
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)
AND
FINDING OF NO PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE (FONPA)
FIVE-YEAR INSTALLATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN (IDP) UPDATE AT
JOINT BASE ANACOSTIA-BOLLING, WASHINGTON, DC

Pursuant to provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Title 42 United States Code (U.S.C.) Sections 4321 to 4347, as amended, implemented by 32 C.F.R. §989, Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP), the Department of the Air Force (DAF) 11th Wing at Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling (JBAB) assessed the potential effects on the natural and human environment associated with implementing the projects in the *Five-Year Installation Development Plan (IDP) Update at Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling, Washington, DC*.

The DAF developed this Environmental Assessment per its regulations that implement NEPA as amended by the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 at 32 C.F.R. §989.

Purpose of and Need for Proposed Action

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to support JBAB's future mission requirements as outlined in the updated and approved IDP. The overall purpose of the JBAB IDP is to ensure that management and development of the real property assets of the installation supports the planning vision, mission readiness, and quality of life for installation residents and employees.

The Proposed Action is needed to provide the facilities and infrastructure to meet the mission requirements of the 11th Wing and its tenant units. Overall, the construction of new facilities, demolition of obsolete facilities, and infrastructure improvements (such as roads and utility lines) would address deficiencies in existing facilities and infrastructure and provide the space to accommodate future missions planned on JBAB. The construction of new facilities would assist in accommodating an expanding service mission and growing workforce at JBAB in support of the IDP's goal to, "Promote and Strengthen JBAB's Identity as an Urban Waterfront Military Community," and to support the consolidation of similar facilities and land uses. The demolition of aging infrastructure would provide space for new construction, compatible with the guidance and goals set forth by the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC). The infrastructure improvements would modernize JBAB's aging electrical infrastructure and improve electrical reliability. The Proposed Action is also needed to increase vehicle and pedestrian capacity; to address increasing demand on mobility networks; and to create recreational trails to support JBAB's need for accessible, walkable development within the Housing and Community Support District.

Proposed Action

The 11th Wing proposes to implement projects identified in the updated and approved IDP at JBAB over a five-year period (FY2025–FY2029) to support various missions. The Proposed Action includes 10 separate projects located throughout JBAB. The 10 projects include the construction of new facilities, infrastructure improvements (such as roads and utility lines), and demolition of facilities. These 10 projects, along with their respective estimated construction timeframes, are described below:

1. **Blanchard Barracks Demolition (FY2025):** Demolish the vacant Blanchard Barracks and three adjacent buildings due to lack of accessibility, lack of habitability, and presence of environmental concerns such as asbestos containing materials, mold, and lead-based paint.

-
2. **Defense Information System Agency (DISA) Facility (FY2028–FY2029):** Construct a facility to support DISA, including a main building, utility plant, gatehouse, and parking deck. This would consolidate the existing mission and workforce at JBAB.
 3. **National Capital Region (NCR) Center of Excellence (FY2028–FY2029):** Build a facility, and an associated parking garage, to consolidate 11th Wing and other DAF NCR-based missions. This would accommodate existing personnel and an anticipated 2,128 new employees.
 4. **Electric Switch Station Reliability Improvements (FY2026–FY2027):** Modernize aging electrical infrastructure on JBAB to improve electrical reliability.
 5. **Reversible Travel Lane on Defense Blvd. (FY2026–FY2027):** Reconfigure and widen Defense Blvd. on JBAB to add a reversible third lane, bicycle lanes, and sidewalks. This would increase vehicle/pedestrian capacity during peak commuting times.
 6. **Connection of Waterfront Trail to Bellevue Housing (FY2026–FY2027):** Create a recreational/multipurpose trail on JBAB, which would support JBAB’s goal of accessible, walkable development.
 7. **CSX Trail (FY2026–2027):** Repurpose the CSX right-of-way and easement land into a pedestrian and bicycle trail to promote accessible, walkable development and provide a connection between Bellevue Housing and the Charter School.
 8. **Replacement Child Development Center (CDC) (FY2028–FY2029):** Construct a new CDC facility to replace an existing CDC slated for demolition and support additional children and staff.
 9. **Medical Squadron (MDS) Clinic (FY2028–FY2029):** Build a new medical facility for the 316th MDS to consolidate MDS medical, dental, administrative, and operations support functions in one location. This project would not increase personnel.
 10. **South Gate & Visitor Center (FY2028–FY2029):** Replace the existing South Gate access control point facility, a dedicated entry point for visitors, and demolish up to seven existing installation houses to meet space and safety requirements. This project would better accommodate visitors, including drop-offs and pick-ups for the Charter School. This project would not increase the number of personnel.

