



Hill Air Force Base, Utah

Final Report

Environmental Assessment for Construction of the New Hess Fitness Center

Contract F42650-03-D-0002
Task Order 0006

February 2004

Report Documentation Page

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE FEB 2004		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2004 to 00-00-2004	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Environmental Assessment for Construction of the New Hess Fitness Center				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) CH2M HILL,215 South State, Suite 1000,Salt Lake City,UT,84111				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Finding of No Significant Impact

Purpose and Need

Hill Air Force Base (HAFB) has two fitness facilities, the Hess Fitness Center and the Westside Gym. The Hess Fitness Center contains the indoor swimming pool and is adjacent to the indoor tennis courts and outdoor jogging track. The Hess Fitness Center is the primary fitness center for the base, containing most of the required core functional areas such as a gymnasium, cardiovascular area, racquetball courts, locker rooms, and strength training areas. However, the building housing the fitness center is deficient in several respects. Specifically, the building space is substandard for both fitness and administrative functions as defined by the *United States Air Force (USAF) Fitness Facilities Design Guide* (USAF, 1999), the building has significant seismic concerns, lighting is inadequate in the corridors, the gymnasium and parking lot are undersized, there is no covered access from the parking lot, and the building's electrical load is generally at capacity. Additionally, the only climate control for the building is heating and ventilation. There is no air conditioning other than small evaporative cooling and window units.

The Westside Gym contains a central fitness equipment area and locker rooms and is used mainly by the civilian base population. The Health and Wellness Center (HAWC) is co-located within the Westside Gym, which is housed in a historically significant building. A previously proposed project would have enlarged the HAWC; however, requirements outlined in the *USAF Fitness Facilities Design Guide* would still not have been met.

The proposed action is necessary to ensure that fitness facilities at HAFB meet the requirements of the *USAF Fitness Facilities Design Guide* and are capable of providing a rewarding fitness experience to both the military and civilian personnel of the Base.

Selection Criteria and Alternatives Considered

The following alternatives were evaluated in an attempt to ensure compliance with the Design Guide.

- **Proposed Action:** Continue use of Westside Gym (Building 1277), demolish outdoor track, construct new 5,854 square meter Fitness Center, construct new track to the south across 11th Street, continue utilization of indoor swimming pool and associated locker rooms, and co-locate the HAWC. Force Protection requirements for the new facility may require new facility siting such that the bubble (Building 10570) will need to be removed.
- **Alternative 1:** Add/alter the existing Hess Fitness Center and co-locate the HAWC.
- **Alternative 2:** HAWC enlargement.
- **No-Action Alternative:** Continue use of existing Hess Fitness Center, HAWC, and Westside Gym.

Due to the cost associated with Alternative 1 (i.e., nearly 70 percent that of constructing a new facility), this alternative has been dismissed from further consideration. Alternative 2 was dismissed from further consideration due to inadequacy of the remaining facilities supporting the fitness program.

The selection criteria established to evaluate the Proposed Action and the No-Action Alternative were as follows: mission accomplishment, community service, and minimization of environmental impacts.


Impact on Resources

Based on the evaluation of environmental consequences in the Environmental Assessment, the Proposed Action would not cause negative environmental effects. Furthermore, air, water, and soil resources would not be negatively impacted by the Proposed Action.

Due to current and future land use of Hill Air Force Base, the No-Action Alternative would have no impact on the environment.

Conclusion

The findings of this Environmental Assessment indicate that the Proposed Action to construct a new Hess Fitness Center will not have significant adverse effects on the human environment or any of the environmental resources as described in the Environmental Assessment. Therefore, issuance of a Finding of No Significant Impact is justified and an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.






Environmental Protection Committee Chairman

7 Feb 04

Date

12673 **STAFF SUMMARY SHEET**

	TO	ACTION	SIGNATURE (Surname), GRADE AND DATE		TO	ACTION	SIGNATURE (Surname), GRADE AND DATE
1	OO-ALC/ CCX	Coord	 2/5/04	6			
2	OO-ALC/ cc	Sig		7			
3				8			
4				9			
5				10			

SURNAME OF ACTION OFFICER AND GRADE Kay Winn, GS-12	SYMBOL OO-ALC/EMOR	PHONE DSN 777-0383	TYPIST'S INITIALS kp 	SUSPENSE DATE 
--	-----------------------	-----------------------	---	--

SUBJECT Environmental Assessment for Construction of the New Hess Fitness Center, Hill Air Force Base, Utah	DATE 20040130
--	------------------

SUMMARY

1. An Environmental Assessment (EA) Tab 2, has been prepared to determine whether implementation of construction of the New Hess Fitness Center would have a significant impact on human health or the environment. The purpose of the proposed action is to meet the requirements of the USAF Fitness Facilities Design Guide and provide a rewarding fitness experience to both the military and civilian personnel of Hill Air Force Base. The proposed 5,854 square meter Fitness Center would replace the current Hess Fitness Center. Proposed action would include continued use of the Westside Gym (Building 1277), demolition of the outdoor track and construction of a new track to the south across 11th Street, continued utilization of indoor swimming pool and associated locker rooms, and co-locate the Health and Wellness Center (HAWC). An Executive Summary is located at Tab 1.
2. The EA was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and 32 CFR Part 989.
3. RECOMMENDATION: OO-ALC/cc Environmental Protection Committee Chairman, sign the FONSI, Tab 3.


W. ROBERT JAMES
Director of Environmental Management

3 Tabs
1. Executive Summary
2. Environmental Assessment
3. Finding of No Significant Impact

Hill Air Force Base, Utah

Environmental Assessment for Construction of the New Hess Fitness Center

**Contract No: F42650-03-D-0002
Task Order 0006**

Prepared for:
Environmental Management Directorate
Hill Air Force Base, Utah

Prepared by:



CH2MHILL

215 S. State Street, Suite 1000
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

FEBRUARY 2004

ES.0 Executive Summary

ES.1 Purpose and Need

ES.1.0.1. Hill Air Force Base (HAFB) has two fitness facilities, the Hess Fitness Center and the Westside Gym. The Hess Fitness Center contains the indoor swimming pool and is adjacent to the indoor tennis courts and outdoor jogging track. The Hess Fitness Center is the primary fitness center for the base, containing most of the required core functional areas such as a gymnasium, cardiovascular area, racquetball courts, locker rooms, and strength training areas. However, the building housing the fitness center is deficient in several respects. Specifically, the building space is substandard for both fitness and administrative functions as defined by the United States Air Force (USAF) Fitness Facilities Design Guide (USAF, 1999), the building has significant seismic concerns, lighting is inadequate in the corridors, the gymnasium and parking lot are undersized, there is no covered access from the parking lot, and the building's electrical load is generally at capacity. Additionally, the only climate control for the building is heating and ventilation. There is no air conditioning other than small evaporative cooling and window units.

ES.1.0.2. The Westside Gym contains a central fitness equipment area and locker rooms and is used mainly by the civilian base population. The Health and Wellness Center (HAWC) is co-located within the Westside Gym, which is housed in a historically significant building. A previously proposed project would have enlarged the HAWC; however, requirements outlined in the USAF Fitness Facilities Design Guide would still not have been met.

ES.1.0.3. The proposed action is necessary to ensure that fitness facilities at HAFB meet the requirements of the *USAF Fitness Facilities Design Guide* and are capable of providing a rewarding fitness experience to both the military and civilian personnel of the base.

ES.2 Selection Criteria and Alternatives Considered

ES.2.0.1. The following alternatives were evaluated in an attempt to ensure compliance with the Design Guide.

- **Proposed Action:** Continue use of Westside Gym (Building 1277), demolish outdoor track, construct new 5,854 square meter Fitness Center, construct new track to the south across 11th Street, continue utilization of indoor swimming pool and associated locker rooms, and co-locate the HAWC. Force Protection requirements for the new facility may require new facility siting such that the bubble (Building 10570) will need to be removed.
- **Alternative 1:** Add/alter the existing Hess Fitness Center and co-locate the HAWC.
- **Alternative 2:** HAWC enlargement.
- **No-Action Alternative:** Continue use of existing Hess Fitness Center, HAWC, and Westside Gym.

ES.2.0.2. Due to the cost associated with Alternative 1 (i.e., nearly 70 percent that of constructing a new facility), this alternative has been dismissed from further consideration. Alternative 2 was dismissed from further consideration due to inadequacy of the remaining facilities supporting the fitness program.

ES.2.0.3. The selection criteria established to evaluate the Proposed Action and the No-Action Alternative were as follows: mission accomplishment, community service, and minimization of environmental impacts.

