

SUPPORTING DETAILS FOR CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS

CE# ADMINISTRATIVE AND REGULATORY ACTIVITIES. These categorical exclusions have the additional requirement to be conducted in conformance with the Greening the Government Executive Orders (e.g., EO 13101, 13123, 13148, 13149, and 13150).

A1 Personnel, fiscal, management, and administrative activities, such as recruiting, processing, paying, recordkeeping, resource management, budgeting, personnel actions, and travel. CAT I

APHIS

Reference: 7CFR372.5 (c) and 7CFR1b.3 (a)

7CFR1b.3 (a) (2) Activities which deal solely with the funding of programs, such as program budget proposals, disbursements, and transfer or reprogramming of funds;

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(i) Administrative actions such as personnel actions, travel, procurement of supplies, etc., in support of normal day-to-day activities and disaster related activities;

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

1. Administrative Actions: c. Routine personnel, fiscal, and administrative activities, actions, procedures, and policies which clearly do not have any environmental impacts, such as military and civilian personnel recruiting, processing, paying, and record keeping.

USDA-ARS

Reference: 7 CFR 1b.3

(1) Policy development, planning and implementation which relate to routine activities, such as personnel, organizational changes, or similar administrative functions;

A2 Reductions, realignments, or relocation of personnel that do not result in exceeding the infrastructure capacity or change the use of space. An example of a substantial change in use of the supporting infrastructure would be an increase in vehicular traffic beyond the capacity of the supporting road network to accommodate such an increase. CAT I

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

1. Administrative Actions: a. Personnel and other administrative action associated with consolidations, reorganizations, or reductions in force resulting from identified inefficiencies, reduced personnel or funding levels, skill imbalances, or other similar causes. (Checklist and CED required.)

2. Real and Personal Property Related Actions m. Relocation of Coast Guard personnel into existing Federally owned or leased space where use does not change substantially and any attendant modifications to the facility would be minor.

4. Operational Actions d. Routine movement of personnel and equipment....

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B. Section II

(b)(14) Relocation of personnel into existing federally-owned (or state-owned in the case of ARNG) or commercially-leased space, which does not involve a substantial change in the supporting infrastructure (for example, an increase in vehicular traffic beyond the capacity of the supporting road network to accommodate such an increase is an example of substantial change)(REC required).

USBP

Reference: Environmental Assessment Proposed Construction of the U.S. Border Patrol Station in Laredo, Webb County, Texas May 1998 resulting in a FONSI signed in May of 1998

This Environmental Assessment was prepared for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) proposed land purchase, construction of a U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) station, and relocation of agents to the new facility on an approximately 10-acre tract at the southeast corner of Grand Central Boulevard and the McPherson Road extension in Laredo, Webb County, Texas.

The INS proposes to purchase an approximately 10-acre tract of land from a private landowner in order to construct a USBP station at the southeast corner of Grand Central Boulevard and the McPherson Boulevard extension in Laredo, Webb County, Texas. The USBP agents stationed at the currently leased Laredo North Station would relocate to the new facility when construction is complete. The new station would consist of the following structures or components: a single-story building (30,500 square feet [with a detention area (2,500 sf)]; three aboveground storage tanks (two 10,000-gallon gasoline tanks and one 12,000-gallon diesel tank); a 2,500-sf drive/parking area; a dog kennel for 26 dogs; and a radio tower.

Analysis: The proposed action is not anticipated to have any significant adverse impacts to soils, water, biological, or cultural resources. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated to land use, socioeconomics, hazardous materials and waste, air quality, or noise. In addition, the proposed action is not anticipated to have any long-term adverse impacts to the environment.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment U.S. Border Patrol Station Wilcox, Arizona September 2002 resulting in a FONSI signed in September of 2002

The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) is proposing to relocate the operation of a United States Border Patrol Station (USBPS) to a new facility. The existing and proposed facilities are located in Wilcox, Cochise County. Two additional site locations were considered and eliminated from further consideration due to environmental constraints. The Proposed Alternative would be located within an existing industrial area nearby other non-residential developments within the City limits of Wilcox.

Analysis: Based on the analysis of the resource studies, no significant adverse impacts would result from the Proposed Alternative.

Reference: Environmental Assessment Proposed Construction of the U.S. Border Patrol Station in Sanderson, Terrell County, Texas February 12, 2001 resulting in a FONSI signed in February of 2001

This EA addresses the potential impacts of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) proposed property purchase, construction of a U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) station, and relocation of agents from an existing facility to the new facility. The proposed facility would be located on an approximately 33-acre tract of land north of U.S. Highway 90 and west of Highland Plaza Ave. in Sanderson, Terrell County, Texas.

The purpose is to construct a new facility to accommodate an increased number of agents who will be assigned to the Marfa Sector, Sanderson Station. The current Sanderson Station can accommodate up to 5 personnel, but has inadequate ancillary facilities and does not have the capability to expand to include these facilities. A new station would allow for the necessary expansion of agent staff size as well as more efficient and effective operations in a modern facility that can best support the USBP mission. The new station would consist of the following structures or components: a single-story building (14,000 square feet); one aboveground gasoline storage tank; a 39,858 sf drive/parking area; a dog kennel; and a radio tower.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

NAVY

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Addition Of Two P-3 Aircraft To The Us Customs Service's Air And Marine Interdiction Division At Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, Texas resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The proposed action is to add two P-3 Orion aircraft to the USCS Air and Marine Interdiction Division at NAS Corpus Chnsti, Texas The additional two aircraft will increase to ten the number of aircraft used by USCS at NAS Corpus Christi to accomplish their mission of drug interdiction and homeland defense.

Additional parking apron will be constructed for the aircraft. Twenty-two new support personnel will join the USCS staff. The existing on-base and off-base utility systems (water, sanitary sewer, telephone, and electric) have adequate capacity to accommodate the proposed activities and personnel.

Analysis: Based on the information gathered during preparation of the EA, the Navy and the U.S. Customs Srvice finds that adding two P-3 aircraft to the USCS Air and Marine Interdiction Division at Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, Texas, will not significantly impact the environment.

A3 Promulgation of rules, issuance of rulings or interpretations, and the development and publication of policies, orders, directives, notices, procedures, manuals, advisory circulars, and other guidance documents of the following nature:

- (a) Those of a strictly administrative or procedural nature;
- (b) Those that implement, without substantive change, statutory or regulatory requirements;
- (c) Those that implement, without substantive change, procedures, manuals, and other guidance documents;
- (d) Those that interpret or amend an existing regulation without changing its environmental effect;
- (e) Technical guidance on safety and security matters; or
- (f) Guidance for the preparation of security plans. CAT I

APHIS

Reference: 7CFR372.5 (c) and 7CFR1b.3 (a)

7CFR1b.3 (a) (1) Policy development, planning and implementation which relate to routine activities, such as personnel, organizational changes, or similar administrative functions;

USDA-ARS

Reference: 7 CFR 1b.3

(6) Activities which are advisory and consultative to other agencies and public and private entities, such as legal counseling and representation;

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(ii) Preparation, revision, and adoption of regulations, directives, manuals, and other guidance documents related to actions that qualify for categorical exclusions

FAA

Reference: FAA order 1050.1d Chapter 31 (a)

(5) Policy and planning documents not intended for or which do not cause direct implementation of project or system actions

Reference: FAA Order 5050.4A Chapter 3, Section 23.

(b) (6) Issuance of airport policy and planning documents including the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS), Airport Improvement Program (AIP) priority system, advisory circulars on planning, design, and development programs which are not intended for direct implementation or which are issued by FAA as administrative and technical guidance to the public.

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

1. Administrative Actions: e. Preparation of guidance documents that implement, without substantive change, the applicable Commandant Instruction or other Federal agency regulations, procedures, manuals, and other guidance documents.
6. Bridge Administration Actions e. Promulgation of operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges.
- f. Identification of advance approval waterways under 33 CFR 115.70.
7. Regulatory Actions a. Regulations concerning vessel operation safety standards (e.g., regulations requiring: certain boaters to use approved equipment which is required to be installed such as an ignition cut-off switch, or carried on board, such as personal flotation devices (PFDS), and/or stricter blood alcohol concentration (BAC) standards for recreational boaters, etc.), equipment approval, and/or equipment carriage requirements (e.g. personal flotation devices (PFDs) and visual distress signals (VDS's)). b. Congressionally mandated regulations designed to improve or protect the environment (e.g., regulations implementing the requirements of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, such as those requiring vessels to have the capability to transmit and receive on radio channels that would allow them to receive critical safety and navigation warnings in U.S. waters, regulations to increase civil penalties against persons responsible for the discharge of oil or hazardous substances into U.S. waters, etc.). (Checklist and CED required.) c. Regulations which are editorial or procedural, such as those updating addresses or establishing application procedures. d. Regulations concerning internal agency functions or organization or personnel administration, such as funding, establishing Captain of the Port boundaries, or delegating authority. e. Regulations concerning the training, qualifying, licensing, and disciplining of maritime personnel. f. Regulations concerning manning, documentation, admeasurement, inspection, and equipping of vessels. g. Regulations concerning equipment approval and carriage requirements. h. Regulations establishing, disestablishing, or changing the size of Special Anchorage Areas or anchorage grounds. (Checklist and CED not required for actions that disestablish or reduce the size of the Area or grounds). i. Regulations establishing, disestablishing, or changing Regulated Navigation Areas and security or safety zones. (Checklist and CED not required for actions that disestablish or reduce the size of the area or zone. For temporary areas and zones that are established to deal with emergency situations and that are less than one week in duration, the checklist and CED are not required. For temporary areas and zones that are established to deal with emergency situations and that are one week or longer in duration, the checklist and CED will be prepared and submitted after issuance or publication.) j. Special local regulations issued in conjunction with a regatta or marine parade; provided that, if a permit is required, the environmental analysis conducted for the permit included an analysis of the impact of the regulations. (Checklist and CED not required) k. Regulations in aid of navigation, such as those concerning rules of the road, International Regulations for the Prevention of Collisions at Sea (COLREGS), bridge-to-bridge communications, vessel traffic services, and marking of navigation systems.

A4 Information gathering, data analysis and processing, information dissemination, review, interpretation, and development of documents, that involves no commitment of resources or recommendations for future commitments of resources other than the associated manpower and funding. Examples include but are not limited to:

- (a) Document mailings, publication and distribution, and training and information programs, historical and cultural demonstrations, and public affairs actions
- (b) Studies, reports, proposals, analyses, literature reviews; computer modeling; and other non-intrusive intelligence gathering activities CAT I

APHIS

Reference: 7CFR372.5 (c) and 7CFR1b.3 (a)

7CFR1b.3 (a) (6) Activities which are advisory and consultative to other agencies and public and private entities, such as legal counselling and representation;

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(iii) Studies that involve no commitment of resources other than manpower and associated funding;

USDA-ARS

Reference: 7 CFR 1b.3

(3) Inventories, research activities, and studies, such as resource inventories and routine data collection when such actions are clearly limited in context and intensity;

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

2. Real and Personal Property Related Actions i. Real property inspections for compliance with deed or easement restrictions.

5. Special Studies a. Environmental site characterization studies and environmental monitoring including: Siting, constructing, operating, and dismantling or closing of characterization and monitoring devices. Such activities include but are not limited to the following: Conducting geological, geophysical, geochemical, and engineering surveys and mapping, including the establishment of survey marks. Installing and operating field instruments, such as stream-gauging stations or flow-measuring devices, telemetry systems, geochemical monitoring tools, and geophysical exploration tools. Drilling wells for sampling or monitoring of groundwater, well logging, and installation of water-level recording devices in wells. Conducting aquifer response testing. Installing and operating ambient air monitoring equipment. Sampling and characterizing water, soil, rock, or contaminants. Sampling and characterizing water effluents, air emissions, or solid waste streams. Sampling flora or fauna. Conducting archeological, historic, and cultural resource identification and evaluation studies in compliance with 36 CFR part 800 and 43 CFR part 7. Gathering data and information and conducting studies that involve no physical change to the environment. Examples include topographic surveys, bird counts, wetland mapping, and other inventories. b. Natural and cultural resource management and research activities that are in accordance with inter-agency agreements and which are designed to improve or upgrade the USCG's ability to manage those resources. c. Planning and technical studies which do not contain recommendations for authorization or funding for future construction, but may recommend further study. This includes engineering efforts or environmental studies undertaken to define the elements of a proposal or alternatives sufficiently so that the environmental effects may be assessed and does not exclude consideration of environmental matters in the studies.

A5 Contingency planning and administrative activities in anticipation of emergency and disaster response and recovery. Examples include response plans, protocols for use of suppressants, etc. CAT I

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(v) Training activities and both training and operational exercises utilizing existing facilities in accordance with established procedures and land use designations

(vi) Procurement of goods and services for support of day-to-day and emergency operational activities, and the temporary storage of goods other than hazardous materials, so long as storage occurs on previously disturbed land or in existing facilities;

(xviii) The following planning and administrative activities in support of emergency and disaster response and recovery: (A) Activation of the Emergency Support Team and convening of the Catastrophic Disaster Response Group at FEMA headquarters; (B) Activation of the Regional Operations Center and deployment of the Emergency Response Team, in whole or in part; (C) Deployment of Urban Search and Rescue teams;

(D) Situation Assessment including ground and aerial reconnaissance; (E) Information and data gathering and reporting efforts in support of emergency and disaster response and recovery and hazard mitigation; and

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B. Section II

(b)(2) Emergency or disaster assistance provided to federal, state, or local entities (REC required).

FAA

Reference: FAA order 1050.1d Chapter 31 (a)

(5) Policy and planning documents not intended for or which do not cause direct implementation of project or system actions

Reference: FAA Order 5050.4A Chapter 3, Section 23.

(b) (6) Issuance of airport policy and planning documents including the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS), Airport Improvement Program (AIP) priority system, advisory circulars on planning, design, and development programs which are not intended for direct implementation or which are issued by FAA as administrative and technical guidance to the public.

DOE

Reference: 10 CFR Pt. 1021, Subpt. D. App. B

A12 Emergency preparedness planning activities, including the designation of onsite evacuation routes.

B1.2 Routine training exercises and simulations including, but not limited to:

Emergency response and security training.

Fire fighting, rescue, and spill response/cleanup training.

B1.2 Training exercises and simulations (including, but not limited to, firing-range training, emergency response training, fire fighter and rescue training, and spill cleanup training).

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

3. Training a. Defense preparedness training and exercises conducted on Coast Guard controlled property that do not involve undeveloped property or increased noise levels over adjacent property and that involve a limited number of personnel, such as exercises involving primarily electronic simulation or command post personnel. (Checklist and CED required.) b. Defense preparedness training and exercises conducted on other than USCG property, where the lead agency or department is not USCG or DOT and the lead agency or department has completed its NEPA analysis and documentation requirements. c. Simulated exercises, including tactical and logistical exercises that involve small numbers of personnel. d. Training of an administrative or classroom nature.

A6 Awarding of contracts for technical support services, ongoing management and operation of government facilities, and professional services that do not involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources. CAT I

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(i) Administrative actions such as personnel actions, travel, procurement of supplies, etc., in support of normal day-to-day activities and disaster related activities;

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

1. Administrative Actions: c. Routine personnel, fiscal, and administrative activities, actions, procedures, and policies which clearly do not have any environmental impacts, such as military and civilian personnel recruiting, processing, paying, and record keeping.

A7 Procurement of non-hazardous goods and services, and storage, recycling, and disposal of non-hazardous materials and wastes, that complies with applicable requirements and that is in support of routine administrative, operational, maintenance activities. Storage activities must occur on previously disturbed land or in existing facilities. Examples include but are not limited to:

- (a) Office supplies
- (b) Equipment
- (c) Mobile assets
- (d) Utility services
- (e) Chemicals and low level radio nuclides for analytical testing and research
- (f) Deployable emergency response supplies and equipment
- (g) Waste disposal and contracts for waste disposal in permitted landfills or other authorized facilities.

