



Department of the Air Force
HQ AEDC (AFMC)
Arnold AFB, TN 37389

Safety, Health, and Environmental Standard

Title: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS PROCESS

Standard No.: A8

Effective Date: 09/30/2015

The provisions and requirements of this standard are mandatory for use by all AEDC personnel engaged in work tasks necessary to fulfill the AEDC mission. Please contact your safety, industrial health and/or environmental representative for clarification or questions regarding this standard.

Approved:

Contractor/ATA Director
Safety, Health and Environmental

Air Force Functional Chief

Record of Review/Revision

(Current revisions are highlighted in yellow and marked with a vertical line in the right margin.)

Date/POC	Description
07/07/2015 Philip Sherrill	Major revision to better document the Environmental Impact Analysis Process and add requirement for an Environmental Work Permit (EWP). Changes are not highlighted. Read entire document
4/29/13	Added NFAC supplement, no other changes.
7/15/09 Philip Sherrill	Updated MATRIX hyperlink in section 4.1.1.1 Updated section 4.1.2.4 – removed Installation Restoration Program from list of categories the EIAP Program Manager can close. Deleted Certificate of Compliance section (previously 4.4)
07/31/08 Philip Sherrill	Annual review performed with updated organizational changes—changed 704 CES/CEV to 704 CES/CEA and <i>Environmental Flight to Asset Management Flight</i> . Removed references to AEDCI 32-70. Revisions highlighted in yellow throughout.
06/01/07 Philip Sherrill	Annual review performed with updated organizational changes noted throughout. Updated the MatrixOne® link and description in Section 4.1.1.1; added two references in Section 5.0. Revisions highlighted in yellow throughout.
02/28/06 Philip Sherrill	Major revision.



Safety, Health, and Environmental Standard

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS PROCESS

1.0 INTRODUCTION/SCOPE/APPLICABILITY

- 1.1 **Introduction** – The Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) is the Air Force’s implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) as outlined in 32 CFR Part 989, *Environmental Impact Analysis Process*. AFI 32-7061, *Environmental Impact Analysis Process*, incorporates 32 CFR 989 by reference as the Air Force Instruction on the EIAP.
- 1.2 **Scope** – This standard defines the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder in the EIAP as it pertains to operations at AEDC.
- 1.3 **Applicability** – This standard applies to all AEDC personnel and operations, including Air Force, Navy, Army Corps of Engineers and Contractors (including Subcontractors) at the Tennessee location and operations conducted by AEDC personnel outside the confines of Arnold AFB. Training requirements (to include use and inspection) for Subcontractor personnel training requirements are established and provided by their management.

2.0 BASIC HAZARDS/HUMAN FACTORS

Construction projects and operational activities at AEDC may have potential to adversely affect human health, the environment, or cultural resources. In order to properly evaluate the potential impacts, the EIAP utilizes an interdisciplinary team to review details of the project or activity, which includes the following areas:

- Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ)
- Air Quality
- Water Resources
- Safety and Occupational Health
- Hazardous Materials
- Hazardous Waste
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Socioeconomic

3.0 DEFINITIONS

Air Force Media Managers – An interdisciplinary team of Air Force personnel with expertise in environmental, safety, and health who review the evaluations of the EIAP Review Team.

Air Force NEPA Manager – An AEDC/TSDCI employee responsible for oversight of the EIAP program.

Baseline Hazard Analysis – A compilation of Subsystem Hazard Analyses (SSHA), System Hazard Analyses (SHA), Operating and Support Hazard Analyses (O&SHA), or any other analyses used to document the known hazards concerned with the operation and maintenance of a system or facility.

Base Operating Contractor(s) – The long-term contractor(s) directly accountable to the Air Force for the AEDC mission.

Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) – Categories of actions that do not individually or cumulatively have potential for significant effect on the environment and do not, therefore, require further environmental analysis in an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement. The list of Air Force-approved CATEX’s is in 32 CFR Part 989 Appendix B.

CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

Contractor Interdisciplinary Team – Evaluates the proposed action and alternative actions for impacts to the environment in regard to their area of expertise.

