

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)**  
**AND**  
**FINDING OF NO PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE (FONPA)**  
**CONSTRUCTION OF A LARGE VEHICLE INSPECTION STATION AND ACCESS**  
**CONTROL POINT**  
**JOINT BASE ANACOSTIA-BOLLING, WASHINGTON, DC**

---

Pursuant to provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Title 42 United States Code (USC) Sections 4321 to 4347, implemented by Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations, Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §1500-1508, and 32 CFR §989, Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP), the U.S. Air Force 11th Wing at Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling (JBAB) assessed the potential impacts on the natural and human environment associated with *Construction of a Large Vehicle Inspection Station and Access Control Point at Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling, Washington, DC*.

***Purpose of and Need for Proposed Action***

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to construct a United Facilities Criteria (UFC) 04-022-01 compliant large vehicle inspection station (LVIS) at JBAB for commercial vehicle processing. The need for the Proposed Action is to improve overall safety, security, and traffic flow effectiveness at JBAB. The current LVIS is located at the South Gate in the family housing section of the installation; therefore, commercial vehicles must enter JBAB at the South Gate, which poses a safety risk to installation residents. In addition, the LVIS at the South Gate increases the risk of a major gate disruption if closure and response actions are necessary. The proposed LVIS would add commercial vehicle inspection capabilities to the Firth Sterling Gate, which would improve installation access, emergency response capability, installation risk mitigation, and reduce impacts on the local public road network adjacent to the South Gate.

***Alternatives***

The Air Force considered six action alternatives for accomplishing the Proposed Action, in addition to the No Action alternative. The six alternatives considered included: 1) construct a UFC-compliant LVIS and access control point (ACP) at the Firth Sterling Gate (Alternative 1); 2) construct the LVIS and ACP at the same general locale as Alternative 1, with a different lane configuration (Preferred Alternative); 3) close the Firth Sterling Gate to vehicle access (Alternative 3); 4) construct a new LVIS and ACP on northern JBAB; 5) construct an LVIS and ACP at the Arnold Gate; and 6) upgrade the South Gate. However, only the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2), construct a UFC-compliant LVIS at the Firth Sterling Gate (Alternative 1), close the Firth Sterling Gate to vehicle access (Alternative 3), and the No Action Alternative were carried forward for full evaluation in the EA.

***Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)***

Under the Preferred Alternative, the Air Force would construct the LVIS at Firth Sterling Gate, within the 100-year floodplain. This would include all associated components to provide a complete and usable LVIS, including passive and active vehicle barriers, identification check and inspection areas with canopies, a bus stop area, a search area office, gate houses for both commercial trucks and POVs, fencing, a permanent vehicle X-ray unit, and a backup generator. The proposed project site would be

---

approximately 10 acres, and the layout would include three POV lanes and two commercial truck inspection lanes entering the installation.

#### *Alternative 1*

Under Alternative 1, the Air Force would construct a UFC-compliant LVIS in the same general location as the Preferred Alternative, within the 100-year floodplain. The project site would be approximately 10 acres and would include all of the same associated components to provide a complete and usable LVIS facility. The proposed layout would include two POV lanes and three commercial truck inspection lanes entering the installation.

#### *Alternative 3*

Under Alternative 3, JBAB would close the Firth Sterling Gate to vehicle access. All vehicle traffic would be diverted to the other two gates on JBAB. Alternative 3 would include the demolition of the existing Firth Sterling Gate facilities and pavements. A fence would be constructed to match the current JBAB perimeter fencing, in accordance with existing installation design guidelines.

#### *No-Action Alternative*

Under the No Action Alternative, the Air Force would not construct a new LVIS at the Firth Sterling Gate and the Firth Sterling Gate would remain noncompliant with UFC 04-022-01. Commercial vehicles would continue to be routed to the South Gate for inspection and entry into JBAB, resulting in safety concerns within the installation residential area and continuation of inefficient traffic flows that back up onto the public roadways.

#### ***Summary of Environmental Findings***

The Air Force has concluded that *Construction of a Large Vehicle Inspection Station and Access Control Point at Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling* would not affect the following resources: airspace, biological resources, land use, infrastructure, and socioeconomics. Based on the findings in this EA, the proposed action would not result in significant adverse impacts to any of the resource areas analyzed. The proposed action would also not result in significant adverse cumulative impacts.

**Air Quality:** Fugitive dust and combustion emissions from construction activities would not significantly impact air quality. During the operations phase, all alternatives would be well below applicable conformity *de minimis* thresholds for an ozone nonattainment area and a carbon monoxide maintenance area.

**Soil and Geological Resources:** Changes to the topography of the site from the use of fill material to raise the elevation of facilities above the floodplain, if selected, would not alter the hydrology of the site.

**Cultural Resources:** There are no known archaeological or traditional cultural sites identified in the project area, and a previous archaeological survey concluded that none are likely to be present. The District of Columbia SHPO concurred with the Air Force's finding that construction of the LVIS, including removal and disposal of the static aircraft display, would have no adverse effect on historic properties within the cultural resources area of potential effect.

**Noise:** Noise from construction activities and operational traffic would be minor in the context of an already urban environment; therefore, impacts to noise would be minimal.

**Public Health and Safety:** All alternatives would result in long-term beneficial impacts to public health and safety from relocation of the LVIS and compliance with UFC.

---

---

**Hazardous Materials and Wastes:** Potential exposure to hazardous or toxic substances during the construction of the LVIS at Fifth Sterling Gate would impact hazardous materials and wastes. However, best management practices (BMPs) would keep impacts negligible to minor.

**Environmental Justice:** There would be no significant impacts that would disproportionately affect minority and low-income communities near the project site.