CAT I

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(vi) Procurement of goods and services for support of day-to-day and emergency operational activities, and the temporary storage of goods other than hazardous materials, so long as storage occurs on previously disturbed land or in existing facilities;

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

1. Administrative Actions: b. Routine procurement activities and actions for goods and services, including office supplies, equipment, mobile assets, and utility services for routine administration, operation, and maintenance.

A8 The commitment of resources, personnel, and funding to conduct audits, surveys, and data collection of a minimally intrusive nature. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- (a) Activities designed to support the improvement or upgrade management of natural resources, such as surveys for threatened and endangered species, wildlife and wildlife habitat, historic properties, and archeological sites; wetland delineations; timber stand examination; minimal water, air, waste, material and soil sampling; audits, photography, and interpretation
- (b) Minimally-intrusive geological, geophysical, and geo-technical activities, including mapping and engineering surveys
- (c) Site characterization studies and environmental monitoring, including siting, construction, operation, and dismantling or closing of characterization and monitoring devices, Facility Audits, Environmental Site Assessments, and Environmental Baseline Surveys
- (d) Vulnerability, risk, and structural integrity assessments of infrastructure.

CAT I

APHIS

Reference: 7CFR372.5 (c) and 7CFR1b.3 (a)

7CFR1b.3 (a) (6) Activities which are advisory and consultative to other agencies and public and private entities, such as legal counselling and representation;

USDA-ARS

Reference: 7 CFR 1b.3

(3) Inventories, research activities, and studies, such as resource inventories and routine data collection when such actions are clearly limited in context and intensity;

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(iii) Studies that involve no commitment of resources other than manpower and associated funding;

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

2. Real and Personal Property Related Actions i. Real property inspections for compliance with deed or easement restrictions.

5. Special Studies a. Environmental site characterization studies and environmental monitoring including: Siting, constructing, operating, and dismantling or closing of characterization and monitoring devices. Such activities include but are not limited to the following: Conducting geological, geophysical, geochemical, and engineering surveys and mapping, including the establishment of survey marks. Installing and operating field instruments, such as stream-gauging stations or flow-measuring devices, telemetry systems, geochemical monitoring tools, and geophysical exploration tools. Drilling wells for sampling or monitoring of groundwater, well logging, and installation of water-level recording devices in wells. Conducting aquifer response testing. Installing and operating ambient air monitoring equipment. Sampling and characterizing water, soil, rock, or contaminants. Sampling and characterizing water effluents, air emissions, or solid waste streams. Sampling flora or fauna. Conducting archeological, historic, and cultural resource identification and evaluation studies in compliance with 36 CFR part 800 and 43 CFR part 7. Gathering data and information and conducting studies that involve no physical change to the environment. Examples include topographic surveys, bird counts, wetland mapping, and other inventories. b. Natural and cultural resource management and research activities that are in accordance with inter-agency agreements and which are designed to improve or upgrade the USCG's ability to manage those resources. c. Planning and technical studies which do not contain recommendations for authorization or funding for future construction, but may recommend further study. This includes engineering efforts or environmental studies undertaken to define the elements of a proposal or alternatives sufficiently so that the environmental effects may be assessed and does not exclude consideration of environmental matters in the studies.

OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES

B1 Research, development, testing, and evaluation activities, or laboratory operations conducted within existing enclosed facilities consistent with previously established safety levels and in compliance with federal, tribal, state, and local requirements to protect the environment when it will result in no, or de minimus change in the use of the facility. If the operation will substantially increase the extent of potential environmental impacts or is controversial, an EA (and possibly an EIS) is required. CAT I

APHIS

Reference: 7CFR372.5 (c) and 7CFR1b.3 (a)

7CFR372.5 (c) (2) Research and development activities. (i) Activities that are carried out in laboratories, facilities or other areas designed to eliminate the potential for harmful environmental effects--internal or external--and to provide for lawful waste disposal (ii) Examples of this category of actions include: (A) The development and/or production (including formulation, repackaging, movement, and distribution) of previously approved and/or licensed program materials, devices, reagents, and biologics; (B) Research, testing, and development of animal repellents; and (C) Development and production of sterile insects.

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B. Section II

(h)(5) Research, testing, and operations conducted at existing enclosed facilities consistent with previously established safety levels and in compliance with applicable federal, state, and local standards. For facilities without existing NEPA analysis, including contractor-operated facilities, if the operation will substantially increase the extent of potential environmental impacts or is controversial, an EA (and possibly an EIS) is required.

USDA-ARS

Reference: 7 CFR 520.5 (b)

(2) Research programs or projects of limited size and magnitude or with only short-term effects on the environment. Examples are:

- (i) Research operations conducted within any laboratory, greenhouse or other contained facility where research practices and safeguards prevent environment impacts such as the release of hazardous materials into the environment;
- (ii) Inventories, studies or other such activities that have limited context and minimal intensity in terms of changes in the environment;
- (iii) Testing outside of the laboratory, such as in small isolated field plots, which does not involve the use of control agents requiring containment or a special license or a permit from a regulatory agency.

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

4. Operational Actions e. Contracts for activities conducted at established laboratories and facilities, to include contractor-operated laboratories and facilities, on USCG-owned property where all airborne emissions, waterborne effluents, external radiation levels, outdoor noise, and solid and bulk waste disposal practices are in compliance with existing applicable Federal, state, and local laws and regulations. (Checklist required.)

B2 Transportation of personnel, detainees, equipment, and evidentiary materials in wheeled vehicles over existing roads or established jeep trails, including access to permanent and temporary observation posts.

CAT I

CEQ

Sec. 1508.18 Major Federal action.

"Major Federal action" includes actions with effects that may be major and which are potentially subject to Federal control and responsibility. Major reinforces but does not have a meaning independent of significantly (Sec. 1508.27). Actions include the circumstance where the responsible officials fail to act and that failure to act is reviewable by courts or administrative tribunals under the Administrative Procedure Act or other applicable law as agency action.

AIR FORCE

Reference: 32 CFR989 App. B

A2.3.22. Routine, temporary movement of personnel, including deployments of personnel on a TDY basis where existing facilities are used.

USBP

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Various Road Improvements from Canyon City, California to The Imperial County Line San Diego County, California U.S. Border patrol March 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in March of 2003

The proposed actions consists of: 1) the placement of up to 50 portable lights, as needed, within 60 feet of the border from the Pacific Crest Trail to the Imperial County line; 2) night vision scope pad and access road construction; 3) installation/repair of four drainage structures; 4) the installation of a 300-foot bollard fence section near Jacumba; 5) blasting activities; and 6) the installation of two water wells and holding

tanks by the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP). All activities would take place between Canyon City, California and the Imperial County line in San Diego County, California.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this analysis and assuming that all mitigation measures recommended herein are implemented, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the Proposed Action Alternative.

B3 Proposed activities and operations to be conducted in an existing structure that would be compatible with and similar in scope to its ongoing functional uses and would be consistent with previously established safety levels and in compliance with federal, tribal, state, and local requirements to protect the environment. CAT I

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(xvii) Actions conducted within enclosed facilities where all airborne emissions, waterborne effluent, external radiation levels, outdoor noise, and solid and bulk waste disposal practices comply with existing Federal, state, and local laws and regulations

DHS

Reference: Nationwide Environmental Assessment for the Implementation at Passenger Cruise Ships at Ports Of Entry November 2003 which resulted in a FONSI which was signed in 12/03

The U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US-VISIT) Program Office sought to analyze both entry and exit processing of Non-Immigrant Visa holders (NIV) at fifteen (15) passenger cruise ship terminals. The Proposed Action will include a new arrival and departure process for twelve (12) of the fifteen (15) passenger cruise ship terminals and a new pre-inspection arrival process for three (3) terminals.

The information to be captured at the self-service workstations for NIVs will include biographical data and fingerprints. For arrival, the Preferred Alternative will include the collection of fingerprint scans and a photograph for all NIVs by CBP staff at the existing arrival inspection checkpoint. This additional process will require the installation of nominal infrastructure (a small box measuring approximately 6x6x2-inches and a digital camera) at each existing CBP inspection booth.

Analysis: It was determined that the deployment, installation, and maintenance requirements necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will have no permanent impact on: land use patterns; local or regional plans; zoning; residential, commercial, or community services; children, low-income, or minority populations; socioeconomics; air, noise, cultural resources; vegetation or wildlife; waters of the U.S., including wetlands; threatened or endangered species; floodways or floodplains; hazardous waste sites; or utilities.

DHS has also concluded that the Preferred Alternative will not result in incremental impacts such that there would be a condition whereby individually minor but collectively significant impacts would result in a measurable impact nationwide. In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA, 1969), this EA evaluated the impact on the natural, physical, and social environs as a result of implementing the proposed interim business process and associated technology. Results of this analysis demonstrate that there will be no significant impacts to the aforementioned resources. In summary, DHS has determined that the Proposed Action will not result in significant direct, indirect, temporary, or cumulative impacts to the environment.

Reference: Nationwide Environmental Assessment US-Visit Implementation at Air Ports Of Entry October 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in November of 2003

This Environmental Assessment (EA) evaluated the impact of implementing a proposed interim business process at 115 arrival and 80 departure airports nationwide. To this end, DHS, through its US-VISIT Program, is proposing (Proposed Action) to modify both entry and exit processing of Non-Immigrant Visa

holders (NIV) at airports nationwide. The US-VISIT program is proposing to collect biometric information for NIVs entering and exiting the U.S. through airports beginning in early January 2004.

Analysis: It was determined that the deployment, installation, and maintenance requirements necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative will have no permanent impact on: land use patterns; local or regional plans; zoning; residential, commercial, or community services; children, low-income, or minority populations; socioeconomics; air, noise, cultural resources; vegetation and wildlife; waters of the U.S. including wetlands; threatened and endangered species; floodways and floodplains; hazardous waste sites; or utilities. DHS has also concluded that the Preferred Alternative will not result in incremental impacts such that there would be a condition whereby individually minor but collectively significant impacts would result in a measurable impact nationwide. In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (1969), this EA evaluated the impact on the social, natural, and physical environs as a result of implementing the proposed interim business process and associated technology. Results of this analysis demonstrate that there will be no significant impacts to the aforementioned resources. In summary, DHS has determined that the Proposed Action will not result in significant direct, indirect, temporary, or cumulative impacts to the environment.

B4 Provision of on-site technical assistance to non-DHS organizations to prepare plans, studies, or evaluations or to conduct training at sites currently used for such activities. Examples include, but are not limited to:

(a) General technical assistance to assist with development and enhancement of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) response plans, exercise scenario development and evaluation, facilitation of working groups, etc.

(b) State strategy technical assistance to assist states in completing needs and threat assessments and in developing their domestic preparedness strategy

(c) Training on use, maintenance, calibration, and/or refurbishing of specialized equipment

CAT I

FHWA

Reference: 23CFR771.117 (c) (16)

Program administration, technical assistance activities, and operating assistance to transit authorities to continue existing service or increase service to meet routine changes in demand.

FAA

Reference: FAA Order 1050.1E

Administrative/General Actions

307k. Agreements with foreign governments, foreign civil aviation authorities, international organizations, or U.S. Government departments calling for cooperative activities or the provision of technical assistance, advice, equipment, or services to those parties, and the implementation of such agreements; negotiations and agreements to establish and define bilateral aviation safety relationships with foreign governments, and the implementation of such agreements; attendance at international conferences and the meetings of international organizations, including participation in votes and other similar actions.

AID

Reference: 22 CFR 216.2 (c)(2)(i)

Education, technical assistance or training programs except to the extent such programs include activities directly affecting the environment (such as construction of facilities, etc.)

DOL

Reference: 29 CFR 11.10 (c)(2)

Apprenticeship activities and related certification and technical assistance actions

USDA

Reference: 7CFR1b.3 (a) 6.

Activities which are advisory and consultative to other agencies and public and private entities, such as legal counseling and representation; and

NPS

Reference: DO-12 3.3

K. Technical assistance to other federal, state, and local agencies or the general public.

B5 Support for community participation projects. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- (a) Earth Day activities
 - (b) Adopting schools
 - (c) Cleanup of rivers and parkways
 - (d) Repair and alteration of housing
- CAT I

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B. Section II

(b)(10). Non-construction activities in support of other agencies/organizations involving community participation projects and law enforcement activities

B6 Approval of recreational or public activities or events at a location typically used for that type and scope (size and intensity) of that activity. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- (a) Picnics
 - (b) Encampments
 - (c) Interpretive programs for historic and cultural resources, such as programs in conjunction with State and Tribal Historic Preservation Officers, or with local historic preservation or re-enactment groups.
- CAT I

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

1. Administrative Actions: f. Approval of recreational activities or events (such as a Coast Guard unit picnic) at a location developed or created for that type of activity.

Reference: 2.B.2.b (35)

Approvals of regatta and marine parade event permits for the following events: (1) Events that are not located in, proximate to, or above an area designated environmentally sensitive by an environmental agency of the Federal, state, or local government. For example, environmentally sensitive areas may include such areas as critical habitats or migration routes for endangered or threatened species or important fish or shellfish nursery areas. (2) Events that are located in, proximate to, or above an area designated as environmentally sensitive by an environmental agency of the Federal, state, or local government and for which the USCG determines, based on consultation with the Governmental agency, that the event will not significantly affect the environmentally sensitive area. (Checklist and CED required)

NAVY

Reference: 32CFR775.6

(31) Approval of recreational activities which do not involve significant physical alteration of the environment or increase human disturbance in sensitive natural habitats and which do not occur in or adjacent to areas inhabited by endangered or threatened species.

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B. Section II

(b)(6) Routinely conducted recreation and welfare activities not involving off-road recreational vehicles.

B7 Realignment or initial home porting of mobile assets, including vehicles, vessels and aircraft, to existing operational facilities that have the capacity to accommodate such assets or where supporting infrastructure changes will be minor in nature to perform as new homeports or for repair and overhaul.

CAT IV

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

4. Operational Actions a. Realignment or initial homeporting of mobile assets, including vessels and aircraft, to existing operational facilities that have the capacity to accommodate such assets or where supporting infrastructure changes will be minor in nature to perform as new homeports or for repair and overhaul. Note. If the realignment or homeporting would result in more than a one for one replacement of assets at an existing facility, then the checklist required for this CE must specifically address whether such an increase in assets could trigger the potential for significant impacts to protected species or habitats before use of the CE can be approved. (Checklist and CED required.)

NAVY

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Addition Of Two P-3 Aircraft To The Us Customs Service's Air And Marine Interdiction Division At Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, Texas resulting in a FONSI The proposed action is to add two P-3 Orion aircraft to the USCS Air and Marine Interdiction Division at NAS Corpus Chnsti, Texas The additional two aircraft will increase to ten the number of aircraft used by USCS at NAS Corpus Christi to accomplish their mission of drug interdiction and homeland defense. Additional parking apron will be constructed for the aircraft. Twenty-two new support personnel will join the USCS staff. The existing on-base and off-base utility systems (water, sanitary sewer, telephone, and electric) have adequate capacity to accommodate the proposed activities and personnel.

Analysis: Based on the information gathered during preparation of the EA, the Navy and the U.S. Customs Srvice finds that adding two P-3 aircraft to the USCS Air and Marine Interdiction Division at Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, Texas, will not significantly impact the environment.

USBP

Reference: Environmental Assessment Expansion of U.S. Border Patrol Air Operations and Facilities, U.S. Border Patrol Tucson Sector, Arizona April 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in April 2003 This Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared to analyze the potential for significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed expansion of United States Border Patrol (USBP) air operations and facilities in Southeastern Arizona.

The USBP proposes to expand air operation origination out of Sierra Vista, Arizona. The only airport capable of supporting increased USBP air operations in the area is the Joint Use Libby Army Airfield/Sierra Vista Municipal Airport (LAAF/SVMA) The USBP could lease or build new facilities at LAAF or SVMA. These additional facilities would include an aircraft hangar, office space, and enough parking for 20 vehicles.