EIAP Program Manager – A contractor staff member who is trained in the EIAP and NEPA regulations with the responsibility of coordinating and maintaining all EIAP documentation for the Air Force. The EIAP Program

Manager acts as a liaison between the proponent, the interdisciplinary team, and the Air Force to ensure that all documentation is accurate and adequate for making decisions and recommendations.

Environmental Assessment (EA) – A concise public document for which a Federal agency is responsible that serves to:

- Provide sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or a FONSI, and
- Aid the Air Force in complying with the NEPA when no EIS is required.

Environmental Work Permit (EWP) – A document verifying that the necessary environmental reviews have been performed prior to project construction or AEDC testing.

Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) –The Air Force implementation of the NEPA process.

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) – A document prepared when an Environmental Assessment indicates the potential for significant degradation of the environment, significant threat or hazard to public health and safety, or substantial environmental controversy. The EIS provides a more in-depth evaluation of the proposed project or activity as well as more involvement of the public sector.

Environmental Planning Function (EPF) – The key Air Force personnel responsible for EIAP including involvement of key participants throughout EIAP and support in preparing and evaluating relevant documents. The EPF provides final signatures and approval for AF813 evaluation and acts as the liaison between the proponent and AFCEE if an EA is required.

Finding of No Practical Alternative (FONPA) – When wetlands or floodplains are involved, if no practicable alternative exists, then a Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA) must be prepared that discusses why impact to the wetland or floodplain cannot be avoided. The FONPA is simply a statement included in the FONSI that states there is no practicable alternative. The analysis in the EA must support this finding.

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) – A document by the Air Force briefly presenting the reasons why an action will have no significant effect on the human, natural or cultural environment and, therefore, for which no Environmental Impact Statement will be prepared. It must include a concise summary of the Environmental Assessment or incorporate the EA by reference along with any other related environmental documents.

Mitigation - A mitigation measure is a solution to an environmental problem and should be accomplished whenever there may be potential harm to the environment.

Open Action Item – Mitigation that requires action by AF Environmental or base operating contractor Environmental personnel prior to or during project execution.

Proponent – Individual or organization advocating an action who can best analyze and describe all the component parts of the action and assist the EPF in development of alternative actions. The proponent ensures integration of the EIAP into the initial planning stages of the proposed project or activity so that decisions reflect environmental values, delays are avoided, and potential conflicts are precluded. The process should be started as early as possible in the planning phase when adequate information is available to evaluate the proposed action and alternatives.

Record of Decision (ROD) – A concise public document stating the decision made on a proposed project or activity evaluated in an EIS.

4.0 REQUIREMENTS/RESPONSIBILITIES

4.1 AF813 Process

The Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations require the NEPA process be integrated “at the earliest possible time to insure that planning and decisions reflect environmental values”. At AEDC, an AF813 must be submitted as soon after an approved requirements document is produced as is feasible. At the latest, the AF813 must be available for review at the preliminary design review (PDR).

- 4.1.1 The **proponent** completes Section I of the automated ENOVIA[®] AF Form 813, *Request for Environmental Impact Analysis*, which includes preparing a Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives (DOPAA) using an interdisciplinary team approach. The electronic form is accessible via the AEDC Portal link to ENOVIA[®] under the Enterprise Applications tab. Proponents of proposed projects or activities who do not have access to

the AEDC Intranet may use the AF Form 813 located in Annex A. The proponent completes each portion of Section 1 as follows:

1. **ASSET ID:** This field is optional but should contain the Synergen ASSET_ID of the building or equipment being impacted by the project.
 2. **PROJECT/ACES/JOB NUMBER:** This is the project number used by the project manager and/or design team – the ANZY number is preferred; however, the appropriate operating contractor job number can be used if the project is a design/execute project.
 3. **TITLE:** The project name associated with the proposed action. The title should always begin with the ANZY number.
 4. **PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION**
 - a. **NEED FOR ACTION:** Explain why this proposed action is needed. What mission deficiency or issue or problem needs to be addressed or corrected? Describe current conditions and any other relevant factors (noncompliance, etc.)—why this action is needed; potential (mission) effects if the action is not taken. Include proposed benefits and consequences if the action is not taken. Itemize any objective criteria for acceptable alternatives—what conditions and requirements all alternatives must meet to be considered a feasible option.
 - b. **PURPOSE FOR ACTION:** State the purpose for the requested proposal—how the action resolves/addresses/corrects the mission need as previously described; include proposed benefits, objective criteria, etc. (descriptive information that addresses purpose and need vs. extensive details).
 5. **DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES (DOPAA)**
 - a. **DESCRIPTION:** This item describes the who, what, where, and when of the proposed action. Who needs the work to be done? What, in detail, would be done to meet the need & purpose stated above (e.g., facility size, floor plan, location, potential environmental impacts, manpower changes, processor chemicals involved, new weapon system or equipment to be introduced or installed, etc.)? Where might the action occur? When might the action occur? Provide time-critical milestones and constraints. Identify anticipated issues or concerns and minimum requirements, focusing on potential ENVIRONMENTAL impacts—mission impacts are discussed in the purpose and need statements.
 - b. **ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS:** Describe other reasonable alternatives being considered that also satisfy the stated purpose and need for the action and the objective requirements identified, including advantages and benefits of each alternative.
 - c. **NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE:** By law, the AF always must consider and assess the environmental impacts of the no-action alternative. No action may mean either that the current conditions or situation or management practice will not change, or that the proposed action will not take place. If no action would result in other predictable actions, those actions should be discussed as part of the no-action alternative. This (and any other) alternative should be comparable in detail to the discussion presented for the proposed action.

[Reference 32 CFR 989, *AF Environmental Impact Analysis Process*, and standards cited therein, particularly §989.4 for discussion of initial considerations and §989.9 for discussion of analysis of alternatives.]
 6. **ATTACHMENTS:** Attach supplemental documentation that explains, clarifies, and illustrates the proposed actions—site maps, building diagrams, and floor plans to explain the location and scope of the action; information that clarifies and quantifies the objective criteria; etc.
- 4.1.1.1 AEDC Test Operation (AEDC/TST) projects must utilize the Environmental Work Permit (Annex B) to evaluate the Statement of Capability (SOC) of each project. If it is determined that a Subject Matter Expert (SME) review is required, an AF813 must be initiated. If no SME review is required, the project qualifies for CATEX A2.3.7 as defined in 32 CFR 989.40 Appendix B and an AF813 is not required.