ES.3 Impact on Resources

ES.3.0.1. Based on the evaluation of environmental consequences in the Environmental Assessment, the Proposed Action would not cause negative environmental effects. Furthermore, air, water, and soil resources would not be negatively impacted by the Proposed Action.

ES.3.0.2. Due to current and future land use of Hill Air Force Base, the No-Action Alternative would have no impact on the environment.

ES.4 Conclusion

ES.4.0.1. The findings of this Environmental Assessment indicate that the Proposed Action to construct a new Hess Fitness Center will not have significant adverse effects on the human environment or any of the environmental resources as described in the Environmental Assessment. Therefore, issuance of a Finding of No Significant Impact is justified and an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Contents

Acronyms	v
1.0 Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action	1-1
1.1 Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action	1-1
1.2 Location of the Proposed Action	1-2
1.3 Applicable Regulatory Requirements	1-2
1.3.1 Environmental Policy.....	1-2
1.3.2 Human Health and Safety.....	1-2
1.3.3 Air Quality.....	1-3
1.3.4 Soil and Water Quality	1-3
1.3.5 Biological Resources.....	1-3
1.3.6 Land and Cultural Resources	1-3
1.3.7 Environmental Justice/Protection of Children	1-4
1.4 Scope and Organization of the Document.....	1-4
2.0 Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives	2-1
2.1 Introduction.....	2-1
2.2 History of the Formulation of Alternatives	2-1
2.3 Identification of Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration.....	2-2
2.3.1 Alternative 1—Renovate Hess Fitness Center.....	2-2
2.3.2 Alternative 2— Health and Wellness Center Enlargement.....	2-2
2.4 Detailed Description of the Proposed Action.....	2-2
2.5 Description of the No-Action Alternative.....	2-2
2.6 Comparison Matrix of Environmental Effects of all Alternatives.....	2-3
2.7 Identification of the Preferred Alternative.....	2-3
3.0 Affected Environment	3-1
3.1 Introduction.....	3-1
3.2 Installation Location and Current Mission	3-1
3.3 Description of the Affected Environment.....	3-1
3.3.1 Aircraft Operations	3-1
3.3.2 Noise.....	3-1
3.3.3 Air Quality.....	3-2
3.3.4 Safety and Occupational Health.....	3-2
3.3.5 Earth Resources	3-2
3.3.6 Water Resources	3-2
3.3.7 Infrastructure/Utilities.....	3-3
3.3.8 Hazardous Materials and Waste	3-3
3.3.9 Biological Resources.....	3-3
3.3.10 Cultural Resources	3-4
3.3.11 Socioeconomic Resources.....	3-5
3.3.12 Environmental Justice.....	3-5

4.0 Environmental Consequences4-1

4.1 Introduction4-1

4.2 Change in Current Mission4-1

4.3 Description of the Effects of all Alternatives on the Affected Environment4-1

4.3.1 Aircraft Operations.....4-1

4.3.2 Noise4-1

4.3.3 Air Quality4-2

4.3.4 Safety and Occupational Health4-2

4.3.5 Earth Resources4-2

4.3.6 Water Resources.....4-2

4.3.7 Infrastructure/Utilities.....4-2

4.3.8 Hazardous Materials and Waste.....4-2

4.3.9 Biological Resources4-2

4.3.10 Cultural Resources.....4-3

4.3.11 Socioeconomic Resources4-3

4.3.12 Environmental Justice4-3

4.4 Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Impacts4-3

4.5 Compatibility of the Proposed Action and Alternatives with the Objectives of Federal, Regional, State, and Local Land Use Plans, Policies, and Controls4-3

4.6 Relationship Between the Short-Term Use of the Environment and Long-Term Productivity4-3

4.7 Irreversible and Irrecoverable Commitments of Resources4-4

5.0 List of Preparers.....5-1

6.0 List of Persons and Agencies Consulted6-1

7.0 References.....7-1

Tables – Following their respective sections

2-1 Comparison Matrix of Environmental Effects

2-2 Selection Criteria Evaluation Summary

3-1 Federal- and State-Listed Species in Davis and Weber Counties

Figures

1-1 Location Map

1-2 Subject Property

Appendices

A Finding of No Significant Impact

B Biological Information

C Environmental Justice Information

Acronyms

AFOSH	Air Force Occupational and Environmental Safety, Fire Protection, and Health Program
CAA	Clean Air Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
HAFB	Hill Air Force Base
HAWC	Health and Wellness Center
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
PM ₁₀	Particulate Matter Less Than 10 Microns in Diameter
SIP	State Implementation Plan
UAC	Utah Administrative Code
USAF	United States Air Force

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

1.0 Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action

1.1 Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

1.1.0.1. The purpose of this Environmental Assessment (EA) is to support the decisionmaking process associated with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). It addresses the proponent's (i.e., 775th Services Division) Proposed Action and reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Action. This EA has been developed to analyze and document potential environmental consequences associated with the proposed activities. If the analyses presented in the EA indicate that implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in significant environmental or socioeconomic impacts, then a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) will be issued (Appendix A). If significant environmental effects result that cannot be mitigated as insignificant, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be required or the Proposed Action will be abandoned and no action will be implemented.

1.1.0.2. Hill Air Force Base (HAFB) has two fitness facilities, the Hess Fitness Center and the Westside Gym. The Hess Fitness Center contains an indoor swimming pool and is adjacent to the indoor tennis courts and outdoor jogging track. The Hess Fitness Center is the primary fitness center for the base, containing most of the required core functional areas such as a gymnasium, cardiovascular area, racquetball courts, locker rooms, and strength training areas. However, the building housing the fitness center is deficient in several respects. Specifically, the building space is substandard for both fitness and administrative functions as defined by the *United States Air Force (USAF) Fitness Facilities Design Guide* (USAF, 1999), the building has significant seismic concerns, lighting is inadequate in the corridors, the gymnasium and parking lot are undersized, there is no covered access from the parking lot, and the building's electrical load is generally at capacity. Additionally, the only climate control for the building is heating and ventilation. There is no air conditioning other than small evaporative cooling and window units.

1.1.0.3. The Westside Gym contains a central fitness equipment area and locker rooms and is used mainly by the civilian base population. The Health and Wellness Center (HAWC) is co-located within the Westside Gym, which is housed in a historically significant building. A previously proposed project would have enlarged the HAWC; however, requirements outlined in the *USAF Fitness Facilities Design Guide* would still not have been met.

1.1.0.4. The proposed action is necessary to ensure that fitness facilities at HAFB meet the requirements of the *USAF Fitness Facilities Design Guide* and are capable of providing a rewarding fitness experience to both the military and civilian personnel of the base.

1.2 Location of the Proposed Action

1.2.0.1. HAFB is located in northern Utah, approximately 25 miles north of Salt Lake City and 5 miles south of Ogden, as shown in Figure 1-1. HAFB occupies approximately 6,700 acres in Davis and Weber counties. The western boundary of the Base is formed by Interstate Highway 15, and the southern boundary is State Route 193. The privately owned Davis-Weber irrigation canal bounds the northern and northeastern perimeters, and the southeastern boundary borders a municipal incineration facility and open farmland adjacent to private residences.

1.2.0.2. The Hess Fitness Center, Building 520, is located in the southern portion of HAFB (see Figure 1-1). Access to the Hess Fitness Center is from D Avenue between 8th and 11th Streets. Building 10570 is a temporary, air-inflated plastic bubble to allow use of outdoor facilities during winter months. The location of both buildings is presented in Figures 1-1 and 1-2. The Westside Gym, Building 1277, is located on the west side of the base at the corner of Cedar Lane and California Drive (see Figure 1-1). Use of the Westside Gym will continue. However, the HAWC will be relocated with the new Hess Fitness Center. The location of the Westside Gym is presented in Figure 1-1.

1.3 Applicable Regulatory Requirements

1.3.0.1. This section addresses several regulatory environmental programs that apply to the Proposed Action. Areas where these programs influence the decisionmaking process include environmental policy, human health and safety, air quality, soil and water quality, biological resources, land and cultural resources, and environmental justice/protection of children.

1.3.1 Environmental Policy

1.3.1.1. NEPA requires that environmental information be made available to public officials and citizens prior to any action being taken. The NEPA process is intended to help public officials make decisions that are based on understanding of environmental consequences, and take actions that protect, restore, and enhance the environment.

1.3.1.2. Air Force Instruction 32-7061 implements the Air Force Environmental Impact Analysis Process. It describes specific tasks and procedures to ensure compliance with NEPA.