As many as 15 full-time USBP personnel could be assigned to the expanded facility. Of these 15 positions, 7 are already stationed at LAAF. As many as 16 aircraft could be stationed at the new facility. Of these 16 aircraft (15 rotary-wing and 1 fixed-wing) 6 aircraft (4 rotary-wing and 2 fixed wing) are already based at LAAF. As a result there could be an estimated 150% increase in USBP air operations at LAAF/SVMA. Additional maintenance activities in the new hangar would be required to support the new aircraft.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

AIR FORCE

Reference: 32 CFR989 App. B

A2.3.31. Relocating a small number of aircraft to an installation with similar aircraft that does not result in a significant increase of total flying hours or the total number of aircraft operations, a change in flight tracks, or an increase in permanent personnel or logistics support requirements at the receiving installation. Repetitive use of this CATEX at an installation requires further analysis to determine there are no cumulative impacts. The EPF must document application of this CATEX on AF Form 813.

B8* Acquisition, installation, maintenance, operation, evaluation, removal, or disposal of security equipment to screen for or detect dangerous or illegal individuals or materials at existing facilities. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- (a) Low-level x-ray devices
- (b) Cameras and biometric devices
- (c) Passive inspection devices
- (d) Detection or security systems for explosive, biological, or chemical substances.
- (e) Access controls, screening devices, and traffic management systems

CAT IV

FAA

Reference: FAA Order 5050.4A Chapter 3, Section 23.

(b) (2) Acquisition of: security equipment required by rule or regulation for the safety or security of personnel and property on the airport (14 CFR Part 107), safety equipment required by rule or regulation for certification of an airport (14 CFR Part 139) or snow removal equipment.

Reference: FAA Order 1050.1E

Equipment and Instrumentation Actions

9. Acquisition of security equipment required by rule or regulation for the safety or security of personnel and property on the airport or launch facility (14 CFR part 107, Airport Security), safety equipment required by rule or regulation for certification of an airport (14 CFR part 139, Certification and Operation: Land Airports Serving Certain Air Carriers) or licensing of a launch facility, or snow removal equipment. (APP, AST)

Equipment and Instrumentation Actions (end) Note: Categorically excluded actions proposed under this notice and public procedure are depicted in italics.

AIR FORCE

Reference: 32 CFR989 App. B

A2.3.14. Installing on previously developed land, equipment that does not substantially alter land use (i.e., land use of more than one acre). This includes outgrants to private lessees for similar construction. The EPF must document application of this CATEX on AF Form 813.

NAVY

Reference: 32CFR775.6

(7) Alteration of and additions to existing structures to conform or provide conforming use specifically required by new or existing applicable legislation or regulations, e.g., hush houses for aircraft engines and scrubbers for air emissions.

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(xvii) Actions conducted within enclosed facilities where all airborne emissions, waterborne effluent, external radiation levels, outdoor noise, and solid and bulk waste disposal practices comply with existing Federal, state, and local laws and regulations;

CBP

Reference: Programmatic Environmental Assessment for GAMMA Imaging Inspection Systems resulting in a FONSI XXXXX

In March 2004, The United States (U.S.) Customs and Border Protection (CBP), analyzed A new method of conducting inspections involves the use of Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII) equipment based on technologies such as low-energy X-ray or low-energy gamma radiation sources to “see” into cargo containers and identify potential contraband. The Applied Technology Division (ATD) of CBP has examined gamma-imaging technologies for their suitability as parts of CBP’s inspection program. The Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA) documents a top-level evaluation of the potential environmental consequences resulting from deploying, installing, and operating of gamma imaging systems to inspect cargoes at air, sea and land ports of entry (POEs) throughout the U.S. and Puerto Rico. Analysis: After considering all relevant factors and issues, the PEA concludes that Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII) equipment would not significantly affect the physical, cultural, and socioeconomic environments. However this PEA mentioned that site-specific analyses will be performed for each location in the U.S. or Puerto Rico, where CBP installs VACIS II, Mobile VACIS, Pallet VACIS and/or Rail VACIS. Each site-specific analysis will be reported in a Supplemental Environmental Document, which will tier off of this PEA in accordance with 40 CFR Part 1508.28.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for Pulsed Fast Neutron Analysis Cargo Inspection System Test Facility at Ysleta Port of Entry Commercial Cargo Facility, El Paso, Texas XXX 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed on XXXXX

This EA analyzed an extended real-life trial of Pulsed Fast Neutron Analysis (PFNA) system, a radiation-based method of Non-Intrusive Inspection Technology that allows CBP to examine cargoes without having to physically unload the cargo containers. Based on a review of candidate locations having a high volume of incoming commercial traffic, the Ysleta Commercial Cargo Facility in El Paso, Texas was identified as the best test site. Under the proposed action, the government will construct a test facility (approximately 9 months) and operate it with the commercial stream-of-commerce (for a maximum period of 6 months). Analysis: The EA analyzed the many potential environmental consequences and determined that all impacts would be negligible or minor. With the exception of radiation, the effects and consequences of the proposed action are not unlike constructing and operating a drive-through tollbooth plaza. With regard to radiation and air quality, a very small amount (a fraction of 1 percent of EPA’s allowable threshold) is released to the atmosphere. A small amount of solid radioactive waste will be disposed of using licensed contractors who typically handle hospital waste. Analyses have shown that the system is safe to operators, cargo and the general public. A stowaway in the cargo vehicle will be subjected to a maximum radiation dose the same as OSHA allows for general public over the course of a year. Weapons of mass destruction will not be initiated by the system. Analysis of possible accidents shows that worst-case radiation doses are below acceptable standards. The EA concluded that this trial would not significantly affect the physical, cultural, and socioeconomic environments.

Reference: Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Gamma Imaging Inspection Systems, Department of Homeland Security, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Applied Technology Division, March 12, 2004 resulting in a FONSI XXXXXX

Customs and Border Protection wrote this PEA to analyze the use of Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII) equipment based on technologies such as low-energy X-ray or low-energy gamma radiation sources to “see” into cargo containers and identify potential contraband. The PEA evaluated potential environmental consequences resulting from deploying, installing, and operating the four different configurations of

gamma imaging systems [known as the Vehicle and Cargo Inspection System (VACIS)] to inspect cargoes at air, sea and land ports of entry (POEs) throughout the U.S. and Puerto Rico.

Analysis: The PEA analyzed the likely environmental consequences, including the radiological consequences, and concluded that VACIS is not expected to significantly affect the physical, cultural, and socioeconomic environments.

B9* Acquisition, installation, maintenance, operation, evaluation, removal, or disposal of target hardening security equipment, devices, or controls to enhance the physical security of existing critical assets to include, but not limited to:

- (a) Motion detection systems
- (b) Temporary use of barriers, fences, and jersey walls on or adjacent to existing facilities
- (c) Impact resistant doors and gates
- (d) X-ray units
- (e) Remote video surveillance systems
- (f) Radar systems
- (g) Diver/swimmer detection systems except sonar
- (h) Blast/shock impact-resistant systems
- (i) Column and surface wraps
- (j) Breakage/shatter-resistant glass CAT IV

FAA

Reference: FAA Order 5050.4A Chapter 3, Section 23.

(a) (3) Installation of miscellaneous items including segmented circles, wind or landing direction indicators or measuring devices, or fencing.

(a) (7) Landscaping generally, and landscaping or construction of physical barriers to diminish impact of airport blast and noise.

(b) (2) Acquisition of: security equipment required by rule or regulation for the safety or security of personnel and property on the airport (14 CFR Part 107), safety equipment required by rule or regulation for certification of an airport (14 CFR Part 139) or snow removal equipment.

Reference: FAA Order 1050.1E

Equipment and Instrumentation Actions

9. Acquisition of security equipment required by rule or regulation for the safety or security of personnel and property on the airport or launch facility (14 CFR part 107, Airport Security), safety equipment required by rule or regulation for certification of an airport (14 CFR part 139, Certification and Operation: Land Airports Serving Certain Air Carriers) or licensing of a launch facility, or snow removal equipment. (APP, AST)

Equipment and Instrumentation Actions (end) Note: Categorically excluded actions proposed under this notice and public procedure are depicted in italics.

DOE

Reference: 10 CFR Pt. 1021, Subpt. D. App. B

B1.11 Installation of fencing, including that for border marking, that will not adversely affect wildlife movements or surface water flow.

NAVY

Reference: 32CFR775.6

(8) Routine actions normally conducted to operate, protect, and maintain Navy-owned and/or controlled properties, e.g., maintaining law and order, physical plant protection by military police and security

personnel, and localized pest management activities on improved and semi-improved lands conducted in accordance with applicable federal and state directives.

B10 Existing aircraft operations conducted in accordance with normal flight patterns and elevations.
CAT II (USCG, BTS)

AIR FORCE

Reference: 32 CFR989 App. B

A2.3.33. Flying activities that comply with the Federal aviation regulations, that are dispersed over a wide area and that do not frequently (more than once a day) pass near the same ground points. This CATEX does not cover regular activity on established routes or within special use airspace.

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B. Section II

(j)(2) Flying activities in compliance with Federal Aviation Administration Regulations and in accordance with normal flight patterns and elevations for that facility, where the flight patterns/elevations have been addressed in an installation master plan or other planning document that has been subject to NEPA public review.

DOE

Reference: 10 CFR Pt. 1021, Subpt. D. App. B

B3.2 Aviation activities for survey, monitoring, or security purposes that comply with Federal Aviation Administration regulations.

USBP

Reference: Environmental Assessment Expansion of U.S. Border Patrol Air Operations and Facilities, U.S. Border Patrol Tucson Sector, Arizona April 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in April 2003

This Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared to analyze the potential for significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed expansion of United States Border Patrol (USBP) air operations and facilities in Southeastern Arizona.

The USBP proposes to expand air operation origination out of Sierra Vista, Arizona. The only airport capable of supporting increased USBP air operations in the area is the Joint Use Libby Army Airfield/Sierra Vista Municipal Airport (LAAF/SVMA) The USBP could lease or build new facilities at LAAF or SVMA. These additional facilities would include an aircraft hangar, office space, and enough parking for 20 vehicles.

As many as 15 full-time USBP personnel could be assigned to the expanded facility. Of these 15 positions, 7 are already stationed at LAAF. As many as 16 aircraft could be stationed at the new facility. Of these 16 aircraft (15 rotary-wing and 1 fixed-wing) 6 aircraft (4 rotary-wing and 2 fixed wing) are already based at LAAF. As a result there could be an estimated 150% increase in USBP air operations at LAAF/SVMA.

Additional maintenance activities in the new hangar would be required to support the new aircraft.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Operation Skywatch USBP Tucson Sector, Arizona May 2002, resulting in a FONSI signed in May 2002.

The proposed action would include the temporary assignment of 20 helicopters and two fixed-wing aircraft, 24 pilots, aircraft mechanics and other support personnel as needed to the Tucson Sector. The aircraft will be staged primarily at the Tucson International Airport and secondarily at the Sierra Vista Municipal

Airport. Other staging sites can and would vary depending on changing operational needs. The proposed action also includes support from the Yuma Sector on an as-needed basis.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA and the environmental design measures to be incorporated as part of the proposed action, it has been concluded that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Reference: Supplemental Environmental Assessment for Operation Skywatch II USBP Tucson Sector, Arizona May 2001, resulting in a FONSI signed in June 2001

The proposed action would include the temporary assignment of three helicopters and two fixed-wing aircraft, three pilots, three aircraft mechanics and other support personnel as needed to the Tucson Sector. The aircraft will be staged at one primary established airport site (Tucson International Airport), but staging sites can and will vary depending on changing operational needs.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the SEA and the environmental design measures to be incorporated as part of the proposed action, it has been concluded that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

B11 Identifications, inspections, surveys, or sampling, testing, seizures, quarantines, removals, sanitization, and monitoring of imported products and that cause little or no physical alteration of the environment. CAT II (CBP, ICE)

APHIS

Reference: 7CFR372.5 (c) and 7CFR1b.3 (a)

7CFR372.5 (c) (1) Routine measures. (i) Routine measures, such as identifications, inspections, surveys, sampling that does not cause physical alteration of the environment, testing, seizures, quarantines, removals, sanitizing, inoculations, control, and monitoring employed by agency programs to pursue their missions and functions. Such measures may include the use--according to any label instructions or other lawful requirements and consistent with standard, published program practices and precautions--of chemicals, pesticides, or other potentially hazardous or harmful substances, materials, and target-specific devices or remedies, provided that such use meets all of the following criteria (insofar as they may pertain to a particular action): (A) The use is localized or contained in areas where humans are not likely to be exposed, and is limited in terms of quantity, i.e., individualized dosages and remedies; (B) The use will not cause contaminants to enter water bodies, including wetlands; (C) The use does not adversely affect any federally protected species or critical habitat; and (D) The use does not cause bioaccumulation. (ii) Examples of routine measures include: (A) Inoculation or treatment of discrete herds of livestock or wildlife undertaken in contained areas (such as a barn or corral, a zoo, an exhibition, or an aviary)

CBP

Reference: Programmatic Environmental Assessment for GAMMA Imaging Inspection Systems resulting in a FONSI XXXXX

In March 2004, The United States (U.S.) Customs and Border Protection (CBP), analyzed A new method of conducting inspections involves the use of Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII) equipment based on technologies such as low-energy X-ray or low-energy gamma radiation sources to "see" into cargo containers and identify potential contraband. The Applied Technology Division (ATD) of CBP has examined gamma-imaging technologies for their suitability as parts of CBP's inspection program. The Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA) documents a top-level evaluation of the potential environmental consequences resulting from deploying, installing, and operating of gamma imaging systems to inspect cargoes at air, sea and land ports of entry (POEs) throughout the U.S. and Puerto Rico. Analysis: After considering all relevant factors and issues, the PEA concludes that Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII) equipment would not significantly affect the physical, cultural, and socioeconomic environments. However this PEA mentioned that site-specific analyses will be performed for each location

in the U.S. or Puerto Rico, where CBP installs VACIS II, Mobile VACIS, Pallet VACIS and/or Rail VACIS. Each site-specific analysis will be reported in a Supplemental Environmental Document, which will tier off of this PEA in accordance with 40 CFR Part 1508.28.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for Pulsed Fast Neutron Analysis Cargo Inspection System Test Facility at Ysleta Port of Entry Commercial Cargo Facility, El Paso, Texas XXX 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed on XXXXX

This EA analyzed an extended real-life trial of Pulsed Fast Neutron Analysis (PFNA) system, a radiation-based method of Non-Intrusive Inspection Technology that allows CBP to examine cargoes without having to physically unload the cargo containers. Based on a review of candidate locations having a high volume of incoming commercial traffic, the Ysleta Commercial Cargo Facility in El Paso, Texas was identified as the best test site. Under the proposed action, the government will construct a test facility (approximately 9 months) and operate it with the commercial stream-of-commerce (for a maximum period of 6 months).

Analysis: The EA analyzed the many potential environmental consequences and determined that all impacts would be negligible or minor. With the exception of radiation, the effects and consequences of the proposed action are not unlike constructing and operating a drive-through tollbooth plaza. With regard to radiation and air quality, a very small amount (a fraction of 1 percent of EPA's allowable threshold) is released to the atmosphere. A small amount of solid radioactive waste will be disposed of using licensed contractors who typically handle hospital waste. Analyses have shown that the system is safe to operators, cargo and the general public. A stowaway in the cargo vehicle will be subjected to a maximum radiation dose the same as OSHA allows for general public over the course of a year. Weapons of mass destruction will not be initiated by the system. Analysis of possible accidents shows that worst-case radiation doses are below acceptable standards. The EA concluded that this trial would not significantly affect the physical, cultural, and socioeconomic environments.

