NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), Ames Research Center

ACTION: Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

SUMMARY: NASA Ames Research Center (NASA ARC) is issuing this FONSI to adopt an Environmental Assessment (EA) and FONSI completed by the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) for the closure of former Defense Fuel Support Point (DFSP) at Moffett Federal Airfield, California. NASA ARC was a cooperating agency in the preparation of the EA. The EA/FONSI were prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended (42 United States Code (U.S.C.) 4321, et seq.), the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Parts 1500-1508), and NASA policy and procedures (14 CFR part 1216, subpart 1216.3). The EA/FONSI are hereby incorporated by reference.

The EA/FONSI considered input received from the public, stakeholder groups, agencies, local governments, and commercial enterprises. The Draft EA was made available to applicable Federal, State, and local agencies, stakeholders and the general public for review and comment. A Notice of Availability for the Draft EA was published in the Federal Register and the San Jose Mercury News in May 2016. The public review and comment period was 30 days. Hardcopies of the Draft EA were placed at the City of Mountain View Public Library. One comment letter was received. A Notice of Availability of the Final EA and FONSI were placed in the Federal Register and the San Jose Mercury News and a bound hardcopy was placed at the City of Mountain View Public Library in July 2016.

DATE: August 2, 2021

ADDRESS: The EA that serves the basis for this FONSI can be viewed online at https://environment.arc.nasa.gov/nepa/index.php and by contacting the following individuals:

Defense Logistics Agency
Laura Fleming
8725 John Kingman Road, DESC-WE Room 2833
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060
Email: Laura.Flemming@dla.mil
Telephone: 703-767-8308

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Andrés Estrada
NASA NEPA Manager
NASA Ames Research Center
Mailstop 204-15
Moffett Field, CA 94035
Email: andres.v.estrada@NASA.gov
Telephone: 650-224-8532

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION: In July 2016, the DLA prepared an EA and issued a FONSI for the closure of the former DFSP at Moffett Federal Airfield, California. The EA analyzed the potential environmental impacts from the closure of the fuel support point including the removal of underground storage tanks (USTs) and associated pipelines and equipment. DLA operated the DFSP Moffett Field facility from 1992 until 2003. The fuel facility ceased operation in December 2003 when the inventory was drawn down. The facility was cleaned and secured in 2005 and has remained in caretaker status

since. In March 2015, DLA received Notices of Violation from the State of California Water Resources Control Board and Santa Clara County regarding improper UST maintenance. This resulted in the preparation of the EA and FONSI.

Purpose and Need

The purpose of the proposed action is to reduce environmental risks associated with five USTs, address the Notices of Violation, and eliminate aging infrastructure no longer required to meet the Department of Defense mission. The proposed action is needed to resolve State of California Water Resources Control Board and County of Santa Clara assertions that DLA is not in compliance with CCR, Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16, Article 7, Underground Storage Tank Requirements, and Unified Facilities Criterion 3-460-0.

Proposed Action and No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, DFSP Moffett Field's former fuel facilities would remain in their current nonclosure status and the State of California Water Resources Control Board and County of Santa Clara, would continue to consider the site in violation of state and county environmental regulations. Implementation of the No Action Alternative would leave the DFSP Moffett Field facilities in a caretaker status. The No-Action Alternative is not considered a reasonable alternative because it does not meet the purpose and need for the proposed action. However, it does provide a measure of the baseline conditions against which the impacts of the proposed action can be compared.

Under the proposed action, DLA would permanently close DFSP Moffett Field. The fuel facility infrastructure would be physically disconnected, abandoned in place, dismantled, and/or demolished. NASA would continue to be the property owner of the parcel. Proposed activities include closure of the five USTs and associated pipelines, truck fill stands, high speed aircraft fueling hydrants, and related infrastructure (e.g., manhole vaults, pumps, pump houses, pump pads, hydrants, racks, and cathodic protection system).

Summary of Environmental Impacts

Eight resources were analyzed in the EA: 1) air quality; 2) biological resources; 3) cultural resources; 4) geology, topography, and soils; 5) hydrology and water resources; 6) hazardous materials and waste; 7) noise; and 8) transportation and circulation. Several resource areas were not carried forward for detailed analysis in the EA because potential impacts were determined to be nonexistent or negligible. Resources not addressed further in the EA include: 1) environmental justice; 2) land use; 3) public health and safety; 4) recreation; 5) socioeconomics; 6) utilities; and 7) visual resources. A summary of potential environmental consequences is provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Potential Environmental Consequences