1.3.2 Human Health and Safety

1.3.2.1. The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 requires employers to provide safe and healthful working conditions. The purpose of this act is to provide an enforcement mechanism for minimizing occupational hazards and exposure.

1.3.2.2. Air Force Instruction 91-301 [*Air Force Occupational and Environmental Safety, Fire Protection, and Health (AFOSH) Program*] details the AFOSH program. The purpose of the AFOSH program is to minimize loss of Air Force resources and to protect Air Force personnel from occupational deaths, injuries, or illnesses by managing risks.

1.3.3 Air Quality

1.3.3.1. The 1970 Clean Air Act (CAA) and its 1990 Amendments establish Federal policy to protect and improve the nation's air quality while protecting human health and the environment. The CAA requires that adequate steps be taken to control the release of air pollutants and prevent significant deterioration in air quality. The Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Air Quality has enforcing power on behalf of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

1.3.3.2. The proposed action occurs in an area that is in attainment status for all National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Therefore, the federal conformity requirements of 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 93.153 do not apply, and a conformity analysis is not required.

1.3.4 Soil and Water Quality

1.3.4.1. The objective of the Clean Water Act is to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters. The Water Quality Act of 1987 established a program for the identification of waters affected by toxic pollutants and implementation of specific controls to reduce those toxics.

1.3.4.2. Air Force Instruction 21-7064, *Integrated Natural Resources Management*, explains how to manage natural resources on Air Force property in compliance with federal, state, and local standards. This instruction gives installations a framework for documenting and maintaining Air Force natural resource programs.

1.3.5 Biological Resources

1.3.5.1. The Endangered Species Act requires Federal agencies that fund, authorize, or implement actions to avoid jeopardizing the continued existence of Federally-listed threatened or endangered species, or destroying or adversely affecting their critical habitat. Federal agencies must evaluate the effects of their actions through a set of defined procedures, which may include preparation of a Biological Assessment and formal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

1.3.5.2. The purpose of the Endangered Species Act is to establish conservation methods for both endangered and threatened species and the ecosystems upon which the endangered and threatened species depend. This act also requires all Federal agencies to cooperate with State and local agencies to resolve water resource issues in concert with conservation of endangered species.

1.3.6 Land and Cultural Resources

1.3.6.1. The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 provides the principal authority used to protect historic properties, establishes the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and defines, in Section 106, the requirements for Federal agencies to consider the effects of an action on properties on or eligible for listing on the National Register.

1.3.6.2. Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties (36 CFR 800 [1986]) provides an explicit set of procedures for Federal agencies to meet their obligations under the NHPA, including resource inventory and consultation with State Historic Preservation Officers.

1.3.6.3. The Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 ensures that Federal agencies protect and preserve archeological resources on Federal or Native American lands and establishes a permitting system to allow legitimate scientific study of such resources.

1.3.6.4. Air Force Instruction 21-7065, *Cultural Resources Management*, sets guidelines for protecting and managing cultural resources in the United States and United States territories and possessions.

1.3.7 Environmental Justice/Protection of Children

1.3.7.1. Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*, is designed to focus the attention of federal agencies on the human health and environmental conditions in minority and low-income communities. It requires federal agencies to adopt strategies to address environmental justice concerns within the context of agency operations.

1.3.7.2. Executive Order 13045, *Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks*, directs Federal agencies to identify and assess environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children and ensure that policies, programs, activities, and standards address disproportionate risks to children that result from environmental health risks or safety risks.

1.4 Scope and Organization of the Document

1.4.0.1. The scope of this EA is to define issues that potentially impact renovation of the Hess Fitness Center at HAFB. The following potential issues are presented and discussed in detail in Sections 3.0 and 4.0 of this EA: aircraft operations, noise, air quality, safety and occupational health, earth resources, water resources, infrastructure/utilities, hazardous materials and wastes, biological resources, cultural resources, and socioeconomic resources.

1.4.0.2. The administrative record for this project contains all scoping information, site inspection notes, and correspondence compiled during the preparation of this EA. The Administrative Record for this project is available on request from the HAFB Environmental Management Directorate.

1.4.0.3. The remainder of this document is organized as follows. The Proposed Action, Alternatives 1 and 2, and the No-Action Alternative are described and evaluated in Section 2.0. The existing conditions and environmental resources in the area to be affected by the alternatives are described in Section 3.0. Section 4.0 contains the basis for the comparison of the environmental consequences of each of the alternatives. A list of preparers and their responsibilities is provided in Section 5.0. A list of agencies and persons contacted during the preparation of this EA, including the topic of consultation and date contacted, is provided in Section 6.0. References used in the preparation of this EA are listed in Section 7.0.




FIGURE 1-1
LOCATION MAP
HESS FITNESS CENTER
HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH



FIGURE 1-2
SUBJECT PROPERTY
HESS FITNESS CENTER
HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH

2.0 Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives

2.1 Introduction

2.1.0.1. The Proposed Action, Alternatives 1 and 2, and the No-Action Alternative are described in this section. The selection criteria used to compare each of the alternative actions are also described. A discussion of the environmental consequences of each action is presented in Section 4.0.

2.2 History of the Formulation of Alternatives

2.2.0.1. HAFB has two fitness facilities, the Hess Fitness Center (Buildings 520 and 10570) and the Westside Gym (Building 1277). The Hess Fitness Center is co-located with the indoor swimming pool and is adjacent to the indoor tennis courts and jogging track. The Hess Fitness Center is the primary fitness center for the base, containing most of the required core functional areas; however, the building is deficient in several respects.

2.2.0.2. The Westside Gym contains a central fitness equipment area and locker rooms and is used mainly by the civilian base population. The HAWC is co-located within the Westside Gym. The Westside Gym is housed in a historically significant building.

2.2.0.3. The Hess Fitness Center is currently maximizing its electrical output and does not contain space or facilities necessary to support the personnel utilizing HAFB. Additionally, the *USAF Fitness Facilities Design Guide* (USAF, 1999) requires co-location of the fitness center and the HAWC. Therefore, the following alternatives were evaluated in an attempt to ensure compliance with the Design Guide.

- **Proposed Action:** Continue use of Westside Gym (Building 1277), demolish outdoor track, construct new 5,854 square meter Fitness Center, construct new track to the south across 11th Street, continue utilization of indoor swimming pool and associated locker rooms, and co-locate the HAWC. Force Protection requirements for the new facility may require new facility siting such that the bubble (Building 10570) will need to be removed.
- **Alternative 1:** Renovate the existing Hess Fitness Center and co-locate the HAWC.
- **Alternative 2:** HAWC enlargement.
- **No-Action Alternative:** Continue use of existing Hess Fitness Center, HAWC, and Westside Gym.

2.3 Identification of Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration

2.3.1 Alternative 1—Renovate Hess Fitness Center

2.3.1.1. Alternative 1 involves renovating the existing fitness center, upgrading floor finishes, and constructing a new addition for other fitness center functions and the HAWC. The renovation would entail reconfiguring the existing locker rooms and administration area to coincide with additional locker room spaces, three racquetball courts, one gymnasium, group exercise rooms and additional fitness equipment spaces. It would also include the conversion of existing three racquetball courts into additional strength training equipment space on the ground level and the addition of a second floor in one court for additional cardiovascular equipment. A new electrical service and distribution panel would be constructed to serve the entire fitness center facility. Parking for a total of 200 vehicles would be provided. Additionally, the building would receive a seismic upgrade. Due to the costs associated with this alternative, nearly 70 percent of constructing a new facility, it has been dismissed from further consideration.

2.3.2 Alternative 2— Health and Wellness Center Enlargement

2.3.2.1. Alternative 2 involves enlarging the HAWC. Programs supported with the HAWC would benefit and possibly increase. However, the existing Hess Fitness Center and Westside Gym would remain unchanged. Due to inadequacy of the remaining facilities supporting the fitness program, this alternative has been dismissed from further consideration.

2.4 Detailed Description of the Proposed Action

2.4.0.1. The Proposed Action would consist of constructing an appropriately sized fitness facility, providing adequate parking, co-locating the HAWC, and continuing use of the indoor swimming pool and associated locker rooms. In order to make space for the new construction, the bubble (Building 10570) and outdoor track would be demolished. The newly constructed 5,854 square meter fitness center would be located immediately east of Building 520 and would include space for a lobby, administration, support, additional locker rooms, gymnasium, group exercise, fitness equipment, racquetball courts and the HAWC. Parking for 200 vehicles would be provided. The outdoor sports field and running track would be relocated south of the existing Hess Fitness Center, across 11th Street. Existing fitness equipment would be relocated to the new structure.