Reference: Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Gamma Imaging Inspection Systems, Department of Homeland Security, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Applied Technology Division, March 12, 2004 resulting in a FONSI XXXXXX

Customs and Border Protection wrote this PEA to analyze the use of Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII) equipment based on technologies such as low-energy X-ray or low-energy gamma radiation sources to "see" into cargo containers and identify potential contraband. The PEA evaluated potential environmental consequences resulting from deploying, installing, and operating the four different configurations of gamma imaging systems [known as the Vehicle and Cargo Inspection System (VACIS)] to inspect cargoes at air, sea and land ports of entry (POEs) throughout the U.S. and Puerto Rico.

Analysis: The PEA analyzed the likely environmental consequences, including the radiological consequences, and concluded that VACIS is not expected to significantly affect the physical, cultural, and socioeconomic environments.

B12 Routine monitoring and surveillance activities that support law enforcement or homeland security and defense operations, such as patrols, investigations, and intelligence gathering, but not including any construction activities except those set forth in subsection F of these categorical exclusions.

CAT III (USCG, BTS, SS)

APHIS

Reference: 7CFR372.5 (c) and 7CFR1b.3 (a)

7CFR1b.3 (a) (5) Civil and criminal law enforcement and investigative activities

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(iv) Inspection and monitoring activities, granting of variances, and actions to enforce Federal, state, or local codes, standards or regulations

USBP

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Airboat Patrols on the Rio Grande River, Del Rio Sector, Texas June 2001, resulting in a FONSI signed in June of 2001

This Environmental Assessment (EA) addresses the potential effects, beneficial and adverse, of the proposed increase of U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) airboat patrols on the Rio Grande River within the Del Rio Sector, Texas. The purpose and need for this project is to increase patrols on the river in order to deter illegal crossings at their point of origin. Such patrols would also serve the purpose of avoiding unnecessary drowning deaths by deterring the illegal activity and/or providing rescue of illegal aliens,

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed action. Increased or enhanced interdiction of illegal and drug entry and activities would have positive, indirect socioeconomic benefits.

USDA-ARS

Reference: 7 CFR 1b.3

(5) Civil and criminal law enforcement and investigative activities;

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B. Section II

(b)(1) Routine law and order activities performed by military/military police and physical plant protection and security personnel, and civilian natural resources and environmental law officers.

B13* Harvest of live trees on DHS facilities not to exceed 70 acres, requiring no more than 1/2 mile of temporary road construction. Do not use this category for even-aged regeneration harvest or vegetation type conversion. The proposed action may include incidental removal of trees for landings, skid trails, and road clearing. Examples include but are not limited to:

- (a) Removal of individual trees for saw logs, specialty products, or fuel wood.
- (b) Commercial thinning of overstocked stands to achieve the desired stocking level to increase health and vigor.

CAT III (USCG, FLETC, S&T)

USFS

Reference: FSH 1909.15—Environmental Policy and Procedures Handbook Chapter 30—Categorical Exclusion From Documentation

31.2—Categories of Action for Which a Project or Case File and Decision Memo Are Required. Routine, proposed actions within any of the following categories may be excluded from documentation in an EIS or an EA; however, a project or case file is required and the decision to proceed must be documented in a decision memo (sec. 32). As a minimum, the project or case file should include any records prepared, such as (1) the names of interested and affected people, groups, and agencies contacted; (2) the determination that no extraordinary circumstances exist; (3) a copy of the decision memo (sec 30.5 (2)); (4) a list of the people notified of the decision; (5) Copy of the notice required by 36 CFR Part 217, or any other notice used to inform interested and affected persons of the decision to proceed with or to implement an action that has been categorically excluded. Maintain a project or case file and prepare a decision memo for routine, proposed actions within any of the following categories.

* * * * *

10. Harvest of live trees not to exceed 50 acres, requiring no more than 1/2 mile of temporary road construction. Do not use this category for even-aged regeneration harvest or vegetation type conversion.

The proposed action may include incidental removal of trees for landings, skid trails, and road clearing. Examples include but are not limited to:

- a. Removal of individual trees for sawlogs, specialty products, or fuelwood.
- b. Harvest of trees to reduce the fuel loading in an overstocked stand adjacent to residential area and construction of a short temporary road to access the stand.
- c. Commercial thinning of overstocked stands to achieve the desired stocking level to increase health and vigor.

11. Salvage of dead and/or dying trees not to exceed 250 acres, requiring no more than 2 mile of temporary road construction. The proposed action may include incidental removal of green trees for landings, skid trails, and road clearing. Examples include but are not limited to:

- a. Harvest of a portion of a stand damaged by a wind or ice event and construction of short temporary road to access the damaged trees.
- b. Harvest of fire damaged trees.

12. Sanitation harvest of trees to control insects or disease not to exceed 250 acres, requiring no more than 1/2 mile of temporary road construction, including removal of infested/infected trees and adjacent green trees up to two tree lengths away if determined necessary to control the spread of insects or disease. The proposed action may include incidental removal of green trees for landings, skid trails, and road clearing. Examples include but are not limited to:

- a. Felling and harvest of trees infested with southern pine beetles and immediately adjacent green trees to control expanding infestations.
- b. Harvest of green trees infested with mountain pine beetle and trees already killed by beetles.

B14* Salvage of dead and/or dying trees on DHS facilities not to exceed 250 acres, requiring no more than 1/2 mile of temporary road construction. The proposed action may include incidental removal of live or dead trees for landings, skid trails, and road clearing. Examples include but are not limited to:

- (a) Harvest of a portion of a stand damaged by a wind or ice event and construction of a short temporary road to access the damaged trees.
- (b) Harvest of fire damaged trees.
- (c) Harvest of insect or disease damaged trees
CAT III (USCG, FLETC, S&T)

USFS

Reference: FSH 1909.15—Environmental Policy and Procedures Handbook Chapter 30—Categorical Exclusion From Documentation

31.2—Categories of Action for Which a Project or Case File and Decision Memo Are Required. Routine, proposed actions within any of the following categories may be excluded from documentation in an EIS or an EA; however, a project or case file is required and the decision to proceed must be documented in a decision memo (sec. 32). As a minimum, the project or case file should include any records prepared, such as (1) the names of interested and affected people, groups, and agencies contacted; (2) the determination that no extraordinary circumstances exist; (3) a copy of the decision memo (sec 30.5 (2)); (4) a list of the people notified of the decision; (5) Copy of the notice required by 36 CFR Part 217, or any other notice used to inform interested and affected persons of the decision to proceed with or to implement an action that has been categorically excluded. Maintain a project or case file and prepare a decision memo for routine, proposed actions within any of the following categories.

* * * * *

10. Harvest of live trees not to exceed 50 acres, requiring no more than 1/2 mile of temporary road construction. Do not use this category for even-aged regeneration harvest or vegetation type conversion. The proposed action may include incidental removal of trees for landings, skid trails, and road clearing. Examples include but are not limited to:

- a. Removal of individual trees for sawlogs, specialty products, or fuelwood.
 - b. Harvest of trees to reduce the fuel loading in an overstocked stand adjacent to residential area and construction of a short temporary road to access the stand.
 - c. Commercial thinning of overstocked stands to achieve the desired stocking level to increase health and vigor.
11. Salvage of dead and/or dying trees not to exceed 250 acres, requiring no more than 2 mile of temporary road construction. The proposed action may include incidental removal of green trees for landings, skid trails, and road clearing. Examples include but are not limited to:
- a. Harvest of a portion of a stand damaged by a wind or ice event and construction of short temporary road to access the damaged trees.
 - b. Harvest of fire damaged trees.
12. Sanitation harvest of trees to control insects or disease not to exceed 250 acres, requiring no more than 1/2 mile of temporary road construction, including removal of infested/infected trees and adjacent green trees up to two tree lengths away if determined necessary to control the spread of insects or disease. The proposed action may include incidental removal of green trees for landings, skid trails, and road clearing. Examples include but are not limited to:
- a. Felling and harvest of trees infested with southern pine beetles and immediately adjacent green trees to control expanding infestations.
 - b. Harvest of green trees infested with mountain pine beetle and trees already killed by beetles.

NAVY

Reference: 32CFR775.6

(32) Routine maintenance of timber stands, including issuance of down-wood firewood permits, hazardous tree removal, and sanitation salvage.

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B. Section II

(g)(1) Routine repair and maintenance of buildings, airfields, grounds, equipment, and other facilities.

Examples include, but are not limited to: Removal and disposal of asbestos-containing material (for example, roof material and floor tile) or lead-based paint in accordance with applicable regulations; removal of dead, diseased, or damaged trees; and repair of roofs, doors, windows, or fixtures (REC required for removal and disposal of asbestos-containing material and lead-based paint or work on historic structures).

INS

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment Immigration and Naturalization Service Brush and Small Tree Thinning Operation near Jacumba, California November 2001 resulting in a FONSI in October of 2001 (FONSI date problem)

This Environmental Assessment (EA) addresses the potential effects, beneficial and adverse, of the proposed brush and small tree thinning operation near Jacumba, California. The proposed action would involve hand-clearing brush within an 18 acre site within Boundary Creek. Large trees, as requested by the landowner, would remain on the site. Riparian habitat would be thinned within the proposed project area. Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed action. Mitigation measures regarding schedule, frequency, and method of clearing/thinning have been incorporated to ensure no significant effects occur. No significant adverse effects to air quality, water quality, cultural resources, unique areas, soils, protected species, or land use are expected as a result of the proposed action.

BLM

Reference: Department of the Interior Departmental Manual – Part 516 5.4 Categorical Exclusions
C. Forestry.

(2) Sale and removal of individual trees or small groups of trees which are dead, diseased, injured or which constitute a safety hazard, and where access for the removal requires no more than maintenance to existing roads.

(4) Precommercial thinning and brush control using small mechanical devices.

REAL ESTATE ACTIVITIES

C1 Acquisition of real property that is not within or adjacent to environmentally sensitive areas, including interests less than a fee simple, by purchase, lease, assignment, easement, condemnation, or donation, which does not result in a change in the functional use of the property. CAT I

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(viii) Acquisition or lease of existing facilities where planned uses conform to past use or local land use requirements;

TSA

Reference: Section 11.11

(p). Real property actions, such as leases, and licenses, that continue a prior use or prior intended use. Other agencies have similar exclusions. See, e.g., FEMA’s regulations at 44 CFR § 10.8(viii): “Acquisition or lease of existing facilities where planned uses conform to past use or local land use requirements.”

FLETC

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Acquisition of a Warehouse Facility in Brunswick, Georgia resulting in a FONSI XXXXX

This FLETC project analyzed the purchase of a warehouse facility that had been leased by FLETC since March 2000. FLETC had already installed a concrete barricade gate system for security. The building housed 51,000 square feet and was constructed in 1986.

Analysis: It was determined that the proposed acquisition of the Warehouse Facility does not constitute a “major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment” when considered individually or cumulative in the context of NEPA including both direct and indirect impacts.

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

2. Real and Personal Property Related Actions b. The grant of a license to a non-Federal party to perform specified acts upon Coast Guard-controlled real property or the amendment, renewal, or termination of such license where the proposed real property use is similar to existing uses. (Checklist and CED required.) c. Allowing another Federal agency to use Coast Guard-controlled real property under a permit, use agreement, or similar arrangement or the amendment, renewal, or termination of such permit or agreement where the real property use is similar to existing uses. (Checklist and CED required.) e. Acquisition of real property (including fee simple estates, leaseholds, and easements) improved or unimproved, and related personal property from a non-Federal party by purchase, lease, donation, or exchange where the proposed real property use is similar to existing uses for the foreseeable future (acquisition through condemnation not covered). (Checklist and CED required.) g. Coast Guard use of real property under the administrative control of another DOT component or another Federal agency through a permit, use agreement, or similar arrangement where the proposed real property use is similar to existing uses. (Checklist and CED required.)

USBP

Reference: Environmental Assessment Proposed Construction of the U.S. Border Patrol Station in Laredo, Webb County, Texas May 1998 resulting in a FONSI signed in May of 1998

This Environmental Assessment was prepared for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) proposed land purchase, construction of a U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) station, and relocation of agents to the new facility on an approximately 10-acre tract at the southeast corner of Grand Central Boulevard and the McPherson Road extension in Laredo, Webb County, Texas.

The INS proposes to purchase an approximately 10-acre tract of land from a private landowner in order to construct a USBP station at the southeast corner of Grand Central Boulevard and the McPherson Boulevard extension in Laredo, Webb County, Texas. The USBP agents stationed at the currently leased Laredo North Station would relocate to the new facility when construction is complete. The new station would consist of the following structures or components: a single-story building (30,500 square feet [with a detention area (2,500 sf)]; three aboveground storage tanks (two 10,000-gallon gasoline tanks and one 12,000-gallon diesel tank); a 2,500-sf drive/parking area; a dog kennel for 26 dogs; and a radio tower.

Analysis: The proposed action is not anticipated to have any significant adverse impacts to soils, water, biological, or cultural resources. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated to land use, socioeconomics, hazardous materials and waste, air quality, or noise. In addition, the proposed action is not anticipated to have any long-term adverse impacts to the environment.

Reference: Environmental Assessment Proposed Construction of the U.S. Border Patrol Station in Sanderson, Terrell County, Texas February 12, 2001 resulting in a FONSI signed in February of 2001
This EA addresses the potential impacts of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) proposed property purchase, construction of a U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) station, and relocation of agents from an existing facility to the new facility. The proposed facility would be located on an approximately 33-acre tract of land north of U.S. Highway 90 and west of Highland Plaza Ave. in Sanderson, Terrell County, Texas.

The purpose is to construct a new facility to accommodate an increased number of agents who will be assigned to the Marfa Sector, Sanderson Station. The current Sanderson Station can accommodate up to 5 personnel, but has inadequate ancillary facilities and does not have the capability to expand to include these facilities. A new station would allow for the necessary expansion of agent staff size as well as more efficient and effective operations in a modern facility that can best support the USBP mission. The new station would consist of the following structures or components: a single-story building (14,000 square feet); one aboveground gasoline storage tank; a 39,858 sf drive/parking area; a dog kennel; and a radio tower.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

C2 Lease extensions, renewals, or succeeding leases where there is no change in the facility's use and all environmental operating permits have been acquired and are current. CAT I

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(viii) Acquisition or lease of existing facilities where planned uses conform to past use or local land use requirements;

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B. Section II

(f)(1) Grants or acquisitions of leases, licenses, easements, and permits for use of real property or facilities in which there is no significant change in land or facility use. Examples include, but are not limited to,

Army controlled property and Army leases of civilian property to include leases of training, administrative, general use, special purpose, or warehouse space (REC required).

Reference: 33 CFR § 230.9 Categorical Exclusions

(l) Renewal and minor amendments of existing real estate grants evidencing authority to use Government owned real property.

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

2. Real and Personal Property Related Actions b. The grant of a license to a non-Federal party to perform specified acts upon Coast Guard-controlled real property or the amendment, renewal, or termination of such license where the proposed real property use is similar to existing uses. (Checklist and CED required.) c. Allowing another Federal agency to use Coast Guard-controlled real property under a permit, use agreement, or similar arrangement or the amendment, renewal, or termination of such permit or agreement where the real property use is similar to existing uses. (Checklist and CED required.) e. Acquisition of real property (including fee simple estates, leaseholds, and easements) improved or unimproved, and related personal property from a non-Federal party by purchase, lease, donation, or exchange where the proposed real property use is similar to existing uses for the foreseeable future (acquisition through condemnation not covered). (Checklist and CED required.) g. Coast Guard use of real property under the administrative control of another DOT component or another Federal agency through a permit, use agreement, or similar arrangement where the proposed real property use is similar to existing uses. (Checklist and CED required.)

BLM

Reference: Department of the Interior Departmental Manual – Part 516 5.4 Categorical Exclusions

E. Realty (9) Renewals and assignments of leases, permits or rights-of-way where no additional rights are conveyed beyond those granted by the original authorizations.

USBP

Environmental Assessment Expansion of U.S. Border Patrol Air Operations and Facilities, U.S. Border Patrol Tucson Sector, Arizona April 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in April 2003

This Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared to analyze the potential for significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed expansion of United States Border Patrol (USBP) air operations and facilities in Southeastern Arizona.