- 4.1.1.2 The proponent promotes the AF Form 813 utilizing the ENOVIA® lifecycle tab or mails a hard copy of the AF Form 813 to the EIAP Program Manager along with all supporting documentation.
- 4.1.1.3 The proponent provides additional information as required during the review cycle. If the review identifies environmental concerns and/or mitigations, the proponent must ensure the issues are resolved before or during project execution. If the AF-813 review determines that “further environmental analysis” is required, the proponent must initiate the PREIAP outlined in section 4.3 of this standard.
- 4.1.1.4 If an open action item is generated by the review process, the proponent or designee is responsible for adding the requirement to an Environmental Work Permit form. The proponent or designee is also responsible for ensuring the requirement is completed before the project is executed.
- 4.1.1.5 An approved AF Form 813 does not relieve the proponent of the responsibility to comply with all other environmental requirements related to the project. Any substantial changes to the project scope that could change the environmental impact shall require additional review by the interdisciplinary team.
- 4.1.2 The **EIAP Program Manager** reviews the AF Form 813 for completeness, attaches additional information as needed and links the ENOVIA® project plans if available.
- 4.1.2.1 The EIAP Program Manager performs the role of Community Planner and evaluates the proposed action for AICUZ and Socioeconomic impacts.
- 4.1.2.2 Under the following circumstances, the EIAP Program Manager can evaluate the following media areas:
- For projects conducted within an existing building or structure (with the exception of the Elk River Dam, Bldg. 3101, or projects with extenuating circumstances): The EIAP Program Manager can identify Biological Resources and Geology/Soils impacts as “NO EFFECT” and the status as “CLOSED.”
 - For projects conducted within an existing building or structure that has no impact on potable water, wastewater, or permitted air sources: The EIAP Program Manager can identify Air Quality and Water Resources impacts as “NO EFFECT” and the status as “CLOSED.”
- 4.1.2.3 The EIAP Program Manager promotes the AF Form 813 to the interdisciplinary review team.
- 4.1.2.4 Following review by the interdisciplinary review team, the EIAP Program Manager is responsible for a final review of all comments, requirements, and actions to determine if the proposed action qualifies for a CATEX as defined in 39 CFR 989.40 Appendix B.
- 4.1.2.4.1 CATEX A2.3.11: “*Actions similar to other actions which have been determined to have an insignificant impact in a similar setting as established in an EIS or an EA resulting in a FONSI*” requires the pertinent EA or EIS to be referenced in the “Remarks” field and the FONSI attached to the AF Form 813.
- 4.1.2.4.2 If the proposed action does not qualify for a CATEX, further environmental action is required and an EA is initiated. If a proposed action is known to require an EIS, the EPF may choose to bypass the EA and proceed with the preparation of an EIS.
- 4.1.3 The contractor interdisciplinary review team evaluates the proposed project or activity in relation to their specific areas of expertise and provides comments on mitigations and/or restrictions. In order to meet the Air Force mandated review period of 60 days, the interdisciplinary review team reviews must be completed within 14 days of receiving the AF Form 813.
- 4.1.3.1 For each area of responsibility, the impact determination is changed from “Not Reviewed” to “No Effect,” “Positive Effect,” “Adverse Effect,” or “Unknown Effect” as required to best quantify the potential impact of the action (Cultural Resources has an additional impact category of “No Adverse Impact”). If the proposed project or activity does not have sufficient information to make a determination, the AF Form 813 can be rejected and sent back to the EIAP Program Manager for additional clarification.
- 4.1.3.2 For each area of responsibility, the team member completes the “Description” field to identify any environmental protection requirements or actions that must be addressed during the development of the proposed project or activity.
- 4.1.3.3 The status for each media area should be left “OPEN” for actions (such as environmental permit applications or modifications, archaeological surveys, historic recordation, etc.) that require AEDC/TSDCI or operating contractor Environmental personnel to accomplish. All actions that are the responsibility of the proponent,

project manager or subcontractor (such as safety requirements, waste containment, stormwater plans, etc.) should have a “CLOSED” status.

- 4.1.3.4 When the last review team member completes the evaluation, the AF Form 813 is automatically forwarded to the EIAP Program Manager for final review.
- 4.1.4 The **AF Media Managers** review the finalized AF Form 813 and concur with the comments or modify the AF Form 813 as required.
 - 4.1.4.1 The AF Media Managers have the authority to approve, modify or reject the AF Form 813 based on the information provided. Rejected documents are automatically sent to the EIAP Program Manager to resolve the identified problems.
- 4.1.5 The **Air Force NEPA Manager** (AEDC/TSDCI) provides the final signature to authorize the environmental analysis determination and approve the comments and/or mitigations.
 - 4.1.5.1 The AF NEPA Manager has the authority to approve or reject the document based on the information provided. Rejected documents are automatically sent to the EIAP Program Manager to resolve the identified problems.
 - 4.1.5.2 Notification of AF Form 813 approval is sent electronically by ENOVIA[®] to the EIAP Program Manager and the proponent.

4.2 Planning Requirements in the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (PREIAP)

The Air Force Center for Engineering and the Environment (AFCEE) developed the Planning Requirements in the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (PREIAP) in an effort to reduce the time and cost of preparing EAs and EISs by implementing a “back-to-basics” approach. The AFCEE [PREIAP](#) guidance document dated 18 January 2012 provides detailed instructions on pre-planning requirements to ensure adequate information is available to efficiently and quickly develop a quality document. This is to be accomplished by a PREIAP team which is conceptually equivalent to the proponent and interdisciplinary AF and operating contractor teams responsible for review of the AF 813. An EA is required if a project does not qualify for a CATEX and the project is not known to require an EIS. The EPF may determine that an EA is not necessary and proceed directly to an EIS.