2.5 Description of the No-Action Alternative

2.5.0.1. Under the No-Action Alternative, HAFB would continue utilizing a small, inadequate facility with a small weight room and small cardiovascular equipment spaces. There are no group exercise rooms. Physical conditioning and recreational programs would continue to be limited due to space restrictions. The current space utilization adversely affects the morale, well-being, and retention rate of assigned military and base civilian

personnel. Testing, training, and team and individual sports would continue to be hindered due to inadequate space.

2.6 Comparison Matrix of Environmental Effects of all Alternatives

2.6.0.1. A summary of the environmental effects of each alternative is presented in Table 2-1. These potential impacts are discussed in detail in Section 4.0.

2.7 Identification of the Preferred Alternative

2.7.0.1. The selection criteria established to evaluate the Proposed Action and the No-Action Alternative are as follows:

- **Mission Accomplishment.** The action will not directly impact the accomplishment of the HAFB mission to provide depot repair, modification, and maintenance support to major aircraft weapons systems. The Air Force Fitness Mission, as provided in the *USAF Fitness Facilities Design Guide* (USAF, 1999), is to enhance combat readiness and quality of life for the entire Air Force community through professionally delivered comprehensive fitness programs using state-of-the-art facilities and equipment.
- **Community Service.** The action will provide participants with the opportunity to participate in a broadened variety of programs and allow additional space for ongoing programs.
- **Minimization of Environmental Impacts.** The action will provide minimal environmental impact.

2.7.0.2. A summary comparison of each action against these selection criteria is presented in Table 2-2. Based on this comparison, only the Proposed Action meets the selection criteria.

TABLE 2-1
 Comparison Matrix of Environmental Effects
Environmental Assessment for Expansion of the Hess Fitness Center

Resource Category	Proposed Action (Construct New Fitness Center and Co-locate HAWC)	No-Action Alternative (Continue use of Westside Gym, HAWC, and existing Hess Fitness Center)
<u>Aircraft Operations</u>	No Effect	No Effect
<u>Noise</u>	Minimal Effect; Short-term construction noise	No Effect
<u>Air Quality</u>	Minimal Effect; Short-term fugitive dust	No Effect
<u>Safety and Occupational Health</u>	No Effect	No Effect
<u>Earth Resources</u>	No Effect	No Effect
Geology		
Topography		
Soils		
<u>Water Resources</u>	Unknown Effect Potential for increase in runoff	No Effect
Surface Water		
Groundwater		
<u>Infrastructure/Utilities</u>	No Effect;	No Effect
Sanitary Sewer		
Potable Water		
Solid Waste Management		
Storm Drainage		
Transportation Systems		
Electricity/Natural Gas		
<u>Hazardous Materials and Wastes</u>	No Effect	No Effect
Hazardous Materials		
Hazardous Waste		

TABLE 2-1 (CONTINUED)
 Comparison Matrix of Environmental Effects
Environmental Assessment for Expansion of the Hess Fitness Center

Resource Category	Proposed Action (Construct New Fitness Center and Co-Locate HAWC)	No-Action Alternative (Continue use of Westside Gym, HAWC, and existing Hess Fitness Center)
<u>Biological Resources</u>	No Effect	No Effect
Vegetation		
Wildlife		
Threatened and Endangered Species		
Wetlands		
Floodplains		
<u>Cultural Resources</u>	Unknown Effect	No Effect
Historical Resources		
Archaeological Resources		
<u>Socioeconomic Resources</u>	Positive Effect Morale improved through fitness center facility improvements.	Negative Effect; Inadequate space for programs, Design Guide requirements not met

NOTES:
 HAWC – Health and Wellness Center

TABLE 2-2
 Selection Criteria Evaluation Summary
Environmental Assessment for Expansion of the Hess Fitness Center

Alternatives	Selection Criteria		
	Fitness Mission Accomplishment	Community Service	Minimize Environmental Impacts
Proposed Action			
Construct New Fitness Center and Co-locate HAWC	Yes	Yes	Yes
No-Action			
Continue use of Westside Gym, HAWC, and existing Hess Fitness Center	No	No	Yes

NOTES:
 HAWC – Health and Wellness Center

3.0 Affected Environment

3.1 Introduction

3.1.0.1. The existing conditions in the areas to be affected by the Proposed Action and the environmental resources at HAFB are described in this section.

3.2 Installation Location and Current Mission

3.2.0.1. HAFB covers about 6,700 acres and is located in Weber and Davis Counties. HAFB has been the site of military activities since 1920, when the western portion of what is now the Base was activated as the Ogden Arsenal, which is an Army Reserve Depot. In 1940 and 1941, four runways were built and the Ogden Air Depot was activated. During World War II, the Ogden Arsenal manufactured ammunition and was a distribution center for motorized equipment, artillery, and general ordnance. The Ogden Air Depot's primary operation was aircraft rehabilitation. In 1948, the Ogden Air Depot was renamed HAFB, and in 1955, the Ogden Arsenal and Air Depot were transferred from the United States Air Force (USAF). Since 1955, HAFB has been a major center for missile assembly and aircraft maintenance. Currently, HAFB is one of three USAF Air Logistics Centers, under the Air Force Materiel Command.

3.3 Description of the Affected Environment

3.3.0.1. This section presents a discussion of the resources present at HAFB and potential issues which must be considered prior to proceeding with the Proposed Action. This discussion will focus on the following areas: aircraft operations, noise, air quality, safety and occupational health, earth resources, water resources, infrastructure/utilities hazardous materials and wastes, biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomic resources, and environmental justice.

3.3.1 Aircraft Operations

3.3.1.1. The Maintenance Directorate provides depot repair, modification, and maintenance support to major aircraft weapons systems, specifically the F-16 Fighting Falcon, A-10 Thunderbolt, C-130 Hercules, and the Peacekeeper and Minuteman Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles. The Maintenance Directorate also tests, repairs, manufactures, and modifies F-4, F-16, F-111, C-130, A-10, and B-2 aircraft. (HAFB, 2003). HAFB does not use the location of the subject property for aircraft operations.

3.3.2 Noise

3.3.2.1. Engine noise from the testing and flight of these aircraft is present throughout the day, although it is not persistent. In a typical year, more than 50,000 takeoffs and landings will be logged by locally based and transient aircraft (HAFB, 2003).

3.3.3 Air Quality

3.3.3.1. Air quality in the vicinity of HAFB (Davis and Weber Counties) is influenced by vehicular, refinery, Davis County Burn Plant emissions, aircraft operations, and other on- and off-Base industrial emissions. HAFB is located in both Davis and Weber counties and neither county is in complete compliance with NAAQS. The EPA has designated Davis County as an attainment area for ozone. The City of Ogden, which is located in Weber County, has been designated as a non-attainment area for carbon monoxide and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀), although the entire county does not carry this designation. The State of Utah is now re-evaluating the State Implementation Plan (SIP) that outlines the State of Utah's plan for meeting the current NAAQS. When the revised SIP and the associated State regulations are finalized, Davis county may become a nonattainment area for ozone.

3.3.4 Safety and Occupational Health

3.3.4.1. According to HAFB policy, all construction plans are reviewed (as appropriate) by HAFB Bioenvironmental Engineering Services. At that time, any potential health concerns are reviewed with the contractor(s) performing the construction work. During construction, all construction personnel are required to comply with 29 CFR 1926, *Safety and Health Regulations for Construction*. Other worker health and safety concerns are addressed in Standard Operating Procedures and in the facility designs.

3.3.5 Earth Resources

3.3.5.1. Much of HAFB has been developed for a variety of industrial uses to support the HAFB mission. A small remnant of property located along the north end of Aspen Avenue near the western boundary of HAFB is used for gardens and farming by resident Base personnel. The location of the proposed addition is within a designated commercial area and is not currently developed for agricultural use.

3.3.6 Water Resources

3.3.6.1. **Surface Water.** The Davis-Weber irrigation canal bounds the northern and northeastern perimeter of the base. Stormwater retention ponds are located throughout the base. The closest of these to the subject property is Pond 3, which is located approximately 2,400 feet to the southwest (See Figure 1-2). There are no surface water bodies in the immediate vicinity of the subject property.

3.3.6.2. **Groundwater.** To date, the groundwater beneath HAFB has not been formally classified under Utah Administrative Code (UAC) R317-6, Groundwater Quality Protection. However, based on the available groundwater quality data, the shallow groundwater would be designated as Class II—Drinking Water Quality based on State of Utah classification criteria. At sites under investigation and remediation by HAFB, regulated contaminant concentrations exceed groundwater quality standards, and the shallow aquifer would be classified as Class III—Limited Use Groundwater. The Sunset and Delta aquifers are located 500 and 800 feet below ground surface, respectively, and are presently used as drinking water sources. Both aquifers would be classified as Class IA—Pristine Groundwater. No contamination has been identified in either of the deeper aquifers (Isakson, 2003).