The USBP proposes to expand air operation origination out of Sierra Vista, Arizona. The only airport capable of supporting increased USBP air operations in the area is the Joint Use Libby Army Airfield/Sierra Vista Municipal Airport (LAAF/SVMA) The USBP could lease or build new facilities at LAAF or SVMA. These additional facilities would include an aircraft hangar, office space, and enough parking for 20 vehicles.

As many as 15 full-time USBP personnel could be assigned to the expanded facility. Of these 15 positions, 7 are already stationed at LAAF. As many as 16 aircraft could be stationed at the new facility. Of these 16 aircraft (15 rotary-wing and 1 fixed-wing) 6 aircraft (4 rotary-wing and 2 fixed wing) are already based at LAAF. As a result there could be an estimated 150% increase in USBP air operations at LAAF/SVMA.

Additional maintenance activities in the new hangar would be required to support the new aircraft.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

C3 Reassignment of real property, including related personal property within DHS (e.g., from one DHS element or activity to another) which does not result in a change in the functional use of the property.

CAT I

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B. Section II

(f)(3) Transfer of real property administrative control within the Army, to another military department, or to other federal agency, including the return of public domain lands to the Department of Interior, and reporting of property as excess and surplus to the GSA for disposal (REC required).

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

2. Real and Personal Property Related Actions

a. The initial lease of, or grant of, an easement interest in, Coast Guard-controlled real property to a non-Federal party or the amendment, renewal, or termination of such lease or easement interest where the reasonably foreseeable real property use will not change significantly and is similar to existing uses. (Checklist and CED required) f. Acquisition of real property and related personal property through transfer of administrative control from another Department of Transportation (DOT) component or another Federal agency to the Coast Guard where title to the property remains with the United States including transfers made pursuant to the defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, Pub. L. 101-510, as amended, (10 U.S.C. 2687 note) and where the proposed Coast Guard real property uses is similar to existing uses. (Checklist and CED required.) j. Transfer of administrative control over real property from the Coast Guard to another Department of Transportation (DOT) component or another Federal agency (title to the property remains with the United States) that results in no immediate change in use of the property k. Determination by the Coast Guard that real property is excess to its needs, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.), and the subsequent reporting of such determination to the Administrator of the General Services Administration or the subsequent filing of a notice of intent to relinquish lands withdrawn or reserved from the public domain with the Bureau of Land Management, Department of Interior, in accordance with 43 CFR part 2370. (Checklist and CED required.) l. Congressionally mandated conveyance of Coast Guard controlled real property to another Federal agency or non-Federal entity. (Checklist and CED required.) n. Decisions to temporarily or permanently decommission, disestablish, or close Coast Guard shore facilities including any follow-on connected protection and maintenance needed to maintain the property until it is no longer under Coast Guard control. (Checklist and CED required.) p. Determination by the Coast Guard that Coast Guard controlled personal property, including vessels and aircraft, is "excess property", as that term is defined in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 472(e)), and any subsequent transfer of such property to another Federal agency's administrative control or conveyance of the United States' title in such property to a non-Federal entity. (Checklist and CED required.)

C4 Transfer of administrative control over real property, including related personal property, between a non-DHS federal agency and DHS which does not result in a change in the functional use of the property.

CAT I

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B. Section II

(f)(3) Transfer of real property administrative control within the Army, to another military department, or to other federal agency, including the return of public domain lands to the Department of Interior, and reporting of property as excess and surplus to the GSA for disposal (REC required).

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

2. Real and Personal Property Related Actions

a. The initial lease of, or grant of, an easement interest in, Coast Guard-controlled real property to a non-Federal party or the amendment, renewal, or termination of such lease or easement interest where the reasonably foreseeable real property use will not change significantly and is similar to existing uses. (Checklist and CED required) f. Acquisition of real property and related personal property through transfer of administrative control from another Department of Transportation (DOT) component or another Federal agency to the Coast Guard where title to the property remains with the United States including transfers made pursuant to the defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, Pub. L. 101-510, as amended, (10 U.S.C. 2687 note) and where the proposed Coast Guard real property uses is similar to existing uses. (Checklist and CED required.) j. Transfer of administrative control over real property from the Coast Guard to another Department of Transportation (DOT) component or another Federal agency (title to the property remains with the United States) that results in no immediate change in use of the property k. Determination by the Coast Guard that real property is excess to its needs, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.), and the subsequent reporting of such determination to the Administrator of the General Services Administration or the subsequent filing of a notice of intent to relinquish lands withdrawn or reserved from the public domain with the Bureau of Land Management, Department of Interior, in accordance with 43 CFR part 2370. (Checklist and CED required.) l. Congressionally mandated conveyance of Coast Guard controlled real property to another Federal agency or non-Federal entity. (Checklist and CED required.) n. Decisions to temporarily or permanently decommission, disestablish, or close Coast Guard shore facilities including any follow-on connected protection and maintenance needed to maintain the property until it is no longer under Coast Guard control. (Checklist and CED required.) p. Determination by the Coast Guard that Coast Guard controlled personal property, including vessels and aircraft, is “excess property”, as that term is defined in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 472(e)), and any subsequent transfer of such property of another Federal agency’s administrative control or conveyance of the United States’ title in such property to a non-Federal entity. (Checklist and CED required.)

FLETC

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment, U.S. Customs Service Firearms Training Facility Harpers Ferry, West Virginia July 2002, resulting in a FONSI signed

This Environmental Assessment analyzed the construction of the Firearms training facility on a 104-Acre Parcel: The proposed Harpers Ferry Firearms Training Facility would be constructed on an approximately 104-acre site within Jefferson County, West Virginia. Construction of the Harpers Ferry Training Facility, under this alternative would utilize 60-acres transferred to the U.S. Customs Service from the National Park Service, along with administrative jurisdiction, as required by PL 106-246 and the “Agreement to Transfer Administrative Jurisdiction of Land” and a 45-foot right-of-way. A 7-acre privately-owned parcel and a 37-acre privately-owned parcel would need to be acquired for implementation of this alternative.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed actions.

AIR FORCE

Reference: 32 CFR989 App. B

A2.3.18. Transferring administrative control of real property within the Air Force or to another military department or to another Federal agency, not including GSA, including returning public domain lands to the Department of the Interior.

BLM

Reference: Department of the Interior Departmental Manual – Part 516 5.4 Categorical Exclusions

E. Realty (15) Transfer of land or interest in land to or from other Bureaus or Federal agencies where current management will continue and future changes in management will be subject to the NEPA process.

C5 Determination that real property is excess to the needs of DHS and, in the case of acquired real property, the subsequent reporting of such determination to the General Services Administration or, in the case of lands withdrawn or otherwise reserved from the public domain, the subsequent filing of a notice of intent to relinquish with the Bureau of Land Management, Department of Interior.

CAT I

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

2. Real and Personal Property Related Actions

k. Determination by the Coast Guard that real property is excess to its needs, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.), and the subsequent reporting of such determination to the Administrator of the General Services Administration or the subsequent filing of a notice of intent to relinquish lands withdrawn or reserved from the public domain with the Bureau of Land Management, Department of Interior, in accordance with 43 CFR part 2370. (Checklist and CED required.) (Checklist and CED required.)

p. Determination by the Coast Guard that Coast Guard controlled personal property, including vessels and aircraft, is “excess property”, as that term is defined in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 472(e)), and any subsequent transfer of such property to another Federal agency’s administrative control or conveyance of the United States’ title in such property to a non-Federal entity. (Checklist and CED required.)

AIR FORCE

Reference: 32 CFR989 App. B

A2.3.17. Transferring land, facilities, and personal property for which the General Services Administration (GSA) is the action agency. Such transfers are excluded only if there is no change in land use and GSA complies with its NEPA requirements.

ARMY

Reference: 33 CFR § 230.9 Categorical Exclusions

(m) Reporting excess real property to the General Services Administration for disposal.

USBP

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Excess or Transfer of U.S. Border Patrol Station Gila Bend, Arizona Immigration and Naturalization Service U.S. Border Patrol February 1999 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This Environmental Assessment documents the potential environmental liabilities and impacts anticipated as a result of excessing or transferring the U.S. Border Patrol station at Gila Bend, Maricopa County, Arizona. The Border Patrol station has been vacant since the early 1990s and is currently serving no value to the Government.

The proposed action would involve minimal construction/repair activities to remove some environmental liabilities and to bring buildings to occupancy standards. The site was surveyed for sensitive biological and cultural resources. One potential state-protected species was recorded at the site. Relocation of this single specimen, if necessary, would be required to be coordinated through the Arizona Department of Agriculture.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed actions. Therefore, no further analysis or documentation (Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted. The INS, in implementing this decision, will employ all practical means to minimize the potential adverse impacts on the local environment.

REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES

D1 Minor renovations and additions to buildings, roads, airfields, grounds, equipment, and other facilities that do not result in a change in the functional use of the real property (e.g. realigning interior spaces of an existing building, extending an existing roadway in a developed area a short distance, adding a small storage shed to an existing building, or retrofitting for energy conservation. This could also include installing a small antenna on an already existing antenna tower that does not cause the total height to exceed 200 feet and where the FCC would not require an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement of the installation).

CAT I

APHIS

Reference: 7CFR372.5 (c) and 7CFR1b.3 (a)

7CFR372.5 (c) (4) Rehabilitation of facilities. Rehabilitation of existing laboratories and other APHIS facilities, functional replacement of parts and equipment, and minor additions to such existing APHIS facilities

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(x) Routine maintenance, repair, and grounds-keeping activities at FEMA facilities;

(xv) Repair, reconstruction, restoration, elevation, retrofitting, upgrading to current codes and standards, or replacement of any facility in a manner that substantially conforms to the preexisting design, function, and location; [SE, in part]

FAA

Reference: FAA Order 5050.4A Chapter 3, Section 23.

(a) (5) Construction, relocation or repair of entrance and service roadway.

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

2. Real and Personal Property Related Actions q. Minor renovations and additions to buildings, roads, airfields, grounds, equipment, and other facilities that do not result in a change in functional use of the real property (e.g. realigning interior spaces of an existing building, extending an existing roadway in a developed area a short distance, installing a small antenna on an already existing antenna tower, adding a small storage shed to an existing building, etc.). (Checklist and CED required.) u. Routine repair and maintenance of buildings, roads, airfields, grounds, equipment, and other facilities which do not result in a change in functional use, or an impact on a historically significant element or setting. v. Routine repair and maintenance to waterfront facilities, including mooring piles, fixed floating piers, existing piers, and unburied power cables. w. Minor renovations and additions to waterfront facilities, including mooring piles, fixed floating piers, existing piers, and unburied power cables, which do not require special, site-specific regulatory permits. (Checklist and CED required.) x. Routine grounds maintenance and activities at units and facilities. Examples include localized pest management actions and actions to maintain improved grounds (such as landscaping, lawn care and minor erosion control measures) that are conducted in accordance with applicable Federal, state, and local directives.

6. Bridge Administration Actions a. Modification or replacement of an existing bridge on essentially the same alignment or location. Excluded are bridges with historic significance or bridges providing access to undeveloped barrier islands and beaches.

AIR FORCE

Reference: 32 CFR989 App. B

A2.3.8. Performing interior and exterior construction within the 5-foot line of a building without changing the land use of the existing building.

INS

Reference: 28 CFR Part 61 Appendix C:

10. Actions Which Normally Do Not Require Either An Environmental Impact Statement Or An Environmental Assessment: (a) Construction projects for existing facilities including but not limited to: Remodeling; replacement of building systems and components; maintenance and operations repairs and general improvements when such projects do not significantly alter the initial occupancy and program of the facility or significantly impact upon the environment.

USBP

Reference: Preliminary Draft Abbreviated Environmental Assessment for Proposed

Construction/Renovation of Border Checkpoint Stations near Las Cruces and Alamogordo, New Mexico and Comstock and El Paso, Texas, March 24, 1997 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This project proposes to construct or renovate six border check points: two near Las Cruces, New Mexico; two near Alamogordo, New Mexico; one near El Paso, Texas; and one near Comstock, Texas.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed actions.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment JTF-6 Border Road Improvement Project Columbus, New Mexico, January 1999 resulting in a FONSI signed in January of 1999

This Environmental Assessment assessed the potential for significant adverse or beneficial environmental impacts of the proposed action proposed to take place in Luna and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico (NM) near the city of Columbus, which is approximately 60 miles west of El Paso, Texas (TX) and 30 miles south of Deming, NM. The proposed action consists of improving 75 miles of soil road and installing single-bar (guardrail type) vehicle barriers in strategic locations along approximately 50 miles of the border road.

Analysis: There would be no significant adverse affects to the natural environment associated with the proposed projects. This EA is tiered from the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) completed for Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) activities along the U.S.-Mexico border (U.S. Army 1994).

Reference: Environmental Impact Analysis to Support a Categorical Exclusion for the Repair and Replacement of a Communications Tower and Access Road Immigration and Naturalization Service July 1998 resulting in a FONSI signed xxxx

The U.S. Border Patrol proposes to repair and replace a 260 ft. radio communications tower and make improvements to the existing access road leading to the proposed tower site east of Bayview, Texas. INS proposes to repair and replace a 260 ft. radio tower and make improvements to the existing access road leading to the proposed tower site east of Bayview, Texas. The proposed action would involve minimal construction activities due to the existing service road and concrete pad which will be utilized.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed actions. Therefore, no further analysis or documentation (Environmental Assessment or Impact Statement) is warranted. The INS, in implementing this decision, will employ all practical means to minimize the potential adverse impacts on the local environment.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Expansion of the Ajo U.S. Border Patrol Station Why, AR May 2001 resulting in a FONSI signed in April of 2001 (FONSI date problem)

This Environmental Assessment (EA) evaluates the potential for environmental impacts associated with expanding the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) Ajo Station in Why, Pima County, Arizona. The site is located within Why, Pima County, Arizona, along Highway 85 approximately 28 miles north of the Mexico border.

Approximately 0.92 acres of land currently owned by USBP will be utilized for the station expansion. The proposed action (Alternative 1) expands the existing Ajo Station approximately 200 feet to the east. Existing conditions on the proposed expansion site consist of disturbed land which formerly served as a corral for horses used by the USBP.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Preliminary Draft Abbreviated Environmental Assessment for Proposed Construction/Renovation of Border Checkpoint Stations near Las Cruces and Alamogordo, New Mexico and Comstock and El Paso, Texas, March 24, 1997 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXXXX
This project proposes to construct or renovate six border check points: two near Las Cruces, New Mexico; two near Alamogordo, New Mexico; one near El Paso, Texas; and one near Comstock, Texas.
Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed actions.

Reference: Draft Environmental Assessment Immigration and Naturalization Service New Palo Parado Temporary Traffic Checkpoint Station Nogales, Arizona October 2000 resulting in a FONSI signed on 1/8/2001
This Environmental Assessment (EA) addresses the potential effects, beneficial and adverse, of the proposed construction of a new temporary checkpoint station (Palo Parado) at milepost 15.6 on Interstate 19 (near Nogales, AZ). The project will require the placement of 2,454 cubic yards of fill in two locations to level the ground. One area will be filled and extended by 12 feet to support an inspection point and a second area will be leveled to use for parking. A third area near the frontage road will be graded and used for temporary storage of and placement of portable toilets. A fourth area may be used in the future placement of an administrative trailer. If this site is used, a platform (approximately 12 ft x 20 ft) would be constructed on the shoulder of the road to provide a level site for the trailer. The total project area is approximately one acre in size and will occur within the existing Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) right-of-way.
Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed action. Increased or enhanced interdiction of illegal and drug entry and activities would have positive, indirect socioeconomic benefits.