- 4.2.1 The primary responsibility of the PREIAP team is to ensure that the Purpose and Need statement along with the DOPAA have been fully scoped and have sufficient detail to allow for decision making. The required information includes an initial prediction of the proposed actions effects, an appraisal of environmental conditions, a determination of the level of analysis required, an estimation of the level of data collection required, and identification of cooperating agencies and/or consultation requirements.
- 4.2.2 The Air Force project manager, along with the interdisciplinary team, must identify any reasonable alternatives to the proposed action in addition to a “no-action alternative.” These alternatives must be fully vetted prior to initiation of the EA or EIS in order to avoid unnecessary delays in the project evaluation. A clear and concise Purpose and Need and a detailed DOPAA containing all reasonable alternatives must be developed. Utilizing this information, the interdisciplinary team must identify potential environmental consequences, data gaps, and any studies or consultations required.
- 4.2.3 The AF project manager will assemble the collected information into a PREIAP package containing the information identified on page 9 of the PREIAP guidance document. This package is provided to the Air Force NEPA Manager for inclusion in the contract package and the statement of work.

4.3 Environmental Assessment (EA) Review

- 4.3.1 The review cycle of the EA will begin with a preliminary draft EA. This PDEA will be reviewed by the interdisciplinary team and the NEPA Manager. A draft final EA will be prepared from comments received on the preliminary draft and reviewed by the EPF, including AEDC/PA, AEDC/JA, and AEDC/SE and the operating contractor Environmental staff. The draft EA will be sent to the State of Tennessee Single Point of Contact (SPOC), appropriate state offices, and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) with responses directed to the NEPA Manager. A legal sufficiency statement or comments detailed enough to assist in creating a legally sufficient final EA document will be provided by AEDC/JA. The final EA will be prepared and submitted to the EPF and the EIAP Program Manager along with an electronic copy of the

document in Microsoft Word® and ADOBE ACROBAT® format. If the EA results in a FONSI, a draft FONSI will be submitted with the final EA. The final EA will be submitted to AEDC/PA for clearance to release the document for public review.

- 4.3.2 The EIAP Program Manager or the operating contractor preparing the EA will draft a Notice of Intent (NOI) to be placed in area newspapers to notify the public of the proposed action and to solicit comments. The EA and unsigned FONSI will be available to the affected public upon request through the Air Force Public Affairs Office. The review period will be no less than 30 days unless an emergency situation exists or severe mission impacts may occur. Comments will be received by the EPF and forwarded to the EIAP Program Manager if modifications to the EA are required.
- 4.3.3 If the proposed action involves cultural resources of interest to Native American organizations, an executive summary will be provided electronically to the pertinent Native American tribes for review and comment.
- 4.3.4 Following the review period, all comments will be considered and incorporated into the FONSI or final EA as appropriate.
- 4.3.5 The FONSI will be signed by the AEDC/CC or his designee. The FONSI signature authority may be designated no lower than the Base Civil Engineer.
- 4.3.6 Copies of the EA and signed FONSI will be maintained by the EPF and the EIAP Program Manager.
- 4.3.7 One hard copy and one electronic copy of the final EA and FONSI will be submitted to the Defense Technical Information Center.

4.4 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Review

- 4.4.1 If AEDC/TSDCI determines an EIS is required, the proponent will be apprised of the requirement. The proponent may have the option to choose the *No Action Alternative* if conducting the EIS is not economically feasible.
- 4.4.2 The EPF will furnish HQ USAF/A7NX, through the MAJCOM, the NOI describing the proposed action for congressional notification and publication in the Federal Register.
- 4.4.3 The EPF, through the base Public Affairs Office, will provide the approved NOI to newspapers in the area potentially affected by the proposed action.
- 4.4.4 After publication of the NOI for an EIS, the EPF must initiate a public scoping process to determine the scope of issues to be addressed.
- 4.4.5 AEDC will work in conjunction with HQ USAF/A7NX and AFCEC/CZN to produce, review, and complete the EIS including consideration of public and agency comments.
- 4.4.6 A ROD will be placed in area newspapers to inform the public of the federal agency's decision on the specific action.