**Water Resources:** There would be short- and long- term, minor impacts to surface water and groundwater. During construction, all alternatives would result in increased soil erosion or sedimentation caused by construction and demolition activities, which could affect local water bodies. BMPs, including an erosion and sediment control plan, would minimize potential impacts to ground and surface water. Since the Proposed Action site is located in the 100-year floodplain, designs for the LVIS facility could mitigate flood risks by constructing the facility and all flood-susceptible utilities at least 3 feet above the 100-year floodplain elevation to comply with current requirements for floodplain construction. Alternatively, the Air Force could consider seeking an exemption to comply with the floodplain EO's, Directive-type Memorandum 22-003, and UFC 3\_201\_01\_2018, justified by the future levee project which, when implemented, would mitigate the proposed action site out of the floodplain. Alternatives 1 and 2 would not result in significant changes to the existing floodplain, and impacts would be minor. Approximately 10 acres would be cleared and graded for construction and stormwater drainage, with an increase of impervious surface area of approximately 271,000 square feet for the Preferred Alternative, and 262,000 square feet for Alternative 1. However, stormwater management and controls in the Preferred Alternative and Alternative 1 designs would ensure that post-development hydrology meets or improves pre-development hydrology, pursuant to Section 438 of the Energy Independence and Security Act, through low-impact development and the use of green infrastructure. Impacts to water resources would be minor under the Preferred Alternative and Alternative 1.

Under Alternative 3, JBAB would close the Fifth Sterling Gate to vehicle access and demolish the existing facilities and pavement. This would remove approximately 2 acres of impervious surface and provide minor, beneficial impacts to water resources.

**Transportation:** The Air Force prepared a Transportation Study for this Proposed Action, which is included as an appendix to the EA. The study looked at the anticipated transportation impacts that could occur within the region when considering planned external developments and anticipated growth in the area. The No Action Alternative would continue to result in traffic backing up onto the local roadways, resulting in minor, adverse impacts. Alternative 1 would result in long-term traffic impacts at several intersections with minor increases in queue length, while other intersections would experience decreases in queue length. Queues for POVs at the gate would extend onto public roadways. Impacts to intersections would not reach thresholds requiring mitigation. The Preferred Alternative would result in similar impacts to Alternative 1, but the POV queues would not extend beyond the installation under normal traffic conditions. Under Alternative 3, traffic impacts would be similar to the No Action Alternative, but would result in queues at three intersections that would require mitigation to offset significant impacts.

*Transportation Mitigation:* Under the Preferred Alternative, queues may occasionally extend beyond the installation due to higher POV volumes associated with large events either on JBAB or due to staging for events on other federal facilities. In consultation with the District Department of Transportation (DDOT), the Air Force will implement the following mitigation measures on high-volume POV days to prevent queues extending onto public roadways to the maximum extent practicable:

- Deploying additional guards to process POVs more efficiently
  - Adjusting truck arrival times to avoid peak commuting hours; and
  - Encouraging employees to use other gates during peak hours
-

---

### **Public Review**

The Air Force published an Early Public Notice in *The Washington Post* on March 17, 18, and 19, 2023 announcing that the Proposed Action would take place in a floodplain and requesting advanced public comment. The Air Force sent letters to Federal and local agencies, the Area Neighborhood Commissions, the Capitol Hill Restoration Society, as well as the Delaware Nation and the Delaware Tribe of Indians. The Air Force received agency responses from the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and DDOT. The Air Force did not receive any responses from Tribes or the general public. The agency responses were considered and addressed within the Draft EA. The Air Force also consulted with the District of Columbia State Historic Preservation Officer under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act concurrent with preparation of the Draft EA. The Air Force placed a Notice of Availability, announcing a 30-day public review of the Draft EA in *The Washington Post* on January 24, 25, and 26, 2024. The Air Force sent letters to the agencies and stakeholders listed above, announcing the 30-day public review of the Draft EA. The Air Force received agency responses from NCPC, USEPA, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and DDOT. The Air Force did not receive any responses from Tribes or the general public. The agency responses were considered and addressed within the Final EA.

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

Based on my review of the facts and analyses contained in the attached EA, incorporated by reference, I conclude that implementation of the Proposed Action would not have a significant environmental impact (including the floodplain), either by itself or cumulatively with other projects associated with JBAB. Accordingly, the requirements of NEPA and the regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality and the Air Force are fulfilled and an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. A Notice of Availability was published on January 24, 2024. Copies of agency coordination letters, project correspondence, and agency comments are included in Appendix A of the EA.

### **Finding of No Practicable Alternative**

Pursuant to Executive Order 11988 and taking into consideration the findings of the EA, which is incorporated herein by reference, I find that there is no practicable alternative to the Proposed Action occurring in a floodplain. The purpose and need for the Proposed Action is specifically to address noncompliance of an existing gate within a floodplain. All other alternatives reviewed during the EA process were eliminated from further consideration because they did not meet the stated purpose and need of the Proposed Action or the specified selection standards. The Proposed Action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to the environment, including floodplains. Based on the environmental constraints and the nature of the project objectives, there are no other available areas on JBAB that would satisfy the objectives of the Proposed Action. The Air Force has sent all required notices to federal agencies, single points of contact, the District of Columbia, local government representatives, and the local news media.

The signing of this combined FONSI/FONPA completes the environmental impact analysis process under Air Force regulations.

CROWLEY.RYAN.A  
F.1009262314

Digitally signed by  
CROWLEY.RYAN.A F.1009262314  
Date: 2024.07.18 14:31:31 -04'00'

RYAN A. F. CROWLEY, Colonel, USAF  
Commander, Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling, 11th Wing

18 July 2024

Date

---