Reference: Final Report Environmental Assessment for Infrastructure within US Border Patrol Naco-Douglas Corridor Cochise County, Arizona Immigration and Naturalization Service Washington DC August 2000. Resulting in a FONSI signed in August 2000
Infrastructure improvements that will be addressed include, but are not limited, to roads, fences, vehicle barriers, helipads, USBP stations, remote video surveillance (RVS) sites, lights, and checkpoints. The cumulative effect of these improvement projects since 1995 and into the reasonably foreseeable future, and in conjunction with other programs or projects proposed or implemented by other agencies, is the primary focus of this EA.
Analysis: The proposed action would involve minimal construction activities within sites that have been, for the most part, previously disturbed. No significant adverse effects to air quality, water quality, cultural resources, unique areas, soils, protected species, or land use are expected. Based on the findings of this analysis no significant adverse impacts would occur from the preferred alternative.

Reference: EA for the Expansion of the US Border Patrol Indio Station, El Centro Sector, CA resulting in a FONSI July 2003
The USBP at the Indio Station had an increase in staff and required an expansion of their facilities. They developed 2.58 acres of previously disturbed but now vacant property to construct a parking lot and install

two module trailers, lighting and an 8 ft fence around the area. The property was not previously paved; however it contained debris and trash and did not support any wildlife populations. Utilities previously existed in the area including water and sewer lines.

Analysis: This EA concluded that the proposed action did not significantly impact the environment. This EA offer support for this CE as it called for “minor renovations and additions to buildings, roads, airfields, grounds, equipment, and other facilities” and it did not “result in a change in the functional use of the real property”.

USDA-ARS

Reference: EA for the Bulk Fuel Oil Storage and Distribution System Project, Plum Island Animal Research Center resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service (ARS) proposed to provide Plum Island Animal Research Center with a bulk fuel oil storage and distribution system that meets or exceeds local, state, and federal requirements for fuel oil systems. The proposed action involves making necessary repairs/modifications to the existing fuel system to meet appropriate regulations and construction of new fuel oil system in a new location not currently being used for the bulk fuel oil system. The associated impacts will be minimized by preventive construction techniques.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this EA, no significant environmental impacts would result from the proposed action.

FLETC

Reference: EA for the expansion of the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) Facility at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, Ga resulting in a FONSI signed in May of 2001

This project sought to expand the existing ATF Facility from 3 office trailers up to a maximum of 8 office trailers, one additional septic tank, and will provide an additional parking area for ATF employees. The new trailers (approximately 1,755 square feet each) would be located in a wooded area adjacent to the three existing ATF trailers. The trailers would be used for ATF offices.

Analysis: This EA concluded that would not significantly affect the physical, cultural, and socioeconomic environments.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for Building 2 Expansion at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center Artesia, New Mexico resulting in a FONSI signed in July of 1999

This project sought to expand Building 2 or the Physical Training Building within the FLETC compound near Artesia, New Mexico by expanding the existing building on the north and west sides by approximately 15,000 square feet.

Analysis: This EA concluded that would not significantly affect the physical, cultural, and socioeconomic environments.

Reference: Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact Construction of Building Alterations and Additions to Building 95, 96, & 97 FLETC, Glynco, GA December 2000 resulting in a FONSI signed in December of 2002.

This EA analyzed the proposed construction of alterations and additions for buildings 95, 96, and 97 at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) at Glynco, Georgia. This proposed action has been developed for FLETC to renovate (primarily interior) existing dormitories (building 95 and 96), and associated boiler house (building 97); and to construct a new Recreational/Community Building within the existing footprint for buildings 95, 96, and 97. The existing footprint of building 95 and 96 (57,480 square feet) would not change; however, the existing footprint (3500 square feet) for building 97 would be reduced, after the obsolete cooling tower area is removed.

Analysis: It was concluded that the proposed building modifications does not constitute a “major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment” when considered individually or

cumulative in the context of the referenced act including both direct and indirect impacts. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Reference: Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Signification Impact for Construction of Building Alterations and Additions September 2000 resulting in a FONSI signed on 9/19/00.

This EA analysed the impacts of the proposed construction of building alterations and additions for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) at Glynco, Georgia. This project proposes alterations and additions to 19 buildings at FLETC. The building modifications involve interior alteration of 15 of the 31 existing townhouse buildings; expansion of building 92; and interior renovation of buildings 90, 94, and 46. The building modifications in the proposed action involve primarily interior alterations and renovations. Analysis: It was concluded that the proposed building modifications does not constitute a “major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment” when considered individually or cumulative in the context of the referenced act including both direct and indirect impacts. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Renovation and Addition to Roads

Reference: Supplemental Environmental Assessment Proposed JTF-6 Road Improvements near Eagle Pass and Cinco Cattle Company Ranch Maverick County, Texas April 2004 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX
This Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA) updates the Final Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) road improvements near Eagle Pass and Cinco Cattle Company Ranch, Texas prepared in May 2000. The original EA addressed the potential for adverse or beneficial environmental impacts of improvements to 15.9 miles of existing primitive road and the construction of five water crossings near Eagle Pass and on the Cinco Ranch. The Cinco Ranch section consists of 11.1 miles of improvements to existing primitive roads and the construction of one Texas bridge (low-water concrete crossing) and one timber trestle bridge near the U.S.-Mexico border west of El Indio, Texas. In addition, another 2.8-mile section of road on Cinco Ranch was identified for possible future upgrade activities. The Proposed Action of this SEA consists of a change in the original bridge crossing design at Cuevas Creek near El Indio from a timber trestle bridge to a Bailey bridge. This new design also elevates the connecting approach roads to and from the proposed bridge and upgrades the surface with caliche aggregate. The Bailey bridge design would raise the road grade above the water surface elevation (50-year floodplain) in Cuevas Creek. This Bailey bridge design, relative to the timber trestle design, would have fewer impacts within the streambed.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Supplemental Environmental Assessment JTF-6 Fence and Road Construction, Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona July 1997 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This Environmental Assessment (EA) addresses the potential for significant adverse or beneficial environmental impacts in accordance with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). This document was tiered from existing EAs completed for previous construction activities (U.S. Army 1991a, 1993) in the same vicinity, and a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement completed for Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) activities along the U.S.-Mexico border (U.S. Army 1994). The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and the U.S. Border Patrol, Tucson Sector are proposing to replace approximately six miles of fence, construct 0.5 miles of new road, and improve 0.8 miles of road along the U.S.-Mexico border at Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona. Approximately .1.3 miles would be of decorative fence, with the remaining 4.9 miles of steel landing mat.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Supplemental Environmental Assessment Whitewater Draw Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona Immigration and Naturalization Service June 21, 2001 resulting in a FONSI signed in April of 2001(FONSI date problem)

This Environmental Assessment (EA) addresses site-specific actual and potential cumulative effects, beneficial and adverse, of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) activity regarding improvement to the border access road and the construction of a water crossing structure for Whitewater Draw, southwest of Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona. This document supplements the Final EA for Infrastructure within U.S. Border Patrol Naco-Douglas Corridor (INS 2000). This document also addresses cumulative impacts of past, present, and foreseeable future construction and operational actions in the proposed project area. Other EAs consulted in developing cumulative impacts in the proposed project area included the Joint Task Force 6 (JTF-6) Road Maintenance and Construction EA (USACE 1996), the JTF-6 Fence and Road Construction EA (USACE 1997b), the Proposed JTF-6 Light Pole Installation Mission EA (USACE 1998), and the JTF-6 Proposed Fence, Lighting, Road Repair and Improvement Project, Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona (USACE 2001).

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis and assuming that all mitigation measures recommended herein are implemented, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the Preferred Alternative. As previously stated, increased or enhanced interdiction of illegal alien entry and drug activities would have positive, indirect socioeconomic benefits.

Reference: Final Supplemental Environmental Assessment for Various Infrastructure and Road Improvements from Canyon City, California to the Imperial County Line San Diego County, California November 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in November of 2003

The propose actions consists the construction of six night vision scope pads and access road construction and maintenance, 2.2 miles of road improvements to the SDG&E Road, an approximately 467-foot section of bypass road construction, and the installation of an approximately 650- foot section of fence and vehicle barriers. These improvements are proposed by the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) and would take place between Tecate and Tierra del Sol, California.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this analysis and assuming that all mitigation measures recommended herein are implemented, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the Proposed Action Alternative.

Reference: Final Report Environmental Assessment for Infrastructure within US Border Patrol Naco-Douglas Corridor Cochise County, Arizona August 2000 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The Proposed Alternative would allow the infrastructure projects currently approved or funded and those anticipated to be completed over the next five years. Infrastructure improvements that will be addressed include, but are not limited, to roads, fences, vehicle barriers, helipads, USBP stations, remote video surveillance (RVS) sites, lights, and checkpoints. The cumulative effect of these improvement projects since 1995 and into the reasonably foreseeable future, and in conjunction with other programs or projects proposed or implemented by other agencies, is the primary focus of this EA.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis and assuming that all mitigation measures recommended herein are implemented, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the preferred alternative

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment Proposed JTF-6 mission JT423-98 Marfa, Texas February 1998 resulting in a FONSI signed in February of 1998

The scope of this EA addresses the potential impacts of proposed improvements on approximately 89.7 miles of existing road rights-of-way, construction of 1.8 miles of new road, and construction of some support facilities (e.g., helicopter landing pads, K-Span buildings, landing strips, obstacle course, etc.) in

the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) Marfa Sector in Presidio and Jeff Davis counties, Texas. In addition, this EA also addresses the potential cumulative impacts associated with a Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) action in west Texas. A Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) was prepared in 1994 for the INS and JTF-6 proposed projects that facilitate Law Enforcement Agency (LEA) missions to reduce illegal drug activity along the southwestern border of the United States. The PEIS addresses the cumulative effects of past and future projects undertaken by JTF-6 for numerous LEAs within the four southwestern states (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California). This EA tiers from the PEIS.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment JTF-6 Border Road Improvement Project Columbus, New Mexico January 1999 resulting in a FONSI in January of 1999

This Environmental Assessment (EA) assesses the potential for significant adverse or beneficial environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives in accordance with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The proposed action is located in Luna and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico (NM) near the city of Columbus, which is approximately 60 miles west of El Paso, Texas (TX) and 30 miles south of Deming, NM. The proposed action consists of improving 75 miles of soil road and installing single-bar (guardrail type) vehicle barriers in strategic locations along approximately 50 miles of the border road. This document is tiered from the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) completed for Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) activities along the U.S.-Mexico border (U.S. Army 1994). The PEIS was prepared in 1994 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and JTF 6 to address the potential impacts of proposed projects that would facilitate law enforcement agencies (LEAs) missions to reduce illegal drug activity along the southwestern border of the U.S. The PEIS addresses the cumulative effect of past and reasonably foreseeable projects undertaken by JTF-6 for numerous LEAs in the four southwestern states (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California).-

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment Joint Task Force Six Proposed Fence Road Repair and Improvement Project Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona February 2001 resulting in a FONSI signed in February of 2001

A Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), prepared in 1994 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and JTF-6, addressed proposed projects that facilitate missions to reduce illegal drug activity trafficking. This Environmental Assessment (EA) tiers from the 1994 PEIS. This EA addresses the potential impacts associated with a proposed fence and road improvement project along the U.S.-Mexico border in Cochise County, Arizona. The Proposed Action includes landing mat fence extension, installation of permanent lighting, road and hydrological repairs and improvements, and road maintenance. The Proposed Action specifically addresses the extension of an existing landing mat fence east of the Port of Entry (POE) for a distance of two miles, installation of permanent lighting east of the POE for a distance of 0.8 of a mile and west of the POE for a distance of one mile; repair/improvement the border road and hydrological conditions east of the POE for a distance of 4 miles and west of Whitewater Draw for a distance of 4 miles; and road maintenance west of the road repair section for a distance of eight miles near Douglas, Arizona.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for the Proposed JTF-6 missions JT513/515/425-98 Laredo, Texas January 1998 resulting in a FONSI signed in January of 1998

This Environmental Assessment addresses the potential impacts of proposed improvements on approximately 239.8 miles of existing road and ranch road rights-of-way in the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) Laredo area in Webb County and Carrizo Springs area in Maverick and Dimmit counties, Texas, and the potential cumulative impacts associated with a Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) action in the Laredo area. The Proposed Action seeks to improve 170.3 miles of existing, deteriorated roads and to construct 69.5 miles of new roads in Webb, Maverick, and Dimmit counties, Texas. A Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) was prepared in 1994 for the INS and JTF-6 proposed projects that facilitate Law Enforcement Agency (LEAs) missions to reduce illegal drug activity along the southwestern border of the United States. The PEIS addresses the cumulative effects of past and future projects undertaken by JTF-6 for numerous LEAs within the four southwestern states (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California). This EA tiers from the PEIS.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for the Installation and Operation of Nine Remote Video Surveillance Systems in the Tucson Sector, Cochise County, Arizona January 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in January of 2003

The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) proposes to install and operate nine Remote Video Surveillance (RVS) systems for the Naco and Douglas U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) Stations. The proposed action includes related permanent road improvements, temporary road improvements, and the installation of powerlines from adjacent power grids. The proposed action would involve minimal construction activities at the proposed RVS sites. All of the access road construction would involve grading of existing roadways and previously disturbed areas.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment For Naco Roadway and Fence Construction Naco, Cochise County, Arizona April 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in March of 2003 (FONSI date problem)

This EA analyzed infrastructure improvements, including the construction of 4 miles of roads and approximately 1.5 miles of fence. The 4 miles of road improvement would occur along the northern edge of the existing border road, 2 miles east and west of the Naco port of entry (POE), with a new access road to the border from the newly constructed Naco Highway. Landing mat or bollard fence, beginning approximately 1 mile west of the POE and continuing for a distance of 1 mile would replace existing vehicle barriers. An additional 0.5 miles of bollard fence would be installed in the natural washes and drains that transect the proposed road.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis and assuming that all design measures recommended herein are implemented, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the Proposed Action Alternative.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Joint Task Force Six Operation 23-90/20-91 Nogales, Santa Cruz County, Arizona July 1991 resulting in a FONSI signed in July of 1991

This Environmental Assessment prepared for the Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) Project, Nogales, Santa Cruz County, Arizona. This Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared to analyze the proposed project, located east of Nogales, Arizona, along the United States and Mexico border, which consists of construction of a firearms training facility on 50 acres of city—owned land; improving about 12 miles of roadway; and construction of about a mile of new roadway, including one wood bridge across a large wash.

Analysis: I have considered the available information contained in this Environmental Assessment and it is my determination that the proposed project will not result in a significant effect on the existing environment. Therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Border Road and Fence; Construction and Repair Tecate to Canyon City, San Diego County, California October 1993 resulting in a FONSI signed in October of 1993 This document analyzes the actions to be taken for border road construction and repair, and fence construction and repair. This PEA has been prepared to assess any environmental concerns associated with this action segments; the installation and/or repair of fencing; and the installation of culverts on about 10 miles of the U.S./Mexico border in the vicinity of Tecate, California. The project will include some widening of roads. A detailed project description is included in Section 4.0 of this FEA.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Draft Environmental Assessment Joint Task Force Six Proposed Fence and Road Improvement Project Naco, Cochise County, Arizona, March 2000 resulting in a FONSI signed on August 3, 2000. The Proposed Action would involve the extension of an existing landing mat fence located east of the Port of Entry (POE) for a distance of one mile near Naco, Arizona. From the ending point of the proposed landing mat fence, a proposed vehicle barrier would extend another three miles to the east. Additionally, two Arizona crossings (low water crossings) would be constructed at two separate ephemeral stream crossings west of the POE. Finally, the Proposed Action would involve improvements to the border road for a four-mile segment east of the POE and a six-mile segment west of the POE. A Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) was prepared in 1994 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6), proposed activities which facilitate Law Enforcement Agencies (LEAs) missions to reduce illegal drug activity along the southwestern border of the U.S. The PEIS addresses the cumulative effects of past and reasonably foreseeable projects undertaken by JTF-6 for numerous LEAs in the four southwestern states (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California). This Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Proposed Action tiers from the 1994 PETS (U.S. Army 1994). Cooperating agencies involved with the Proposed Action include the U.S. Border Patrol, the INS, and JTF-6.