3.3.6.3. Building 520 is located just west of the base Operable Unit 8. Trace levels of groundwater contamination may exist at the site; however, groundwater is over 100 feet below the ground surface in the area of the proposed action (Smith, 2003).

3.3.7 Infrastructure/Utilities

3.3.7.1. The Base infrastructure consists of systems that support Basewide activities. Examples of Base infrastructure include rail and other transportation facilities; industrial wastewater, stormwater, and sanitary sewer systems; fueling and defueling areas and facilities; electrical stations and power lines; surplus equipment and materials storage areas; and waste treatment or disposal areas. Structures in the vicinity of the subject property include roadways, stormwater, sanitary sewers, residential areas, medical facilities, and power lines.

3.3.8 Hazardous Materials and Waste

3.3.8.1. The subject property is not associated with any industrial uses, nor has it been in the past. Furthermore, no hazardous materials or petroleum products were identified at the subject property during the October 2003 site visit.

3.3.9 Biological Resources

3.3.9.1. **Flora.** HAFB is located in a geographic region that would typically support a mountain-brush type native plant community. Dominant vegetation in this plant community includes scrub oak (*Quercus gambelii*), big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata*), rabbit brush (*Chrysothamnus* sp.), and western wheatgrass (*Agropyron smithii*). However, much of HAFB has been developed, and the area is populated by introduced species. Only a small remnant of the native plant community occurs in the northern portion of the Base. Other microenvironments also exist at HAFB. One such environment is the stormwater retention basins that support vegetation associated with wetlands including sedge grasses (*Carex* sp.), sandbar willow (*Salix exigua*), and cattails (*Typha latifolia*). Although HAFB supports a broad variety of plant life, no threatened or endangered plant species have been identified (Moss, 2003).

3.3.9.2. **Fauna.** The wildlife found at HAFB are common to mountain-brush habitat and the western United States. Wildlife are most frequently found in the relatively undisturbed northern area of the Base. Wildlife in this area consists of a variety of large and small mammals, birds, amphibians, and reptiles. Common residents include: mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*), fox (*Vulpes vulpes*), coyotes (*Canis latrans*), mice (*Peromyscus* sp.), shrews (*Sorex* sp.), weasels (*Mustela frenata*), cottontail (*Sylvilagus nuttalli*) and jack rabbits (*Lepus* sp.), lizards, pheasants (*Phasianus colchicus*), meadow larks (*Sturnella neglecta*), horned larks (*Eremophila alpestris*), magpies (*Pica pica*), and killdeer (*Charadrius vociferus*). Wildlife species found in the wetlands include mallard ducks (*Anas platyrhynchos*) and great blue herons (*Ardea herodias*).

3.3.9.3. One threatened species, the American bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), and one endangered species, the willow flycatcher (*Empidonox traillii*) have been observed at HAFB. A list of all species observed at HAFB is included in Appendix B. Bald eagles from the northern latitudes winter along streams and lakes throughout Utah and have been observed at the Weber River just north of the Base. Willow Flycatchers require dense

vegetation and water for their habitat. The proposed project location does not contain dense vegetation or a water source. Neither the American bald eagle or the Willow Flycatcher have been seen nesting at HAFB.

3.3.9.4. Table 3-1 indicates the State-listed species that inhabit Davis and Weber Counties and possibly HAFB. None of these species are known to inhabit the subject property.

3.3.10 Cultural Resources

3.3.10.1. Cultural resources are defined as any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, place, or object considered important to a culture, subculture, or community for scientific, traditional, or religious reasons.

3.3.10.2. Cultural resources can be divided into three basic categories: archaeological, architectural, and traditional cultural properties. Archaeological resources are where prehistoric and historic activities measurably altered the earth (for example, pit houses, hearths) or where physical remains were deposited (for example, projectile points, pottery, cans, bottles). Architectural resources include standing buildings, dams, canals, bridges, or other structures. In general, architectural resources must be at least 50 years old to be considered eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. Structures less than 50 years old may warrant inclusion in the NRHP if they are exceptionally significant or have the potential to gain future significance (for example, Cold War era structures). Traditional resources are those associated with cultural practices and beliefs of a living community that are rooted in its history and are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community.

3.3.10.3. The NHPA, Section 106 (36 CFR 800) and Air Force Instruction 32-7065 require the Air Force to protect historic properties. Currently, there are no NRHP listed properties on HAFB. Over three hundred eligible and potentially eligible historic architectural resources have been identified within HAFB (Hirschi, 2003). The majority of these structures date to the late 1930s and early 1940s and include some Cold War era properties. There are two proposed NRHP districts: the Hill Field Historic District, and the Ogden Arsenal Historic District.

3.3.10.4. There have been no significant discoveries of archaeological resources on Hill Air Force Base. A few prehistoric artifacts have been recovered, but were isolated enough to negate the need for further excavation or site designation. Additionally, no traditional cultural properties have been identified at HAFB.

3.3.10.5. Building 520, constructed in 1966, is not yet a historic structure and lacks exceptional Cold War significance. Therefore, any additions or modifications would have no effect to historic properties. If any cultural resources are observed in the area during any phase of construction, action in the immediate vicinity would stop, and the Inadvertent Discovery Procedures would be implemented with direction from the HAFB Cultural Resources Manager, and in accordance with the HAFB Draft Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (Hirschi, 2003).

3.3.10.6. If this plan is followed, no significant adverse impacts to cultural resources are expected from the construction activities of the Proposed Action. Under the No-Action Alternative, no construction activity would take place. Therefore, there are no expected

adverse impacts to cultural resources associated with either the Proposed Action or the No-Action Alternative.

3.3.11 Socioeconomic Resources

3.3.11.1. Presently, the HAFB work force comprises approximately 22,000 civilian, military, and contractor personnel. More than 70 percent of the personnel at the base are civilian. The workforce at HAFB is drawn from throughout northern Utah (HAFB, 2003).

3.3.12 Environmental Justice

3.3.12.1. The percentage of residents below the poverty level in vicinity of the subject property, based on the 2000 census, is less than the state percentage. The percentages of minority residents and children in the vicinity are greater than the State percentage.

3.3.12.2. Appendix C contains output from the EPA Environmental Justice Geographic Assessment Tool website (EPA, 2003). The maps contained in Appendix C are centered on the subject property. These maps indicate that the entire area of the subject property is located in an area that is 20-30 percent minority (non-Caucasian) population. The maps also indicate that 10 to 20 percent of the population lives below poverty.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE 3-1
 Federal- and State-Listed Species in Davis and Weber Counties
Environmental Assessment for Construction of the Hess Fitness Center at HAFB

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	State Status
BIRDS			
Bald Eagle	<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	T	T
Southwestern Willow Flycatcher	<i>Empidonox traillii</i>	E	
Yellow-Billed Cuckoo	<i>Coccyzus americanus</i>	C	T
American White Pelican	<i>Pelecanus erythrorhynchos</i>		SD
Black Tern	<i>Chlidonias niger</i>		SP
Blue Grosbeak	<i>Guiraca caerulea</i>		SP/SD
Bobolink	<i>Dolichonyx oryzivorus</i>		SP/SD
Burrowing Owl	<i>Athene cunicularia</i>		SP
Caspian Tern	<i>Sterna caspia</i>		SP
Ferruginous Hawk	<i>Buteo regalis</i>		T
Grasshopper Sparrow	<i>Ammodramus savannarum</i>		SP/SD
Lewis' Woodpecker	<i>Melanerpes lewis</i>		SP/SD
Long-Billed Curlew	<i>Numenius americanus</i>		SP/SD
Short-eared Owl	<i>Asio flammeus</i>		SP
Greater Sage-Grouse	<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>		SP/SD
Mountain Plover	<i>Charadrius montanus</i>		SP/SD
Northern Goshawk	<i>Accipiter gentilis</i>		SP
Sharp-Tailed Grouse	<i>Tympanuchus phasianellus</i>		SD
FISH			
June Sucker	<i>Chasmistes liorus</i>	E	
Bluehead Sucker	<i>Catostomus discobolus</i>		SP
Common Yellowthroat	<i>Geothlypis trichas</i>		SP
Least Chub	<i>Lotichthys phlegethontis</i>		CS
Bonneville Cutthroat Trout	<i>Oncorhynchus clarki utah</i>		CS
AMPHIBIANS			
Columbia Spotted Frog	<i>Rana luteiventris</i>		CS