Alternatives

The DAF considered several action alternatives for accomplishing the Proposed Action, in addition to the No Action Alternative, including: 1) implement the IDP five-year projects (Preferred Alternative), 2) alternative siting for IDP five-year projects (Alternative 2), 3) reconfigure Arnold Gate to exit only, and 4) implement IDP five-year projects without transportation improvements. However, only the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 1), alternative siting for IDP five-year projects (Alternative 2), and the No Action Alternative were carried forward for full evaluation in the Environmental Assessment (EA).

Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 1, the Proposed Action would be implemented. The locations of the 10 projects under Alternative 1 are described below. Built facilities and any flood-susceptible utilities would comply with the standards and requirements set forth under Executive Order (EO) 11988 and Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) 3-201-01 (2018). Mitigation measures would be determined in the design phase for each applicable project.

1. **Blanchard Barracks Demolition:** The Blanchard Barracks and three other buildings would be demolished on approximately 20 acres within the Historic Bolling District.
2. **DISA Facility:** The new DISA facility would be redeveloped within the same area as Project 1, following demolition. The site is within the Historic Bolling District.

-
3. **NCR Center of Excellence:** The NCR Center of Excellence and a parking garage would be constructed on a portion of Giesboro Park west of Chappie James Blvd., within the Sentinels of the Capital District.
 4. **Electric Switch Station Reliability Improvements:** The corridor for this project is within the Historic Anacostia District, Sentinels of the Capital District, and Historic Bolling District.
 5. **Reversible Travel Lane on Defense Blvd.:** This project would occur on Defense Blvd. from Boundary Road to the Firth Sterling Gate. The portion of Defense Blvd. is within the Historic Anacostia District.
 6. **Connection of Waterfront Trail to Bellevue Housing:** The new multi-use trail would connect the south end of the Waterfront Trail adjacent to the Slip Inn to the Bellevue housing area traveling through the Doolittle Park housing area. This project is located within the Housing and Community Support District.
 7. **CSX Trail:** The repurposed CSX multi-use trail would connect the Air Force Honor Guard campus to the Bellevue housing area paralleling Duncan Avenue. The CSX right-of-way and easement is within the Historic Bolling District and Housing and Community Support District.
 8. **Replacement CDC:** The replacement CDC would be constructed adjacent to the JBAB Charter School, on a green field site adjacent to Hickam Village. This site is within the Historic Bolling District.
 9. **MDS Clinic:** The new 316th MDS Clinic facility would be constructed on McChord Street between Castle Avenue SW and Luke Avenue SW. This project is within the Historic Bolling District.
 10. **South Gate & Visitor Center:** This project would replace the existing South Gate and up to seven existing houses in Westover Estates would be demolished to provide space to fit all the gate components. The project is within the Housing and Community Support District.

Alternative 2

Under Alternative 2, the Proposed Action would be implemented; however, some of the projects would occur in different locations than Alternative 1, as described below. Similar to Alternative 1, built facilities and any flood-susceptible utilities would comply with the standards and requirements set forth under EO 11988 and UFC 3-201-01 (2018). Mitigation measures would be determined in the design phase for each applicable project.

1. **Blanchard Barracks Demolition:** Same location as Alternative 1.
2. **DISA Facility:** The new DISA facilities would be constructed on a portion of Giesboro Park west of Chappie James Blvd. The site is within the Sentinels of the Capital District.
3. **NCR Center of Excellence:** The land associated with Project 1 would be redeveloped to accommodate the new NCR Center of Excellence facilities. Four additional buildings on JBAB would be demolished to accommodate the redevelopment at this location.
4. **Electric Switch Station Reliability Improvements:** The corridor for this project is similar to the Alternative 1 location but would be along a different route.
5. **Reversible Travel Lane on Defense Blvd.:** Same location as Alternative 1.
6. **Connection of Waterfront Trail to Bellevue Housing:** Same location as Alternative 1.
7. **CSX Trail:** Same location as Alternative 1.