4.5 Environmental Work Permit

Since considerable time may pass between the initial AF813 application and the actual construction of projects, an Environmental Work Permit (EWP) is required to verify that conditions, requirements, and governing regulations have not changed in the interim. In addition, the EWP will be utilized early in the test planning process to determine if the test conditions are outside of the CATEX granted for the test facility and warrant the submittal of an AF813 modification. When an EWP review is required, the EWP shall be submitted to the Environmental Manager for routing to the required SME. Once completed, a copy of the EWP form will be returned to the originator for filing. The EWP form is found in Annex B.

- 4.5.1 Test Processes
 - 4.5.1.1 AEDC Test Operation (AEDC/TST) projects must utilize the EWP to evaluate the Statement of Capability (SOC) of each project. This must occur early enough in the test planning process to allow proper time for review (minimum of two weeks). If the lead test operations engineer determines that an environmental SME review is required, the EWP will be used to document the review. If the lead test operations engineer determines that no SME review is required, he/she must document the decision by applying their signature to the EWP and placing the document in the test project files. If the EWP review is not required or if the EWP

review determines that test conditions are still within the original parameters, the project qualifies for CATEX A2.3.7 as defined in 32 CFR 989.40 Appendix B and an AF813 is not required. If the EWP review finds that test conditions have changed or are outside the CATEX parameters, then an AF813 modification will be required (see Section 4.1).

4.5.2 Construction Projects

Use of the EWP is required for all construction projects regardless of the managing organization. This will include operating contractor-managed, Air Force-managed (SABER) and investment-funded construction. This must occur far enough in advance of actual construction (minimum of two weeks) to allow proper time for SME reviews. Prior to construction, the project manager/construction manager/project monitor must determine if an environmental SME review is required. The EWP will be used to document the review. If the project manager/construction manager/project monitor determines that no SME review is required, he/she must document the decision by applying their signature to the EWP and placing the document in the project files. If the EWP review finds that conditions, requirements, and/or governing regulations have changed then an AF813 modification will be required (see Section 4.1).

Construction projects shall include project level work with ANZY project numbers including investment projects where renovation of facility footprint, heat source, fuel type, or refrigerant system is changed requiring system safety hazard analysis review prior to operations. These may typically be executed as MILCON projects, SABER Contracts etc. Routine maintenance and repair is not intended to require an EWP.

5.0 TRAINING/CERTIFICATION

Not Applicable

6.0 INSPECTIONS/AUDITS

An annual audit of the EIAP program will be conducted using the Environmental, Safety, Occupational Health Compliance Assessment and Management Program (ESOHCAMP).

7.0 REFERENCES

Title 32 Code of Federal Regulations Part 989 (32 CFR Part 989) *Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP)*

Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1500–1508 (40 CFR Part 1500–1508) *Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the NEPA*

HQ AFMC Supplemental Guidance, *Environmental Impact Analysis Process*, dated 4 April 2011

AFCEE Planning Requirements in the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (PREIAP) Guidance, dated 18 January 2012

Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 4715.9, *Environmental Planning and Analysis*