TABLE 3-1
 Federal- and State-Listed Species in Davis and Weber Counties
Environmental Assessment for Construction of the Hess Fitness Center at HAFB

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	State Status
Western Toad	<i>Bufo boreas</i>		SP
MOLLUSKS			
Ogden Rocky Mountainsnail	<i>Oreohelix peripherica wasatchensis</i>	C	
Lyrate Mountainsnail	<i>Oreohelix haydeni</i>		SP/SD
REPTILES			
Milksnake	<i>Lampropeltis triangulum</i>		SP
PLANTS			
Ute Ladies' Tresses	<i>Spiranthes diluvialus</i>	T	
MAMMALS			
Gray Wolf	<i>Canis lupus</i>	T – Extirpated	
Canada Lynx	<i>Lynx canadensis</i>	T	
Wolverine	<i>Gulo gulo</i>		T
Brazilian Free-Tailed Bat	<i>Tadarida brasiliensis</i>		SP/SD
Townsend's Big-Eared Bat	<i>Corynorhinus townsendii</i>		SP/SD

Source: *Utah Natural Heritage Program Biological and Conservation Database, County Lists of Utah's Federally Listed Threatened (T), Endangered (E), and Candidate (C) Species*. UDNR, 2003.

NOTES:

Key to Federal Status:

C – A taxon for which the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has on file sufficient information on biological vulnerability and threats to justify it being a “candidate” for listing as endangered or threatened.

E – A taxon that is listed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as “endangered” with the possibility of worldwide extinction.

T – A taxon that is listed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as “threatened” with becoming endangered.

T – Extirpated – A “threatened” taxon that is “extirpated” and considered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to no longer occur in Utah.

TABLE 3-1
 Federal- and State-Listed Species in Davis and Weber Counties
Environmental Assessment for Construction of the Hess Fitness Center at HAFB

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	State Status
-------------	-----------------	----------------	--------------

Key to State Status:

CS – Conservation Species: any wildlife species or subspecies, except those species currently listed under the Endangered Species Act as Threatened or Endangered, that meets the state criteria of Endangered, Threatened, or of Special Concern, but is currently receiving sufficient special management under a Conservation Agreement developed and/or implemented by the state to preclude its listing.

SD – Species of Special Concern: any wildlife species or subspecies that occurs in limited areas and/or numbers due to a restricted or specialized habitat.

SP – Species of Special Concern: any wildlife species or subspecies that has experienced a substantial decrease in population, distribution and/or habitat availability.

SP/SD – Species of Special Concern: any wildlife species or subspecies that has both a declining population and a limited range.

T – State Threatened Species: Any wildlife species or subspecies which is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant part of its range in Utah or the world.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

4.0 Environmental Consequences

4.1 Introduction

4.1.0.1. The environmental consequences of constructing a new Hess Fitness Center and co-locating the HAWC are discussed in this section. This section also contains a discussion of the environmental consequences of the No-Action Alternative.

4.2 Change in Current Mission

4.2.0.1. No changes in the current mission of HAFB would occur as a result of the proposed construction. If the No-Action Alternative were adopted, the mission of Air Force Fitness Center would not be met, and HAFB personnel would continue to use a small, inadequate facility without any group exercise rooms, a small weight room and small cardiovascular equipment spaces. Physical conditioning and recreational programs would continue to be limited due to space restrictions. This condition adversely affects the morale, well being, and retention rate of HAFB personnel.

4.3 Description of the Effects of all Alternatives on the Affected Environment

4.3.0.1. The following paragraphs discuss the resources present within the vicinity of the subject property and potential impacts on these resources if the Proposed Action or the No-Action Alternative were implemented. This discussion focuses on the following areas: aircraft operations, noise, air quality, safety and occupational health, earth resources, water resources, infrastructure/utilities, hazardous materials and wastes, biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomic resources, and environmental justice.

4.3.1 Aircraft Operations

4.3.1.1. Since the fitness center provides personal benefits to HAFB personnel but does not influence aircraft, the proposed construction would not have an effect on aircraft operations.

4.3.2 Noise

4.3.2.1. No long-term exposure to additional noise would occur as a result of implementing the Proposed Action. Any noise generated during construction or renovation activities would be limited to areas immediately adjacent to the site. Any potential health concerns for site workers or program participants exposed to excessive noise during these activities would need to be addressed in the construction/remodeling plans. No additional noise would be generated by the No-Action Alternative.

4.3.3 Air Quality

4.3.3.1. Implementing the Proposed Action or Alternative 1 would not cause long-term effects on air quality. Dust may be generated during construction and renovation activities, but control measures will be used to keep dust to a minimum. The No-Action Alternative would not impact air quality.

4.3.4 Safety and Occupational Health

4.3.4.1. Construction and renovation activities conducted as part of the Proposed Action should be reviewed with the contractor(s) performing the work to assess potential safety and health concerns. Additional worker and fitness center health and safety issues would need to be reviewed by HAFB Bioenvironmental Engineering Services. The No-Action Alternative would not have an impact on safety and occupational health.

4.3.5 Earth Resources

4.3.5.1. Construction of the Proposed Action or the No-Action Alternative would not have an impact on earth resources.

4.3.6 Water Resources

4.3.6.1. **Surface Water.** Neither the Proposed Action or the No-Action alternative would have an effect on surface water quality in the vicinity of the subject property.

4.3.6.2. **Groundwater.** Neither the Proposed Action or No-Action Alternative would have an effect on groundwater resources.

4.3.7 Infrastructure/Utilities

4.3.7.1. There is the potential for construction activities associated with the Proposed Action or Alternative 1 to impact existing utilities in the area. To prevent a negative impact from occurring (i.e., causing a break in the storm sewer, etc.), the presence and location of sanitary sewers, stormwater sewers, potable water lines, transportation systems, electrical, or natural gas lines (as appropriate) in the vicinity of these properties must be confirmed by Red Stakes, at (801) 777-1995. In addition, any construction projects on HAFB property must involve the participation of the Civil Engineering Department Community Planner, Mr. Bert Whipple. Mr. Whipple can be reached at (801) 777-1171. The No-Action Alternative would have no impact on utilities.

4.3.8 Hazardous Materials and Waste

4.3.8.1. Neither construction of the Proposed Action or the No-Action Alternative would generate hazardous materials or wastes.

4.3.9 Biological Resources

4.3.9.1. Based on the current scope of activities planned for the area, negative impacts to biological resources are not anticipated. The Proposed Action and the No-Action Alternative would have no impact on biological resources.

4.3.10 Cultural Resources

4.3.10.1. HAFB has two districts that have been proposed as historic, but the subject property is not located in either of these districts, nor is it greater than 50 years old. No archaeological or historical sites have been identified either on or in the immediate vicinity of the Hess Fitness Center (Hirschi, 2003).

4.3.11 Socioeconomic Resources

4.3.11.1. Neither the Proposed Action or No-Action Alternative would create additional jobs because this facility does not provide an economic benefit to military operations at HAFB. However, the property provides a community resource (specifically to HAFB personnel) through fitness programs.

4.3.12 Environmental Justice

4.3.12.1. The population of Davis and Weber counties represents approximately 19.5 percent of the population of the State of Utah. Therefore, no minority or low-income groups or populations of children would be disproportionately impacted by the Proposed Action. The No-Action Alternative would have no effect on environmental justice issues.

4.4 Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Impacts

4.4.0.1. The discussion of potential environmental impacts presented in Section 4.3 indicates that neither the Proposed Action or No-Action Alternative would create unavoidable adverse environmental impacts.

4.5 Compatibility of the Proposed Action and Alternatives with the Objectives of Federal, Regional, State, and Local Land Use Plans, Policies, and Controls

4.5.0.1. HAFB is an active military facility. The current mission of HAFB is to provide depot repair, modification, and maintenance support to major aircraft weapon systems, and there is no anticipated land use change for HAFB. Therefore, implementing the proposed alternatives would not impact current land use plans.

4.6 Relationship Between the Short-Term Use of the Environment and Long-Term Productivity

4.6.0.1. The Hess Fitness Center is not being used to directly accomplish HAFB mission objectives. Therefore, implementing the proposed alternative would not impact long-term productivity of the Base.