-
8. **Replacement CDC:** The replacement CDC would be built on vacant land north of McChord Street, east of Duncan Avenue, and west of Westover Avenue. The JBAB Historic Chapel, which is located within the same parcel, would remain in place and would be avoided. This site is in the Historic Bolling District.
 9. **MDS Clinic:** The 316th MDS Clinic functions would mostly remain in their existing locations. A 10,000-square foot one-story addition would be constructed on Building 17 and Building 1300 would be renovated. Building 3 would be vacated and its staff and operations would move to the new and renovated space, partially consolidating the MDS functions. This project is within the Historic Bolling District.
 10. **South Gate & Visitor Center:** Same location as Alternative 1.

No-Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the proposed construction of the five-year IDP projects would not occur. Activities that occur in existing facilities on JBAB would continue to operate in unconsolidated, geographically separated facilities; security requirements necessary for compliance with Department of Defense (DoD) and DAF guidelines would not be met; aging facilities and infrastructure would continue to deteriorate and require extensive and costly upkeep; and inefficient workarounds to meet mission requirements would continue. New mission partners programmed for JBAB would not be accommodated by the existing installation facilities.

Summary of Environmental Findings

The DAF has concluded that implementing the projects in the *Five-Year Installation Development Plan Update at Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling, Washington, DC* would not affect the following resources: soil and geological resources, land use, public health and safety, and socioeconomics. Based on the findings in this EA, the Proposed Action would not result in significant adverse effects to any of the resource areas analyzed. The Proposed Action would also not result in significant adverse cumulative effects.

Air Quality: Fugitive dust and combustion emissions from construction activities and operations would not significantly impact air quality. During the construction and operations phases, emissions associated with the alternatives would be well below *de minimis* thresholds and would not interfere with state or local air quality implementation plans. Greenhouse gas emissions would be negligible and insignificant in relation to global yearly emissions.

Water Resources: There would be short- and long- term, minor effects on surface water and groundwater. No proposed construction activities would involve withdrawals from or discharges to surface water bodies or groundwater. While groundwater may be present at shallow depths at some sites, requiring dewatering for below-grade construction, this would only be temporary, with groundwater levels expected to resume to normal once dewatering ceases. A geotechnical report for each site would address site-specific groundwater and soil properties, and detailed plans for dewatering would be developed during the project design phase. Dewatering at Project 5 would follow applicable regulations and current DAF guidance due to potential per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) contamination on JBAB near this site. Construction equipment poses a short-term risk of leaking petroleum, oil, and lubricants (POL), but contractors would follow spill prevention protocols to minimize impacts. The increase in impervious surfaces from the proposed projects would require stormwater management to ensure post-development hydrology meets or improves pre-development conditions, using best management practices and green infrastructure. During construction, Alternatives 1 and 2 would result in increased soil erosion or sedimentation caused by construction and demolition activities, which could affect local water bodies. Best management practices, including an erosion and sediment control plan, would minimize potential impacts to ground and surface water.

Much of the land proposed for development lies within the 100-year or 500-year floodplain, necessitating compliance with EO 11988. Built facilities and any flood-susceptible utilities would comply with the standards and requirements set forth under EO 11988 and UFC 3-201-01 (2018); if applicable, mitigation measures would be determined in the design phase for each project. Stormwater management and controls in the Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 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.

Biological Resources: Direct effects on vegetation would be minor and indirect effects on adjacent vegetation would be negligible. Tree removal would result in a minor reduction in local carbon sequestration abilities and flood storage capacity. There would be direct, short-term, negligible effects to wildlife from construction noise, displacement, and mortality. There would be no long-term effects to wildlife habitat. There would be no effects to bald eagles and no significant effects on threatened or endangered species.