Analysis: Based on the results of the EA and the environmental design measures to be incorporated as part of the Proposed Action, it has been concluded that the Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

D2 Routine upgrade, repair, maintenance, or replacement of equipment and vehicles, such as aircraft, vessels, or airfield equipment which does not result in a change in the functional use of the property.

CAT I

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B. Section II

(j)(3) Installation, repair, or upgrade of airfield equipment (for example, runway visual range equipment, visual approach slope indicators).

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

2. Real and Personal Property Related Actions t. Routine repair, renovation, and maintenance actions on aircraft and vessels.

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

1. Administrative Actions: b. Routine procurement activities and actions for goods and services, including office supplies, equipment, mobile assets, and utility services for routine administration, operation, and maintenance.

USDA-ARS

Reference: 7 CFR 520.5 (b)

(1) Repair, replacement of structural components or equipment, or other routine maintenance of facilities controlled in whole or in part by ARS;

D3 Repair and maintenance of buildings, roads, airfields, grounds, equipment, and other facilities which do not result in a change in functional use or an impact on a historically significant element or setting (e.g. replacing a roof, painting a building, resurfacing a road or runway, pest control activities, restoration of trails and firebreaks, culvert maintenance, grounds maintenance, existing security systems, waterfront facilities that do not require individual regulatory permits, and other facilities). CAT I

APHIS

Reference: 7CFR372.5 (c) and 7CFR1b.3 (a)

7CFR372.5 (c) (4) Rehabilitation of facilities. Rehabilitation of existing laboratories and other APHIS facilities, functional replacement of parts and equipment, and minor additions to such existing APHIS facilities

USDA-ARS

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Harbor Repairs Project, Plum Island Animal Research Center resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service (ARS) proposed to provide Plum Island Animal Research Center with an improved harbor and repair or replace existing harbor structures. The project sought to ensure the long term stability and usefulness of the Plum Island Animal Research Center harbor. The project was carried out under the requirements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and NYSDEC permits.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this EA, no significant adverse environmental impacts would result from the proposed action.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Bulk Fuel Oil Storage and Distribution System Project, Plum Island Animal Research Center resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service (ARS) proposed to provide Plum Island Animal Research Center with a bulk fuel oil storage and distribution system that meets or exceeds local, state, and federal requirements for fuel oil systems. The proposed action involves making necessary repairs/modifications to the existing fuel system to meet appropriate regulations and construction of new fuel oil system in a new location not currently being used for the bulk fuel oil system. The associated impacts will be minimized by preventive construction techniques.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this EA, no significant environmental impacts would result from the proposed action.

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(x) Routine maintenance, repair, and grounds-keeping activities at FEMA facilities;

(xv) Repair, reconstruction, restoration, elevation, retrofitting, upgrading to current codes and standards, or replacement of any facility in a manner that substantially conforms to the preexisting design, function, and location; [SE, in part]

INS

Reference: 28 CFR Part 61 Appendix C:

10. Actions Which Normally Do Not Require Either An Environmental Impact Statement Or An Environmental Assessment: (a) Construction projects for existing facilities including but not limited to: Remodeling; replacement of building systems and components; maintenance and operations repairs and general improvements when such projects do not significantly alter the initial occupancy and program of the facility or significantly impact upon the environment.

FAA

Reference: FAA Order 5050.4A Chapter 3, Section 23.

(a) (5) Construction, relocation or repair of entrance and service roadway.

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

2. Real and Personal Property Related Actions q. Minor renovations and additions to buildings, roads, airfields, grounds, equipment, and other facilities that do not result in a change in functional use of the real property (e.g. realigning interior spaces of an existing building, extending an existing roadway in a developed area a short distance, installing a small antenna on an already existing antenna tower, adding a small storage shed to an existing building, etc.). (Checklist and CED required.) u. Routine repair and maintenance of buildings, roads, airfields, grounds, equipment, and other facilities which do not result in a change in functional use, or an impact on a historically significant element or setting. v. Routine repair and maintenance to waterfront facilities, including mooring piles, fixed floating piers, existing piers, and unburied power cables. w. Minor renovations and additions to waterfront facilities, including mooring piles, fixed floating piers, existing piers, and unburied power cables, which do not require special, site-specific regulatory permits. (Checklist and CED required.) x. Routine grounds maintenance and activities at units and facilities. Examples include localized pest management actions and actions to maintain improved grounds (such as landscaping, lawn care and minor erosion control measures) that are conducted in accordance with applicable Federal, state, and local directives.

6. Bridge Administration Actions a. Modification or replacement of an existing bridge on essentially the same alignment or location. Excluded are bridges with historic significance or bridges providing access to undeveloped barrier islands and beaches.

USBP

Reference: Final Report Environmental Assessment for Infrastructure within US Border Patrol Naco-Douglas Corridor Cochise County, Arizona August 2000 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The Proposed Alternative would allow the infrastructure projects currently approved or funded and those anticipated to be completed over the next five years. Infrastructure improvements that will be addressed include, but are not limited, to roads, fences, vehicle barriers, helipads, USBP stations, remote video surveillance (RVS) sites, lights, and checkpoints. The cumulative effect of these improvement projects since 1995 and into the reasonably foreseeable future, and in conjunction with other programs or projects proposed or implemented by other agencies, is the primary focus of this EA.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis and assuming that all mitigation measures recommended herein are implemented, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the preferred alternative

Reference: Environmental Assessment on Proposed JTF-6 Projects in West Texas September 1993

The proposed action would involve four separate projects at several locations in seven southwest Texas counties. The proposed projects are: (1) the repair/upgrade of approximately 150 miles (241 kilometers) of existing roads in Terrell, Brewster, Presidio, Jeff Davis, Culberson, and Hudspeth counties; (2) the construction of helicopter landing zones at radio repeater stations on Christmas Mountain, Santiago Peak, and Tres Hermanos in Brewster County and Mount Livermore in Jeff Davis County; (3) the upgrade of an

existing firing range near Fabens in El Paso County; and (4) the construction of a U.S. Border Patrol check station on U.S. Highway 62-180 in El Paso County.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment JTF-6 Border Road Improvement Project Columbus, New Mexico, January 1999 resulting in a FONSI signed in January 1999

This Environmental Assessment assessed the potential for significant adverse or beneficial environmental impacts of the proposed action proposed to take place in Luna and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico (NM) near the city of Columbus, which is approximately 60 miles west of El Paso, Texas (TX) and 30 miles south of Deming, NM. The proposed action consists of improving 75 miles of soil road and installing single-bar (guardrail type) vehicle barriers in strategic locations along approximately 50 miles of the border road.

Analysis: There would be no significant adverse effects to the natural environment associated with the proposed projects. This EA is tiered from the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) completed for Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) activities along the U.S.-Mexico border (U.S. Army 1994).

Reference: Final Report Environmental Assessment for Infrastructure within US Border Patrol Naco-Douglas Corridor Cochise County, Arizona Immigration and Naturalization Service Washington DC August 2000. Resulting in a FONSI signed in August 2000

Infrastructure improvements that will be addressed include, but are not limited, to roads, fences, vehicle barriers, helipads, USBP stations, remote video surveillance (RVS) sites, lights, and checkpoints. The cumulative effect of these improvement projects since 1995 and into the reasonably foreseeable future, and in conjunction with other programs or projects proposed or implemented by other agencies, is the primary focus of this EA.

Analysis: The proposed action would involve minimal construction activities within sites that have been, for the most part, previously disturbed. No significant adverse effects to air quality, water quality, cultural resources, unique areas, soils, protected species, or land use are expected. Based on the findings of this analysis no significant adverse impacts would occur from the preferred alternative.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Border Road Maintenance & Repair Naco, Cochise County, Arizona, February 1993, resulting in a FONSI signed in February, 1993.

This EA analyzed the potential for impact from the routine maintenance of the existing road along the U.S.— Mexican Border. The project encompasses 22 miles of existing roads east and west of Naco, Arizona. The road maintenance will consist of light scraping, installation of culverts, grading and shaping for drainage, and placing gravel in several washes.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this EA, no significant environmental impacts would result from the proposed action.

Reference: Final Supplemental Environmental Assessment of Remote Video Surveillance Systems (RVS) and Communication Towers (CTOW) for the US Border Patrol in the Harlingen, Laredo, and Eagle Pass Stations October 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed October 2003

This Supplemental Environmental Assessment (EA) supplements the Final EA of Remote Video Surveillance Systems (RVS) Systems and Communication Towers (CTOW) for the US Border Patrol in the Harlingen, Laredo, and Eagle Pass Stations. This Supplemental EA (SEA) addresses additional effects that may potentially occur relative to proposed construction of an access road for the Walker Tower 2B site and proposed improvements to an existing access road for the Lupes Tower site. Both sites are located within the Laredo South Station's area of operations. The project consisted of construction of a new access road and upgrade of an existing roadway to provide access to two RVS sites: the Walker Tower 2B and Lupes

Tower. The proposed construction consists of grading a 12-foot wide by 1,200-foot long access road at the Walker Tower 2B site and minor improvements to approximately 600 feet of an existing road at the Lupes Tower site.

Analysis: Based upon the results of these EAs, it was concluded that the project was not likely to adversely affect the environment; therefore, further environmental analysis is not warranted.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Construction of a Physical Security Training Facility, Building 15, for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) at Glynco, Georgia resulting in a FONSI signed on 9/19/2000.

The proposed action would consist of construction a new building (Building #15) at the intersection of Legislative Drive and Records Avenue to house the physical security training that is presently being conducted in Building #146. The building would be called the Physical Security Training Facility. The work would include:

- (1) Construction of a 12,000 square foot, one-story, standing seam galvanized steel roofed building, with architectural concrete masonry for the exterior bearing walls;
- (2) Site improvements consisting of storm drainage, walkways and landscaping;
- (3) Connection to the FLETC-wide underground chilled water and natural gas distribution loops. The new chilled water loop (supply and return lines) would connect to the nearest existing valve pit located approximately 800 feet southeast of the new facility;
- (4) Restoration of a roughly 5,000 square-foot existing paved area for parking;
- (5) Relocation of the training activities from Building #146; and
- (6) Modification and reuse of the existing training facility for other ongoing FLETC activities.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this analysis no significant adverse impacts would occur from these activities.

Repair and Maintenance of Roads

Reference: Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment JTF-6 Road Maintenance and Construction Naco - Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona, July 1996 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The scope of the EA covers the impact of performing maintenance on approximately 52 miles of existing road, constructing two miles of new road, and constructing 2.5 miles of rail barrier, all near Naco and Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona. This document was tiered off of existing EM completed for previous road maintenance activities for 52 miles of existing road, and a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement completed for Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) activities along the U. S.-Mexico border. The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and the U.S. Border Patrol, Tucson Sector are proposing to perform maintenance activities on approximately 52 miles of existing road, and to construct two miles of new road near the U.S.-Mexico border.

Analysis: There would be no significant adverse affects to the natural environment associated with the proposed projects. The proposed action would not impact area land use, water resources, air quality, cultural resources, or socioeconomic i Impacts of the proposed action would not affect any listed or species proposed for listing as threatened or endangered in accordance with the Endangered Species Act.

Additionally, with environmental design measures specified as part of the proposed action, there would be negligible impacts to area soil, water resources, and biological resources.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment on proposed JTF-6 Road Repair Projects on the Tohono O'Odham Indian Nation September 1992 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The proposed action consists of two Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) operations. The proposed operations are to repair approximately 32.5 miles of the existing border road and to establish listening post/operation post

(LP/OP) sites on the Tohono O'odham Indian Nation in southern Arizona along the United States and Mexico International Border. The repair projects would include approximately 29.5 miles of the existing border road between Christmas Gate and Ali Chuk and 3.0 miles of the existing border road south of Au Chuk. The LP/OP sites would be constructed on Horse Peak in the Morena Mountains. A combination of four-wheel drive vehicles and hiking would be used to access the LP/OP sites.

Analysis: Based on the finding of this environmental assessment, and the mitigations which would be utilized during the construction phase of proposed repair of the border road from Christmas Gate to Ali Chuk, no significant impacts would occur from the proposed action.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment on Proposed JTF-6 mission JT032-93 Laredo, Texas July 1993 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The proposed action, Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) Mission JT032-93, would involve four separate actions at several locations in six south Texas counties. The proposed action would involve (1) repair and construction of approximately 150 miles of existing fire breaks along highway right-of-ways, (2) the repair/upgrade of approximately six miles of road along the Rio Grande within or near Laredo, (3) the upgrade/repair of three small-arms firing ranges at Freer, Hebbronville, and Laredo (4) the construction of a fitness/obstacle course at the Laredo Junior College in Laredo, Texas.

Analysis: Based on the finding of this environmental assessment and the mitigations which would be utilized during the construction phase, no significant impacts would occur during the proposed project.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for the Proposed JTF- Levee Road Maintenance and Repair Project Brownsville, Texas April 2000 resulting in a FONSI signed in July of 2000

This Final Environmental Assessment (EA) identifies the potential adverse and beneficial environmental impacts that would occur upon implementation of maintenance and repair activities of levee and access roads near the Brownsville, Texas area in accordance with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Army Regulation 200-2. The scope of this EA covers the potential impacts of maintenance and repair of approximately 11 miles of roads located on flood control levees owned/controlled by the U.S. Section, International Boundary and Water Commission's (US City of Brownsville, and/or Cameron County. The upgrades include resurfacing with caliche or comparable road-base material to enhance the safety of any roads in disrepair. In addition, about 2.6 miles of access roads and six ramps are proposed to be improved.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Road Improvements along King's Ranch Road and the U.S-Mexico Border near Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona February 2002 resulting in a FONSI signed in February of 2002

The Proposed Action Alternative involves major road and drainage repairs/improvements along a 2-mile section of border road that JTF-6 did not complete under a previous NEPA document. This alternative also includes one mile of major road improvements along King's Ranch Road, which runs north-south from the new Douglas Border Patrol station to the U.S.-Mexico border.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA and the environmental design measures to be incorporated as part of the proposed action, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Joint Task Force Six Operations JT089-93, JT094-93 and JT265-93 Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona February 1993 resulting in a FONSI signed in February of 1993

The purpose of JTF—6 Operations in Douglas, Arizona is to provide routine maintenance to existing drag and mountain roads, along the U.S.—Mexico Border and to install fences at the U.S. Border Patrol Station in Douglas, Arizona. The proposed project includes three components: JT 265—93, the maintenance, of 24 miles of an existing drag road east and west of Douglas, Arizona. JT 094—93, the maintenance of about one mile of mountain road east of Douglas, Arizona. JT 089—93, the installation of fences at the U. S. Border Patrol Station at Douglas, Arizona. The road maintenance will consist of light scraping, installation of culverts, grading and shaping for drainage, placing gravel in a slowly flowing wash and resetting existing cattle guards. Road projects will be maintained within their existing width. Limited turnarounds and passing areas will be coordinated with on—site monitors.