4.7 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources

4.7.0.1. The proposed alternatives would not cause an irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources.

5.0 List of Preparers

5.0.0.1 The following CH2M HILL personnel were involved in the preparation of this EA:

- Staci Hill, P.E., Project Manager
- Laurel Redenbaugh, Project Engineer
- Michael Cox, Senior Reviewer

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

6.0 List of Persons and Agencies Consulted

6.0.0.1 The following agencies and persons were consulted during the preparation of this EA.

- CH2M HILL, Associate Hydrogeologist, Todd L. Isakson, (801) 281-2426 – discussed groundwater contamination at HAFB. October 2003.
- Hill Air Force Base, 75th Services Division, Services Project Officer, Peter A. Villafana, (801) 777-3667 – onsite discussion of proposed subject. October 2003.
- Hill Air Force Base, 75th Civil Engineer Squadron, Project Manager, Richard Nehring (801) 775-3369 – onsite discussion of proposed action and clarification of project alternatives. October 2003.
- Hill Air Force Base, Environmental Management Directorate, Project Engineer, Shannon Smith (801) 775-6913 – discussed groundwater and wastewater at the subject property. October 2003.
- Hill Air Force Base, Environmental Management Directorate, Natural Resources Geographic Information Systems Specialist, Sanford Moss (801) 775-6972 – discussed nest locations at HAFB and flora and fauna of HAFB. October 2003.
- Hill Air Force Base, Environmental Management Directorate, Natural Resources Manager, Marcus Blood (801) 775-4618 – discussed endangered species at HAFB. October 2003.
- Hill Air Force Base, Cultural Resources Program Manager, Sam Johnson (801) 775-3653 – requested cultural resource information. October 2003.
- Hill Air Force Base, Archaeologist, Jaynie Hirschi (801) 775-6920 – requested archaeological survey and historic building information. October 2003.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Enforcement, Compliance and Environmental Justice Region VIII, Nancy Reish (303) 312-6040 – requested environmental justice information. October 9, 2003.

6.0.0.2 To fully comply with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations, a copy of the Proposed Final Environmental Assessment is usually made available for public review and comment.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

7.0 References

- Hill Air Force Base (HAFB), 2003. 2003 Base Guide and Telephone Directory. San Diego, California. 2003.
- Hirschi, 2003. Personal Communication. Jaynie Hirschi, HAFB Environmental Management (EM) Archaeologist. October 2003.
- Isakson, 2003. Personal Communication and e-mail. Todd Isakson, CH2M HILL Associate Hydrogeologist. October 2003.
- Moss, 2003. Personal Communication. Sanford Moss, HAFB Natural Resources Geographic Information Systems Specialist. October 2003.
- Smith, 2003. Personal Communication and e-mail. Shannon Smith, HAFB Environmental Management Project Engineer. October 2003.
- United States Air Force (USAF), 1999. *USAF Fitness Facilities Design Guide*. Brooks Air Force Base, Texas. October 1999.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 2003. *Environmental Justice Geographic Assessment Tool [online]*. Available: <http://www.epa.gov/enviro/ej>. October 2003.
- Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, 2003. *County Lists of Utah's Federally Listed Threatened (T), Endangered (E), and Candidate (C) Species*. July 2003.
- Utah Natural Heritage Program Biological and Conservation Database *Utah's State Listed Species by County*. October 2002.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX A

Finding of No Significant Impact

Finding of No Significant Impact

Purpose and Need

Hill Air Force Base (HAFB) has two fitness facilities, the Hess Fitness Center and the Westside Gym. The Hess Fitness Center contains the indoor swimming pool and is adjacent to the indoor tennis courts and outdoor jogging track. The Hess Fitness Center is the primary fitness center for the base, containing most of the required core functional areas such as a gymnasium, cardiovascular area, racquetball courts, locker rooms, and strength training areas. However, the building housing the fitness center is deficient in several respects. Specifically, the building space is substandard for both fitness and administrative functions as defined by the *United States Air Force (USAF) Fitness Facilities Design Guide* (USAF, 1999), the building has significant seismic concerns, lighting is inadequate in the corridors, the gymnasium and parking lot are undersized, there is no covered access from the parking lot, and the building's electrical load is generally at capacity. Additionally, the only climate control for the building is heating and ventilation. There is no air conditioning other than small evaporative cooling and window units.

The Westside Gym contains a central fitness equipment area and locker rooms and is used mainly by the civilian base population. The Health and Wellness Center (HAWC) is co-located within the Westside Gym, which is housed in a historically significant building. A previously proposed project would have enlarged the HAWC; however, requirements outlined in the *USAF Fitness Facilities Design Guide* would still not have been met.

The proposed action is necessary to ensure that fitness facilities at HAFB meet the requirements of the *USAF Fitness Facilities Design Guide* and are capable of providing a rewarding fitness experience to both the military and civilian personnel of the Base.

Selection Criteria and Alternatives Considered

The following alternatives were evaluated in an attempt to ensure compliance with the Design Guide.

- **Proposed Action:** Continue use of Westside Gym (Building 1277), demolish outdoor track, construct new 5,854 square meter Fitness Center, construct new track to the south across 11th Street, continue utilization of indoor swimming pool and associated locker rooms, and co-locate the HAWC. Force Protection requirements for the new facility may require new facility siting such that the bubble (Building 10570) will need to be removed.
- **Alternative 1:** Add/alter the existing Hess Fitness Center and co-locate the HAWC.
- **Alternative 2:** HAWC enlargement.
- **No-Action Alternative:** Continue use of existing Hess Fitness Center, HAWC, and Westside Gym.

Due to the cost associated with Alternative 1 (i.e., nearly 70 percent that of constructing a new facility), this alternative has been dismissed from further consideration. Alternative 2 was dismissed from further consideration due to inadequacy of the remaining facilities supporting the fitness program.

The selection criteria established to evaluate the Proposed Action and the No-Action Alternative were as follows: mission accomplishment, community service, and minimization of environmental impacts.

Impact on Resources

Based on the evaluation of environmental consequences in the Environmental Assessment, the Proposed Action would not cause negative environmental effects. Furthermore, air, water, and soil resources would not be negatively impacted by the Proposed Action.

Due to current and future land use of Hill Air Force Base, the No-Action Alternative would have no impact on the environment.

Conclusion

The findings of this Environmental Assessment indicate that the Proposed Action to construct a new Hess Fitness Center will not have significant adverse effects on the human environment or any of the environmental resources as described in the Environmental Assessment. Therefore, issuance of a Finding of No Significant Impact is justified and an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Environmental Protection Committee Chairman

Date

APPENDIX B

Biological Information

TABLE B1

Species found at Hill Air Force Base


Environmental Assessment for Construction of the Hess Fitness Center at HAFB


Double-crested Cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax auritus</i>	Black-billed Magpie <i>Pica pica</i>
Mallard <i>Anas platyrhynchos</i>	Common Raven <i>Corvus corax</i>
Redhead <i>Aythya americana</i>	Black-capped Chickadee <i>Parus atricapillus</i>
Common Goldeneye <i>Bucephala clangula</i>	Mountain Chickadee <i>Parus gambeli</i>
Turkey Vulture <i>Cathartes aura</i>	Rock Wren <i>Salpinctes obsoletus</i>
Bald Eagle <i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	Blue-gray Gnatcatcher <i>Poliophtila caerulea</i>
Northern Harrier <i>Circus cyaneus</i>	American Robin <i>Turdus migratorius</i>
Sharp-shinned Hawk <i>Accipiter striatus</i>	Cedar Waxwing <i>BombyciZla cedrorum</i>
Cooper's Hawk <i>Accipiter cooperii</i>	European Starling <i>Sturnus vulgaris</i>
Swainson's Hawk <i>Buteo swainsoni</i>	Warbling Vireo <i>Vireogilvus</i>
Red-tailed Hawk <i>Buteo jamaicensis</i>	Yellow Warbler <i>Dendroica petechia</i>
American Kestrel <i>Falco sparverius</i>	Yellow-rumped Warbler <i>Dendroica coronata</i>
Prairie Falcon <i>Falco mexicanus</i>	Wilson's Warbler <i>Wilsonia pusilla</i>
Ring-necked Pheasant <i>Phasianus colchicus</i>	Black-headed Grosbeak <i>Pheucticus melanocephalus</i>
Killdeer <i>Charadrius vociferus</i>	Lazuli Bunting <i>Passerina amoena</i>
California Gull <i>Larus californicus</i>	Chipping Sparrow <i>Spizella passerina</i>
Rock Dove <i>Columba livia</i>	Brewer's Sparrow <i>Spizella breweri</i>
Mourning Dove <i>Zenaida macroura</i>	Lark Sparrow <i>Chondestesgrammacus</i>
Black-chinned Hummingbird <i>Archilochus alexandri</i>	Lark Bunting <i>Calamospiza melanocorys</i>
Broad-tailed Hummingbird <i>Selasphorus platycercus</i>	Grasshopper Sparrow <i>Ammodramus savannarum</i>
Rufous Hummingbird <i>Selasphorus rufus</i>	Song Sparrow <i>Melospiza melodia</i>
Belted Kingfisher <i>Ceryle alcyon</i>	White-crowned Sparrow <i>Zonotrichia leucophrys</i>
Lewis' Woodpecker <i>Melanerpes lewis</i>	Dark-eyed Junco <i>Junco hyemalis</i>
Downy Woodpecker <i>Picoides pubescens</i>	Red-winged Blackbird <i>Agelaius phoeniceus</i>
Northern Flicker <i>Colaptes auratus</i>	Western Meadowlark <i>Sturnella neglecta</i>
Willow Flycatcher <i>Empidonox traillii</i>	Brewer's Blackbird <i>Euphagus cyanocephalus</i>
Western Kingbird <i>Tyrannus verticalis</i>	Brown-headed Cowbird <i>Molothrus ater</i>
Horned Lark <i>Eremophila alpestris</i>	Bullock's Oriole <i>Icterus bullockii</i>
N. Rough-winged Swallow <i>Stelgidopteryx serripennis</i>	House Finch <i>Carpodacus mexicanus</i>
Bank Swallow <i>Riparia riparia</i>	Pine Siskin <i>Carduelis pinus</i>
Cliff Swallow <i>Hirundo pyrrhonota</i>	American Goldfinch <i>Carduelis tristis</i>
Barn Swallow <i>Hirundo rustica</i>	House Sparrow <i>Passer domesticus</i>
Western Scrub-Jay <i>Aphelocoma californica</i>	

