, endangered species, wetlands, or historical lands. Proposed action does not use uncontrolled/unpermitted hazardous substances and provides an overall positive effect on human safety, native vegetation growth, and natural disaster aversion. Safety is not required to perform analysis as all work for the proposal with take place off of DAF controlled property and no DAF employee will be conducting any work.</p> <p>The DAF is aware of the November 12, 2024 decision in Marin Audubon Society v. Federal Aviation Administration, No. 23-1067 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 12, 2024). To the extent that a court may conclude that the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA are not judicially enforceable or binding on this agency action, the DAF has nonetheless elected to follow those regulations at 40 C.F.R. Parts 1500– 1508, in addition to the DAF's procedures/regulations implementing NEPA at 32 CFR 989, to meet the agency's obligations under NEPA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321 et seq.</p>	
19. ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING FUNCTION CERTIFICATION ( <i>Name and Grade</i> ) Tomlinson, Robert GS-13	19a. SIGNATURE //Tomlinson Robert DOD - robert.r.tomlinson i:0e.t fedvis robert.r.tomlinson// 19b. DATE 06/17/2025

## CONTINUATION SHEET

### Review Comments:

#### **Hazardous Materials/Waste** (08/06/2024 - Ingrassia Sandra DOD - sandra.t.ingrassia)

The project to mitigate wildfire risk will not require the use of hazardous materials.

#### **Tanks** (08/06/2024 - katrina.m.alvarez1)

1. Will the Project require a new and/or replacement of a tank(s)?

No new tanks installed or replaced.

2. Will the Project require the relocation of a tank(s)?

No.

#### **Cultural Resources** (08/07/2024 - Lawton William DOD - william.c.lawton)

This project triggers the requirement for a Section 106 consultation. However, there is no archaeological survey coverage in the project area. CPW will contract to undertake a survey in spring 2025; CRM will initiate Section 106 consultation when survey report is available and analysis of potential effects to historic properties is possible. SHPO concurred to no historic properties affected.

#### **Water Resources** (08/13/2024 - Yang Weiran DOD - weiran.yang)

1. Will a new or modified National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), or HN equivalent, permit be required?

No.

2. Would the Project require permitting to discharge effluents into an existing body of water?

No.

3. Would the Project impact any existing body of water, floodplain or jurisdictional wetland?

No.

4. Are there downstream sedimentation or storm water-born pollution issues that may be impacted by implementing the Project?

No.

5. Will the Project comply with the installation's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan or require a modification?

No.

6. Does the installation drain to an impaired water body and would the Project have the potential to create excessive runoff, sedimentation, and/or erosion as a result of implementing the Project?

No.

7. Would the Project have the potential to adversely affect/require mods or substantial changes to installation or community groundwater, wastewater, storm water or other natural or manmade water systems to accommodate regulated wastewater pollutants?

No.

8. Does the installation lack sustainable and adequate potable and process water supplies to support the Project?

No.

Overall, this project do not have Water Quality concern.

#### **Bioenvironmental** (08/26/2024 - Puleo Michael DOD - michael.j.puleo)

Per AFI 48-154, Occupational and Environmental Health Program and AFTTP 3-2.82, Occupational and Environmental Health Site Assessment, the activities for this proposed action are categorized as/similar to/identical to current operations at this installation. No significant occupational or environmental health concerns to mission personnel are noted, and 21 CES will ensure compliance with all applicable requirements.

#### **Air Quality** (09/03/2024 - Baumann Carly DOD - carly.a.baumann)

1. Will the Project create criteria pollutant and/or hazardous air pollutant emissions during construction and or operations?

No

2. Will implementation of the Project require the issuance of a new or modified air permit?

No

3. Has the Project been analyzed in Air Conformity Applicability Model (ACAM)? Attach the ACAM report.

N/A

4. Will the Project include source(s) that may be classified as a New Source or a major modification of an existing source?

No

5. Will mitigation, emissions control devices and/or other management practices be required to minimize or eliminate effects to the region's air quality condition with regard to attainment of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)?

No

#### **Natural Resources** (09/16/2024 - Kelley David DOD - david.j.kelley)

No caves, faults, geothermal vents, mineral resources or any other geologic feature that would affect this work iare located within the

project area.