8.0 ANNEXES

A. Air Force (AF) Form 813

B. Environmental Work Permit

9.0 SUPPLEMENT

NFAC A321-0801-XSP A8, *Environmental Impact Analysis Process*

ANNEX A

REQUEST FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS			Report Control Symbol RCS				
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).							
SECTION I – PROPONENT INFORMATION							
1. TO (Environmental Planning Function) ATA Environmental/ Phil Sherrill		2. FROM (Proponent organization and function address symbol)			2a. TELEPHONE NO.		
3. TITLE OF PROPOSED ACTION							
4. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION (Identify decision to be made and need date)							
5. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES (DOPAA) (Provide sufficient details for evaluation of the total action.)							
6. PROPONENT APPROVAL (Name and grade)		6a. SIGNATURE			6b. DATE		
SECTION II – PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL SURVEY. (Check appropriate box and describe potential environmental effects including cumulative effects.) (+ = positive effect; 0 = no effect; - = adverse effect; U – unknown effect)				+	0	-	U
7. AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBLE USE ZONE/LAND USE (Noise, accident potential, encroachment, etc.)							
8. AIR QUALITY (Emissions, attainment status, state implementation plan, etc.)							
9. WATER RESOURCES (Quality, quantity, source, etc.)							
10. SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH (Asbestos/radiation/chemical exposure, explosives safety quantity-distance, bird/wildlife aircraft hazard, etc.)							
11. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/WASTE (Use/storage/generation, solid waste, etc.)							
12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (Wetlands/floodplains, threatened or endangered species, etc.)							
13. CULTURAL RESOURCES (Native American burial sites, archaeological, historical, etc.)							
14. GEOLOGY AND SOILS (Topography, minerals, geothermal, Installation Restoration Program, seismicity, etc.)							
15. SOCIOECONOMIC (Employment/population projections, school and local fiscal impacts, etc.)							
1. OTHER (Potential impacts not addressed above.)							
SECTION III – ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS DETERMINATION							
2.		<input type="checkbox"/> PROPOSED ACTION QUALIFIES FOR CATERGORICAL EXCLUSION (CATEX) # _____; OR <input type="checkbox"/> PROPOSED ACTION DOES NOT QUALIFY FOR A CATEX; FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS IS REQUIRED.					
3. REMARKS							
19. ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING FUNCTION CERTIFICATION (Name and Grade)		19a. SIGNATURE			19b. DATE		

AF FORM 813, SEP 99, CONTINUATION SHEET

SAMPLE

ANNEX B

ENVIRONMENTAL WORK PERMIT

(Must be completed prior to testing or project construction)

AIR EMISSIONS

- I certify that this test or project will not alter existing or add new air emissions or sources:
 - This test or project may alter existing or add new air emissions or sources:
(SME Review Required)
- SME Review Completed by: _____ Date: _____
Reviewer Comments:

CULTURAL RESOURCES

- I certify that this test or project will not alter existing historical building architectural features (to include building interiors, exteriors and surrounding area) and will not disturb archeological sites:
 - This test or project may alter existing historical building architectural features (to include building interiors, exteriors and surrounding area) and will not disturb archeological sites:
(SME Review Required)
- SME Review Completed by: _____ Date: _____
Reviewer Comments:

HAZARDOUS WASTE

- I certify that this test or project will not result in the generation of hazardous waste:
 - This test or project may result in the generation of hazardous waste.
(SME Review Required)
- SME Review Completed by: _____ Date: _____
Reviewer Comments:

NATURAL RESOURCES

- I certify that this test or project will not affect base natural resources (trees, vegetation, wildlife, etc.):
 - This test or project may affect base natural resources:
(SME Review Required)
- SME Review Completed by: _____ Date: _____
Reviewer Comments:

STORAGE TANKS (SPCC)

- I certify that this test or project will not permanently add, remove, or alter storage tanks for POL in excess of 55 gallons:
 - This test or project may permanently add, remove, or alter storage tanks for POL in excess of 55 gallons:
(SME Review Required)
- SME Review Completed by: _____ Date: _____
Reviewer Comments:

STORM WATER

- I certify that this test or project will not disturb more than one acre of ground and/or will not involve construction or modification of a building while disturbing 5000 square feet of soil and that surface runoff will remain unchanged:
- This test or project may disturb more than one acre of ground and/or may involve construction or modification of a building while disturbing 5000 square feet of soil and that surface runoff may not remain unchanged: (SME Review Required)

SME Review Completed by: _____ Date: _____
 Reviewer Comments:

POTABLE WATER

- I certify that this test or project will not alter potable water systems:
- This test or project may alter potable water systems: (SME Review Required)

SME Review Completed by: _____ Date: _____
 Reviewer Comments:

WASTE WATER

- I certify that this test or project will not cause significant changes (as compared to historical ranges) to the volume, temperature, or chemistry of water discharged and/or the project will not create a connection to the waste water collection system :
- This test or project may cause significant changes (as compared to historical ranges) to the volume, temperature, or chemistry of water discharged and/or the project may create a connection to the waste water collection system: (SME Review Required)

SME Review Completed by: _____ Date: _____
 Reviewer Comments:

Initiator's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Environmental Branch Manager Signature: _____ Date: _____
(Required only if SME review is needed)

*Subject Matter Expert (SME) contact numbers:

Air Emissions: 454-3888	Storage Tanks: 454-4027 or 454-4284
Cultural Resources: 454-6708	Storm Water: 454-4012
Hazardous Waste: 454-3628, 454-7383 or 454-3521	Potable Water: 454-3888 or 454-4012
Natural Resources: 454-5378 or 454-3230	Waste Water: 454-3888 or 454-4012

A321-0801-XSP A8 Environmental Impact Analysis Process Supplement

This supplement has been approved for the NFAC Site.