Resource	*Proposed Action*
Air Quality	The proposed action would result in short-term, intermittent impacts on air quality, including emissions from demolition and excavation activities, such as earthwork, as well as fugitive dust from site disturbance and vehicle exhaust from demolition and excavation equipment and vehicles. Ground disturbance would be short term, limited to approximately 5 to 6 months, and dust control mitigation measures (e.g., wet suppression) would be used during demolition and excavation activities. With the implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) impacts to air quality would be less than significant. When considered in combination with other projects in the vicinity, the proposed action is not likely to result in cumulative impacts on air quality.
Biological Resources	The proposed action would temporarily remove vegetation and potential burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*) habitat within the project site and could result in impacts on wildlife species during demolition and excavation. The burrowing owl is a California species of special concern and a federal species of concern and is protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. With the implementation of avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures such as pre-demolition and pre-excavation surveys, biological monitoring, and creation of artificial burrows for burrowing owls after UST removal, the proposed action is not likely to adversely affect any federal or state listed threatened, endangered, or candidate species or its habitat. Therefore, implementation of the proposed action would not result in significant impacts to biological resources. When considered in combination with other projects in the vicinity, the proposed action is not likely to result in cumulative impacts on biological resources.
Cultural Resources	The proposed action is located in the Sunnyvale Historic District. The proposed action would not have direct impacts on historic properties and would not indirectly impede their ability to convey their historical significance. In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, NASA has determined that the proposed action would result in no adverse effect on cultural resources. NASA initiated consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) in a letter dated April 19, 2016. SHPO concurred with NASA's determination of no adverse effect in a letter dated June 30, 2016. Consequently, no significant impacts to cultural resources are expected as a result of the proposed action. When considered in combination with other projects in the vicinity, the proposed action is not likely to result in cumulative impacts on cultural resources.
Geology, Topography, and Soils	The demolition and excavation associated with the permanent closure of the fuel facility would result in temporary surface disturbance by excavation and grading. DLA would use BMPs for erosion control to prevent erosion and potential landslides. The disturbed areas would be backfilled and regraded to their natural topography, then compacted and reseeded. BMPs would be identified in the geotechnical/engineering evaluation, Closure Plan, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Construction Permit, Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, Work Plan, Environmental Protection Plan, Quality Control Plan, and Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan. With the implementation of those BMPs, it is expected that the proposed action would not result in a significant impact to geological resources. When considered in combination with other projects in the vicinity, the proposed action is not likely to result in cumulative impacts on geological resources.
Hazardous Materials and Waste	The proposed action would involve removing USTs and associated infrastructure and would include post-removal characterization sampling in accordance with California Code of Regulations requirements for tank removal. No potential remediation is expected. If contamination is found, remediation would be completed in accordance

Table 1. Summary of Potential Environmental Consequences

Resource	*Proposed Action*
	with appropriate regulations under a separate project. The proposed action is subject to compliance with impact avoidance and minimization measures. To reduce the risk of human exposure to contamination, BMPs would be implemented; these would be outlined in the Closure Plan, NPDES General Construction Permit, site-specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, Waste Management Plan, Sampling and Analysis Plan, Environmental Protection Plan, Quality Control Plan, Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan, Accident Prevention Plan, and Health and Safety Plan. During the closure of the USTs and the pipelines, excavated soil would be characterized in accordance with California Code of Regulations, and if sample results should indicate contaminated soil exists, that soil would not be used as backfill and would instead be appropriately disposed of offsite. The proposed action would not result in a significant impact from hazardous materials and waste. When considered in combination with other projects in the vicinity, the proposed action is not likely to result in cumulative impacts on hazardous materials and waste.
Hydrology and Water Resources	DLA would obtain all necessary stormwater permits and implement BMPs to ensure that stormwater runoff would not impact water quality during demolition and excavation. The proposed action would be subject to compliance with impact avoidance and minimization measures and the BMPs that would be outlined in the Closure Plan, NPDES General Construction Permit, site-specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, Waste Management Plan, Sampling and Analysis Plan, Environmental Protection Plan, Quality Control Plan, and Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan. The proposed action would not result in impacts on jurisdictional waters of the U.S. On May 2, 2016, the USACE San Francisco District issued a signed preliminary jurisdictional determination. Jurisdictional waters of the U.S. will be avoided. The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission determined the proposed action would have no effect on the coastal zone of San Francisco Bay or its resources. With implementation of BMPs, it is expected that the proposed action would not result in a significant impact to hydrology and water resources. When considered in combination with other projects in the vicinity, the proposed action is not likely to result in cumulative impacts on hydrology and water resources.
Noise	The proposed action is expected to result in short-term, intermittent elevation of ambient noise levels during demolition and excavation activities. No sensitive receptors such as residences, schools, or hospitals are within 7,500 feet of the project site. Demolition and excavation activities would use noise-generating equipment; however, it is not expected to produce significant amounts of additional noise beyond the noise currently generated by air traffic and would not significantly affect noise receptors when combined with other current and future noise emitters in the surrounding areas. Noise associated with demolition activities would range from approximately 74 to 90 decibels at 50 feet but would decrease with the distance from the source. The surrounding topography and buildings would shield sensitive noise receptors from demolition noise. Therefore, noise levels from the proposed action would not result in a significant impact. When considered in combination with other projects in the vicinity, the proposed action is not likely to result in cumulative impacts on noise.
Transportation and Circulation	Short-term, minor impacts during demolition and excavation are expected due to an increase of less than a 25.7 average daily traffic count from traffic associated with the transport of personnel, materials, and equipment. The context and intensity of the potential impacts are expected to be minor. A Traffic Control Plan would be developed to avoid congestion within Moffett Field. The majority of demolition and excavation-related traffic would access Moffett Field from the Highway 101 and Ellis Street exit to the main gate. The short-term addition of a 25.7 average daily traffic

Table 1. Summary of Potential Environmental Consequences

Resource	*Proposed Action*
	count would not result in a significant contribution to regional traffic. When considered in combination with other projects in the vicinity, the proposed action is not likely to result in cumulative impacts on transportation and circulation.

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI): Based on the review of the EA and FONSI completed by DLA, I conclude that the proposed action will not have a significant impact on the quality of the human or natural environment or generate significant controversy either by itself or when considering cumulative effects. The requirements of NEPA, the Council on Environmental Quality, and 14 CFR part 1216, subpart 1216.3, have been fulfilled, and an EIS is not necessary and will not be prepared. This proposed action is between two federal agencies and will occur solely on federal property. As such, the federal action is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Therefore, CEQA analysis is not required nor addressed in the EA or this FONSI.

EUGENE TU Digitally signed by EUGENE TU
Date: 2021.07.30 10:20:52 -07'00'

_____ _____

Dr. Eugene L. Tu
Director
Ames Research Center

Date