**Biological Resources** (09/16/2024 - Kelley David DOD - david.j.kelley)

1. Would the Project impact any plants or animals that are listed or candidates for threatened, unique, rare or endangered status?
2. Will there be any impacts from the construction of the Project on any types of critical, sensitive or unique habitats to include floodplains, wetlands, vernal pools, etc.?
3. Would there be any potential impacts to Threatened or Endangered species (TES) from implementing the Project's construction, operation and/or maintenance activities?
4. Are there any surveyed federal- or state-listed TES within the Project's region of influence?

Based on a review of information provided by the USFWS Information for Planning and Consultation and Colorado Parks and Wildlife none of the above referenced biological resources will be affected by this project.

**Hazardous Materials/Waste** (09/16/2024 - Smith Brian DOD - brian.n.smith5)

1. Would the Project require the use of new or different hazardous or toxic substances that may come in contact with the surrounding environment?

The project does not specifically call for the use of hazardous materials or toxic substances.

2. Would mission personnel be required to use hazardous or toxic materials to implement the Project?

No hazardous or toxic materials are going to be used in support of this project.

4. Does the Project have the potential to generate hazardous materials and/or waste?

The work is primarily happening off base on Colorado State land and should not result in any hazardous materials being brought onto the installation for disposal.

5. Would the Project require issuance of new or modified solid waste and/or hazardous waste related permit?

This project will not impact the hazardous waste generator category for CMSFS.

7. Does the Project require hazardous waste to be collected and stored on the property?

No, the project does not call for the generator, storage, or disposal of hazardous waste.

8. Does the Project increase potential risks for explosion, spill or the release of hazardous materials or waste?

The project would not result in an increased risk for explosion, spill, or release of hazardous waste into the environment.

9. Any wastes characterized as Universal (lamps, batteries, etc.) or Hazardous waste must be properly disposed of by the contractor in accordance with (IAW) all federal & state regulations.

The project does not call for the generation of universal waste or hazardous waste to be generated

**Other** (09/16/2024 - Wooten David DOD CIV - david.f.wooten1)

In the event of any of the following items contact the Environmental Office at 719-556-6100.

1. Hazardous waste, hazardous materials or oil and fuel spills? - Potential risk for fuel or hydraulic spills during operational activities. Through the use of a local Spill Kit and proper training, containment is expected with minimal impact to environment.
2. Adding or removing tanks? - Not applicable.
3. Bringing hazardous materials onto the installation? - None expected.
4. Removing hazardous or toxic waste from the installation? - None expected.
5. Adding or removing generators or real property installed engine? - Not applicable.
6. Inadvertent discoveries of human remains or historic artifacts? - None expected.

Also,

- CMSFS is designated in a disproportionately impacted community under state regulation. The operations and earth movement will have no impact to the disproportionately impacted community in the socio-economic area.

**Hazardous Materials/Waste** (09/16/2024 - Wooten David DOD CIV - david.f.wooten1)

1. Would the Project require the use of new or different hazardous or toxic substances that may come in contact with the surrounding environment? No Toxic substances will be disturbed as part of this project

2. Would mission personnel be required to use hazardous or toxic materials to implement the Project? No Toxic substances will be disturbed

as part of this project

3. If renovation is to occur, has the building been surveyed for asbestos-containing material (ACM)? Coordinate with the Toxics Program POC on whether ACM is present, and if the renovation and disposal will be conducted IAW ACM regulations. No Toxic substances will be disturbed as part of this project

6. If renovation is to occur, lead base paint (LBP) may be present. Coordinate with the Toxics Program POC accordingly. No LBP will be involved with this project.

**Legal** (06/17/2025 - Haynes Valerie DOD - valerie.v.haynes)

Legal review finding legal sufficiency for ADOPTED CATEX sent to EPF this date. VVH

**Attachments:**

[cui-proposal-export-2023-07-06-05-45.pdf](#)

[USSF CMSFS REPI.pdf](#)

[FINAL JA SIGNED Legal Rev re 813 for Fire Mitigation near CMSFS.17.jun.2025.pdf](#)