Review: This supplement will be reviewed and updated using the same cycle as AEDC Safety, Health, and Environmental (SHE) Standard A8 Environmental Impact Analysis Process.

References: 32 CFR Part 989 *Environmental Impact Analysis Process*
40 CFR Part 1500 *Regulations for Implementing NEPA: Purpose, Policy, and Mandate*
AEDC SHE Standard A8 Environmental Impact Analysis Process
Air Force Supplement Directive (AFPD) 32-70, *Environmental Quality*
Department of Defense Directive (DoDD) 4715.1, *Environmental Security*
Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 4715.9, *Environmental Planning and Analysis*
DoDD 5000.1, *Defense Acquisition*
DoDD 5000.2-R, *Mandatory Procedures for Major Defense Acquisition Programs and Major Automated Information System Acquisition Programs*
National Environmental Supplement Act of 1969 (NEPA)

Scope:

This supplement provides guidance for complying with the requirements of the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) which is implemented at NFAC to determine potential environmental effects of projects conducted on base.

This supplement implements the National Environmental Supplement Act of 1969 (NEPA) which requires an analysis of the environmental impact “in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.” The purpose of NEPA is “to declare a national supplement which will encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment; to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man; to enrich the understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to the Nation; and to establish a Council on Environmental Quality.” Federal agencies must consider the NEPA recommendations for the proposed project or activity; however, NEPA does not mandate the selection of the more environmentally preferable alternative.

The EIAP, the Air Force’s implementation of NEPA, is outlined in Title 32 Code of Federal Regulations Part 989 (32 CFR Part 989), *Environmental Impact Analysis Process*. AFI 32-7061, *Environmental Impact Analysis Process*, implements Air Force Supplement Directive (AFPD) 32-70, *Environmental Quality*, and incorporates 32 CFR 989 by reference as the Air Force Instruction on the EIAP. The EIAP review ensures that all appropriate environmental impact analyses, historic property consultations, and environmental permits are obtained and implemented in order to not impact test capabilities and established schedules. In addition, the review ensures all permit conditions required for operations are maintained, and that the Air Force is in compliance with regulatory requirements. The instruction is applicable to AEDC NFAC and applies to all government and contractor personnel within NFAC who propose actions, projects, and operations.

The cited regulations, policies, and directives are essential to achieve and maintain compliance with NEPA and the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 CFR Part 1500 et seq. referred to as the “CEQ regulations”). Further requirements are contained in the Department of Defense Directive (DoDD) 4715.1, *Environmental Security*, Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 4715.9, *Environmental Planning and Analysis*, DoDD 5000.1, *Defense Acquisition*, and 5000.2-R, *Mandatory Procedures for Major Defense Acquisition Programs and Major Automated Information System Acquisition Programs*.

A321-0801-XSP A8 Environmental Impact Analysis Process Supplement

This supplement applies to all personnel conducting operations, maintenance, testing and support at NFAC, NASA AMES.

NFAC Worksite Application:

NFAC will follow the following NASA Ames Procedures Requirements 8800.3 "Ames Environmental Handbook"

- I. NFAC Site Management shall ensure supplement is followed
- II. NFAC Supervisors, Test Directors, and Project Managers shall:
 1. Ensure the supplement is followed
 2. Maintain environmental compliance
 3. Ensure NASA issued building permit is complete (if applicable) and any special provisions are followed (example Archeological requirements)
- III. NFAC Safety Engineer/Management Designee shall assess projects that could have the potential to impact the environment.
- IV. NFAC Staff shall follow this supplement.