Cultural Resources: The DAF would consult under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) for each project would occur once adequate designs for consultation are available. Design of new construction would be done in accordance with the cultural resources Standard Operating Procedures included in the 2020 JBAB Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP). The DAF would avoid all historic properties where feasible and conduct archaeological investigations for each project where necessary. The DAF would seek to avoid, minimize and mitigate any potential adverse effects to historic properties through consultation with the DC State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). Identified adverse effects would be mitigated under the terms of an individual project Section 106 agreement with the DC SHPO and other consulting parties as necessary. If appropriate mitigation is identified with the DC SHPO and followed, there would be no significant effects to cultural resources.

Infrastructure: There would be short-term, minor disruptions in utility services on an intermittent basis during construction. In the long-term, there would be increased demand on infrastructure from implementation of the projects, and beneficial effects on electrical reliability at JBAB from implementation of Project 4. Modern building designs that incorporate water and energy efficiency standards would likely offset a portion of the anticipated increase in demand. However, the increases in infrastructure demand would have long-term, minor effects on the overall infrastructure capacities, adding additional stress to aging systems already in need of upgrades.

Noise: Noise from construction activities and vehicle traffic would have a minor effect on off-installation receptors in the context of an urban environment. On-installation noise-sensitive receptors include the Learn DC Public Charter School, which could be exposed to increased noise levels during the construction period; however, these effects would be short-term and intermittent.

Hazardous Materials and Wastes: Demolition and construction activities would comply with applicable laws and regulations and contractors would employ best management practices to minimize potential for accidental releases. There would be long-term, beneficial effects on hazardous materials and waste management from reduced amounts of special hazards. Discovered hazardous materials would be managed in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations.

Transportation: DAF prepared a Transportation Study to determine the effects of this Proposed Action, which is included as an appendix to the EA. The study looked at the anticipated transportation effects that could occur within the region when also considering planned external developments and anticipated growth in the area. The No Action Alternative would result in adverse, long-term traffic effects from development and growth outside of JBAB property. The Preferred Alternative would result in long-term, adverse traffic effects at several intersections with increases in vehicle delay and queue length, while other intersections would experience no changes in delays or queue length. Effects on local intersections

would reach a threshold that requires mitigation at three intersections. Alternative 2 would result in similar effects as the Preferred Alternative; mitigation would be required at three intersections. Mitigation for impacts to traffic from either action alternative includes signal timing modifications and roadway geometric improvements that would minimize impacts. With mitigations, implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in significant transportation impacts within the study area.

Public Review

The DAF published an Early Public Notice in *The Washington Times* on June 12, 2024, announcing that the Proposed Action would take place in a floodplain and requesting advanced public comment. The DAF sent letters to Federal and local agencies, the Area Neighborhood Commissions, the Delaware Nation and the Delaware Tribe of Indians, and other local stakeholders. The DAF received agency responses from the DC SHPO, the District Department of Energy and Environment, and the National Capital Planning Commission. The responses were considered and addressed within the Draft EA.

The DAF also consulted with the DC SHPO under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act concurrent with preparation of the Draft EA. The DAF placed a Notice of Availability, announcing a 30-day public review of the Draft EA, in *The Washington Times* on February 28, 2025, and March 3, 2025. The DAF sent letters to the agencies and stakeholders listed above, announcing the 30-day public review of the Draft EA. The DAF received agency responses from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the National Park Service, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the DC SHPO. Agency and public comments received were considered in preparing the Final EA. Copies of agency coordination letters, project correspondence, and agency comments are included in Appendix B of the 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 DAF are fulfilled and an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. A Notice of Availability of the Final EA will be published when the FONSI/FONPA is signed.

Finding of No Practicable Alternative

Pursuant to EO 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 to address deficiencies in existing facilities and infrastructure and provide the space to accommodate future missions planned to join JBAB. 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 DAF 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 DAF regulations.

CLARK.JAMES.M.1097044755
Digitally signed by
CLARK.JAMES.M.1097044755
Date: 2025.06.30 14:48:56
-04'00'

JAMES M. CLARK, Colonel, USAF
Commander, JBAB & 11th Wing

6/30/25

Date

UNIQUE ID: PEAX-007-57-UAF-1727349364