Source: Utah Natural Heritage Program Biological and Conservation Database, Utah's State Listed Species by County. UDWR, 2002.

APPENDIX C

Environmental Justice Information







Environmental Justice Geographic Assessment Tool

[Contact Us](#) | Search: [GO](#)
[EPA Home](#) > [EnviroMapper](#) > Environmental Justice Geographic Assessment Tool

Statistics represent residential population within a **9.9** mile buffer around feature of interest

Enter a new buffer value (max. 10 miles) [Go](#)

Social
Economic
Health
Environmental
Map
Regional

County and State Comparison

Overview

Total Persons:	304346	Land Area:	80.1%	Households in Area:	96503
Population Density:	967.57 /sq mi	Water Area:	19.9%	Housing Units in Area:	101737
Percent Minority:	16.1%	Persons Below Poverty Level:	24801 (8.1%)	Households on Public Assistance:	3682
<i>This space intentionally left blank</i>		Housing Units Built <1970:	39%	Housing Units Built <1950:	15%

Race and Age*

Race Breakdown	Persons (%)	Age Breakdown	Persons(%)
White:	268317 (88.2%)	Child 5 years or less:	35160 (11.6%)
African-American:	4393 (1.4%)	Minors 17 years and younger:	101388 (33.3%)
Hispanic-Origin:	32284 (10.6%)	Adults 18 years and older:	202958 (66.7%)
Asian/Pacific Islander:	5503 (1.8%)	Seniors 65 years and older:	25415 (8.4%)
American Indian:	2444 (0.8%)	<i>This space intentionally left blank</i>	
Other Race:	15999 (5.3%)		
Multiracial:	7690 (2.5%)		

(* Columns that add up to 100% are highlighted)

Education

Education Level (Persons 25 & older)	Persons (%)
Less than 9th grade:	9071 (5.5%)
9th -12th grade:	18084 (11.0%)
High School Diploma:	47400 (28.8%)
Some College/2 yr:	52256 (31.7%)
B.S./B.A. or more:	37909 (23.0%)

SOURCE: [U.S. Bureau of the Census](#) 
Data represents population and housing statistics by block group for Census 2000.

[Go To Top Of The Page](#)

[EPA Home](#) | [Privacy and Security Notice](#) | [Contact Us](#)

This page was generated on Thursday, October 9, 2003

View the graphical version of this page at: http://oaspub.epa.gov/envjust/demog_service.get_geom?coords=-111.99755%2C41.090319%2C-111.99755%2C41.120319%2C-111.95755%2C41.120319%2C-111.95755%2C41.090319%2C-111.99755%2C41.090319&featype=poly&radius=9.9&report_type=html&census_type=bg2k&p_caller=polyself&p_title=Environmental+Justice+Assesme



Environmental Justice

[Recent Additions](#) |
 [Contact Us](#) |
 [Print Version](#)
 Search: [GO](#)
[EPA Home](#) > [EnviroMapper](#) > Environmental Justice

Close Window

County and State Comparison

Overview

	Study Area	DAVIS County, UT	MORGAN County, UT	WEBER County, UT	UTAH
Total Persons:	304346	238994	7129	196533	2233169
Population Density:	967.57 /sq mi	784.93 /sq mi	11.7 /sq mi	341.48 /sq mi	27.19 /sq mi
Percent Minority:	16.1%	10.3%	3%	17.3%	14.7%
Persons Below Poverty Level:	24801 (8.1%)	11984 (5%)	369 (5.2%)	18022 (9.2%)	206328 (9.2%)
Households in Area:	96503	71201	2046	65698	701281
Households on Public Assistance:	3682	2059	50	2477	
Housing Units Built <1970:	39%	29%	40%	47%	36%
Housing Units Built <1950:	15%	7%	22%	20%	16%

Race

Race Breakdown	Study Area	DAVIS County, UT	MORGAN County, UT	WEBER County, UT	UTAH
White:	268317 (88.2%)	220057 (92.1%)	6988 (98.0%)	172385 (87.7%)	1991560 (89.2%)
African-American:	4393 (1.4%)	2555 (1.1%)	2 (0.0%)	2388 (1.2%)	16150 (0.7%)
Hispanic-Origin:	32284 (10.6%)	12780 (5.3%)	113 (1.6%)	24970 (12.7%)	200005 (9.0%)
Asian/Pacific Islander:	5503 (1.8%)	3497 (1.5%)	8 (0.1%)	2352 (1.2%)	36878 (1.7%)

American Indian:	2444 (0.8%)	1279 (0.5%)	2 (0.0%)	1565 (0.8%)	28646 (1.3%)
Other Race:	15999 (5.3%)	5452 (2.3%)	31 (0.4%)	13075 (6.7%)	94089 (4.2%)
Multiracial:	7690 (2.5%)	5226 (2.2%)	98 (1.4%)	4474 (2.3%)	51480 (2.3%)
(* Columns that add up to 100% are highlighted)					

Age

Age Breakdown	Study Area	DAVIS County, UT	MORGAN County, UT	WEBER County, UT	UTAH
Child 5 years or less:	35160 (11.6%)	27883 (11.7%)	715 (10.0%)	20826 (10.6%)	248608 (11.1%)
Minors 17 years and younger:	101388 (33.3%)	84017 (35.2%)	2631 (36.9%)	60771 (30.9%)	716831 (32.1%)
Adults 18 years and older:	202958 (66.7%)	154977 (64.8%)	4498 (63.1%)	135762 (69.1%)	1516338 (67.9%)
Seniors 65 years and older:	25415 (8.4%)	17566 (7.3%)	624 (8.8%)	20437 (10.4%)	190531 (8.5%)
(* Columns that add up to 100% are highlighted)					

Education

Education Level (Persons 25 & older)	Study Area	DAVIS County, UT	MORGAN County, UT	WEBER County, UT	UTAH
Less than 9th grade:	9071 (5.5%)	2566 (2.1%)	81 (2.3%)	8022 (7.0%)	59014 (5.0%)
9th -12th grade:	18084 (11.0%)	8672 (7.2%)	222 (6.2%)	14336 (12.6%)	127879 (10.7%)
High School Diploma:	47400 (28.8%)	30980 (25.9%)	1125 (31.6%)	33655 (29.5%)	317169 (26.6%)
Some College/2 yr.:	52256 (31.7%)	40690 (34.0%)	1241 (34.9%)	35328 (30.9%)	364575 (30.6%)
B.S./B.A. or more:	37909 (23.0%)	36757 (30.7%)	890 (25.0%)	22835 (20.0%)	321909 (27.0%)

SOURCE: [U.S. Bureau of the Census](#) 
 Data represents population and housing statistics by county for Census 2000.

[Go To Top Of The Page](#)

[EPA Home](#) | [Privacy and Security Notice](#) | [Contact Us](#)

Last updated on Thursday, October 9th, 2003
http://oaspub.epa.gov/envjust/demog_report_2.doCountyStateComp