Analysis: A review of this Environmental Assessment and coordination with the appropriate agencies indicate that the actions, as proposed by the Joint Task Force Six Operation for road maintenance and fence installation, will not have a significant impact on the quality of the physical or biological environment. All requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) have been satisfied; therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Border Road Maintenance & Repair Naco, Cochise County Arizona February 1993 resulting in a FONSI signed in February of 1993

The proposed project consists of 22 miles of an existing road east and west of Naco, Arizona. The road maintenance will consist of light scraping, installation of culverts, grading and shaping for drainage, and placing gravel in several washes.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Environmental Assessment on Proposed JTF-6 Projects in West Texas September 1993 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The proposed action would involve four separate projects at several locations in seven southwest Texas counties. The proposed projects are: (1) the repair/upgrade of approximately 150 miles (241 kilometers) of existing roads in Terrell, Brewster, Presidio, Jeff Davis, Culberson, and Hudspeth counties; (2) the construction of helicopter landing zones at radio repeater stations on Christmas Mountain, Santiago Peak, and Tres Hermanos in Brewster County and Mount Livermore in Jeff Davis County; (3) the upgrade of an existing firing range near Fabens in El Paso County; and (4) the construction of a U.S. Border Patrol check station on U.S. Highway 62-180 in El Paso County.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Border Fence Construction and Road Repair Naco, Cochise County, Arizona Jtf-6 Operation JT044-94 resulting in a FONSI signed in April of 1994

This Environmental Assessment prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), Los Angeles District (LAD) for the Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) project for Naco, Arizona. JTF—6 coordinates all Title 10 Department of Defense support to Federal, state and local law enforcement agencies as requested by Operation Alliance and approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the efforts to disrupt illegal drug operations along the southwest land border and protect national security. The purpose of JTF—6 Operation at Naco, Arizona, is to assist law enforcement agencies in the prevention of illegal importation of drugs along the U.S./Mexico border. The proposed project consists of replacing 3 miles of existing chain-link fencing with 10 feet high steel landing mat fencing, installation of culverts and repair of approximately 1 mile of existing road parallel to the fence along International Boundary at Naco, Arizona.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

D4* Reconstruction and/or repair by replacement of existing utilities or surveillance systems in an existing right-of-way or easement, upon agreement with the owner of the relevant property interest. CAT
IV

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B, Section II

(e)(2) Acquisition, installation, and operation of utility and communication systems, mobile antennas, data processing cable and similar electronic equipment that use existing right-of-way, easement, distribution systems, and/or facilities (REC required).

FAA

Reference: FAA Order 5050.4A Chapter 3, Section 23.

(a) (2) Installation or upgrading of airfield lighting systems, including runway end identification lights, visual approach aids, beacons and electrical distribution systems.

USDA-ARS

Reference: EA for the Underwater Electrical Cable Replacement Project, Plum Island Animal Research Center resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service (ARS) proposed to provide Plum Island Animal Research Center with a new underwater electrical cable from Orient Point, NY to Plum Island Animal Research Center. The proposed action was designed to meet all regulatory requirements, limit environmental impacts and meet the electrical and communications need of Plum Island Animal Research Center.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this EA, no significant adverse environmental impacts would result from the proposed action.

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(xv) Repair, reconstruction, restoration, elevation, retrofitting, upgrading to current codes and standards, or replacement of any facility in a manner that substantially conforms to the preexisting design, function, and location; [SE, in part]

INS

Reference: 28 CFR Part 61 Appendix C:

10. Actions Which Normally Do Not Require Either An Environmental Impact Statement Or An Environmental Assessment: (a) Construction projects for existing facilities including but not limited to: Remodeling; replacement of building systems and components; maintenance and operations repairs and general improvements when such projects do not significantly alter the initial occupancy and program of the facility or significantly impact upon the environment.

USBP

Reference: Environmental Impact Analysis to Support a Categorical Exclusion for the Repair and Replacement of a Communications Tower and Access Road Immigration and Naturalization Service July 1998 resulting in a FONSI signed in XXXXX

The U.S. Border Patrol proposes to repair and replace a 260 ft. radio communications tower and make improvements to the existing access road leading to the proposed tower site east of Bayview, Texas. An existing service road and concrete pad were to will be used in this project.

Analysis: No significant adverse effect to any resource (i.e., air quality, water quality, cultural resource, wetlands, protected species, land use, etc.) was expected.

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

2. Real and Personal Property Related Actions q. Minor renovations and additions to buildings, roads, airfields, grounds, equipment, and other facilities that do not result in a change in functional use of the real property (e.g. realigning interior spaces of an existing building, extending an existing roadway in a developed area a short distance, installing a small antenna on an already existing antenna tower, adding a small storage shed to an existing building, etc.). (Checklist and CED required.) u. Routine repair and maintenance of buildings, roads, airfields, grounds, equipment, and other facilities which do not result in a change in functional use, or an impact on a historically significant element or setting. v. Routine repair and maintenance to waterfront facilities, including mooring piles, fixed floating piers, existing piers, and unburied power cables. w. Minor renovations and additions to waterfront facilities, including mooring piles, fixed floating piers, existing piers, and unburied power cables, which do not require special, site-specific regulatory permits. (Checklist and CED required.) x. Routine grounds maintenance and activities at units and facilities. Examples include localized pest management actions and actions to maintain improved grounds (such as landscaping, lawn care and minor erosion control measures) that are conducted in accordance with applicable Federal, state, and local directives.

6. Bridge Administration Actions a. Modification or replacement of an existing bridge on essentially the same alignment or location. Excluded are bridges with historic significance or bridges providing access to undeveloped barrier islands and beaches.

NAVY

Reference: 32CFR775.6

(8) Routine actions normally conducted to operate, protect, and maintain Navy-owned and/or controlled properties, e.g., maintaining law and order, physical plant protection by military police and security personnel, and localized pest management activities on improved and semi-improved lands conducted in accordance with applicable federal and state directives.

DOE

Reference: 10 CFR Pt. 1021, Subpt. D. App. B

B1.7 Acquisition, installation, operation, and removal of communication systems, data processing equipment, and similar electronic equipment.

B1.19 Siting, construction, and operation of microwave and radio communication towers and associated facilities, if the towers and associated facilities would not be in an area of great visual value.

D5* Maintenance dredging and repair activities within waterways, floodplains, and wetlands where no new depths are required, applicable permits are secured, and associated debris disposal will be at an approved disposal site. CAT III (USCG, CBP)

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

2. Real and Personal Property Related Actions s. Maintenance dredging and debris disposal where no new depths are required, applicable permits are secured, and disposal will be at an existing approved disposal site. (Checklist and CED required.)

ARMY

Reference: 33 CFR § 230.9 Categorical Exclusions

(c) Minor maintenance dredging using existing disposal sites.

D6 Maintenance of aquatic and riparian habitat in streams and ponds, using native materials or best natural resource management practices. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- (a) Installing or repairing gabions with stone from a nearby source
- (b) Adding brush for fish habitat
- (c) Stabilizing stream banks through bioengineering techniques
- (d) Removing and controlling exotic vegetation, not including the use of herbicides or non-native biological controls. CAT III (FLETC, USCG)

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(xi) Planting of indigenous vegetation

DOE

Reference: 10 CFR Pt. 1021, Subpt. D. App. B

B1.20 Small-scale activities undertaken to protect, restore, or improve fish and wildlife habitat, fish passage facilities (such as fish ladders or minor diversion channels), or fisheries.

USBP

Reference: Supplemental Environmental Assessment Immigration and Naturalization Service Border Road Maintenance and Construction, Tecate to Campo, San Diego County, California April 1997 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This supplemental Environmental Assessment (EA) assesses the potential for significant adverse or beneficial environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives in accordance with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The proposed action involves approximately three miles of new road construction, which includes two miles of riparian area rehabilitation and one mile of highly erodible land rehabilitation on corresponding abandoned road sections, and approximately six miles of maintenance to existing border roads along the U.S.-Mexico border between Tecate and Campo, San Diego County, California.

A Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) was prepared in 1994 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) proposed projects that facilitate law enforcement agencies (LEAs) missions to reduce illegal drug activity along the southwestern border of the U.S. (U.S. Army 1994b). The PEIS addressed the cumulative effects of past and reasonably foreseeable projects undertaken by JTF-6. Additionally, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USCOE), Los Angeles District, prepared two EAs (Tecate to Canyon City; Campo to Jacumba) for border road maintenance and construction activities in this region (U.S. Army 1993 and 1994a). This EA is a supplement to the JTF-6 PEIS, and tiers from the PEIS and the two previous EAs.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA and the environmental design measures to be incorporated as part of the proposed action, it has been concluded that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Various Road Improvements from Canyon City, California to The Imperial County Line San Diego County, California U.S. Border patrol March 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in March of 2003

The proposed actions consists of: 1) the placement of up to 50 portable lights, as needed, within 60 feet of the border from the Pacific Crest Trail to the Imperial County line; 2) night vision scope pad and access road construction; 3) installation/repair of four drainage structures; 4) the installation of a 300-foot bollard fence section near Jacumba; 5) blasting activities; and 6) the installation of two water wells and holding tanks by the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP). All activities would take place between Canyon City, California and the Imperial County line in San Diego County, California.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this analysis and assuming that all mitigation measures recommended herein are implemented, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the Proposed Action Alternative.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment Immigration and Naturalization Service Brush and Small Tree Thinning Operation near Jacumba, California November 2001 resulting in a FONSI in October of 2001 (FONSI date problem)

This Environmental Assessment (EA) addresses the potential effects, beneficial and adverse, of the proposed brush and small tree thinning operation near Jacumba, California. The proposed action would involve hand-clearing brush within an 18 acre site within Boundary Creek. Large trees, as requested by the landowner, would remain on the site. Riparian habitat would be thinned within the proposed project area. Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed action. Mitigation measures regarding schedule, frequency, and method of clearing/thinning have been incorporated to ensure no significant effects occur. No significant adverse effects to air quality, water quality, cultural resources, unique areas, soils, protected species, or land use are expected as a result of the proposed action.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment Joint Task Force Six Proposed Fence Road Repair and Improvement Project Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona February 2001 resulting in a FONSI signed in February of 2001

A Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), prepared in 1994 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and JTF-6, addressed proposed projects that facilitate missions to reduce illegal drug activity trafficking. This Environmental Assessment (EA) tiers from the 1994 PEIS. This EA addresses the potential impacts associated with a proposed fence and road improvement project along the U.S.-Mexico border in Cochise County, Arizona. The Proposed Action includes landing mat fence extension, installation of permanent lighting, road and hydrological repairs and improvements, and road maintenance. The Proposed Action specifically addresses the extension of an existing landing mat fence east of the Port of Entry (POE) for a distance of two miles, installation of permanent lighting east of the POE for a distance of 0.8 of a mile and west of the POE for a distance of one mile; repair/improvement the border road and hydrological conditions east of the POE for a distance of 4 miles and west of Whitewater Draw for a distance of 4 miles; and road maintenance west of the road repair section for a distance of eight miles near Douglas, Arizona.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Border Road Maintenance & Repair Naco, Cochise County Arizona February 1993 resulting in a FONSI signed in February of 1993

The proposed project consists of 22 miles of an existing road east and west of Naco, Arizona. The road maintenance will consist of light scraping, installation of culverts, grading and shaping for drainage, and placing gravel in several washes.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Southerly International Border Water Improvement Project March 2000 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act of 1974, Public Law 93- 320, authorized the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities in the Colorado River Basin to control the, salinity of water delivered to Mexico by the International Boundary and Water Commission. The purpose of this Environmental Assessment (EA) is to identify some proposed options developed by the Bureau of

Reclamation, Yuma Area Office, and the International Boundary and Water Commission for the delivery of water to Mexico across the land boundary at San Luis, Arizona. Currently, water is delivered through the Sanchez Meiorada Canal at the southerly International Boundary (SIB). The water flow at the SIB fluctuates and flow variations render deliveries at the SIB unpredictable for both quantity and quality. This Environmental Assessment considers the following three alternatives to providing improved flows and less salty water to Mexico at the SIB: 1) Install variable speed motor controllers at the SIB Boundary Pumping Plant (BPP) and construct a diversion channel from the BPP to the Bypass Drain, 2) Install variable speed motor controllers at the SIB BPP without the construction of a diversion canal; and 3) no action.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

CONSTRUCTION, INSTALLATION, AND DEMOLITION ACTIVITIES

E1 Construction, operation, maintenance, and removal of utility and communication systems, mobile antennas, data processing cable, intrusion detection systems, and similar electronic equipment that use existing rights-of-way, easements, utility distribution systems, and/or facilities and for equipment and towers not higher than 200 feet where the FCC would not require an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement for the acquisition, installation, operation or maintenance. CAT I

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B. Section II

(e)(2) Acquisition, installation, and operation of utility and communication systems, mobile antennas, data processing cable and similar electronic equipment that use existing right-of-way, easement, distribution systems, and/or facilities (REC required).

AIR FORCE

Reference: 32 CFR989 App. B

A2.3.12. Installing, operating, modifying, and routinely repairing and replacing utility and communications systems, data processing cable, and similar electronic equipment that use existing rights of way, easements, distribution systems, or facilities.

DOE

Reference: 10 CFR Pt. 1021, Subpt. D. App. B

B1.7 Acquisition, installation, operation, and removal of communication systems, data processing equipment, and similar electronic equipment.

B1.19 Siting, construction, and operation of microwave and radio communication towers and associated facilities, if the towers and associated facilities would not be in an area of great visual value.

NAVY

Reference: 32CFR775.6

(16) Acquisition, installation, and operation of utility and communication systems, data processing cable, and similar electronic equipment which use existing rights of way, easements, distribution systems, and/or facilities.

FAA

Reference: FAA Order 5050.4A Chapter 3, Section 23.

(a) (2) Installation or upgrading of airfield lighting systems, including runway end identification lights, visual approach aids, beacons and electrical distribution systems.

(a) (7) Landscaping generally, and landscaping or construction of physical barriers to diminish impact of airport blast and noise.

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(ix) Acquisition, installation, or operation of utility and communication systems that use existing distribution systems or facilities, or currently used infrastructure rights-of-way;

(x) Routine maintenance, repair, and grounds-keeping activities at FEMA facilities;

(xv) Repair, reconstruction, restoration, elevation, retrofitting, upgrading to current codes and standards, or replacement of any facility in a manner that substantially conforms to the preexisting design, function, and location; [SE, in part]

USDA-ARS

Reference: EA for the Underwater Electrical Cable Replacement Project, Plum Island Animal Research Center resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service (ARS) proposed to provide Plum Island Animal Research Center with a new underwater electrical cable from Orient Point, NY to Plum Island Animal Research Center. The proposed action was designed to meet all regulatory requirements, limit environmental impacts and meet the electrical and communications need of Plum Island Animal Research Center.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this EA, no significant adverse environmental impacts would result from the proposed action.

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

2. Real and Personal Property Related Actions q. Minor renovations and additions to buildings, roads, airfields, grounds, equipment, and other facilities that do not result in a change in functional use of the real property (e.g. realigning interior spaces of an existing building, extending an existing roadway in a developed area a short distance, installing a small antenna on an already existing antenna tower, adding a small storage shed to an existing building, etc.). (Checklist and CED required.) u. Routine repair and maintenance of buildings, roads, airfields, grounds, equipment, and other facilities which do not result in a change in functional use, or an impact on a historically significant element or setting. v. Routine repair and maintenance to waterfront facilities, including mooring piles, fixed floating piers, existing piers, and unburied power cables. w. Minor renovations and additions to waterfront facilities, including mooring piles, fixed floating piers, existing piers, and unburied power cables, which do not require special, site-specific regulatory permits. (Checklist and CED required.) x. Routine grounds maintenance and activities at units and facilities. Examples include localized pest management actions and actions to maintain improved grounds (such as landscaping, lawn care and minor erosion control measures) that are conducted in accordance with applicable Federal, state, and local directives.

6. Bridge Administration Actions a. Modification or replacement of an existing bridge on essentially the same alignment or location. Excluded are bridges with historic significance or bridges providing access to undeveloped barrier islands and beaches.

INS

Reference: 28 CFR Part 61 Appendix C:

10. Actions Which Normally Do Not Require Either An Environmental Impact Statement Or An

Environmental Assessment: (a) Construction projects for existing facilities including but not limited to: Remodeling; replacement of building systems and components; maintenance and operations repairs and general improvements when such projects do not significantly alter the initial occupancy and program of the facility or significantly impact upon the environment.

USBP

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Remote Video Surveillance System in Lower Niagara River, New York July 2001 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Border Patrol proposes to install and operate a remote video surveillance (RVS) system along the lower Niagara River in Niagara County, New York. Four sites along the Lower Niagara River are under consideration for installation of RVS equipment. Site No. 1 is located atop the Wrobel Towers, a 13-story senior citizen residential building located at 800 Niagara Avenue: in the City of Niagara Falls. Site No. 2 is located on undeveloped, state-owned parkland, approximately 150 feet west of the Robert Mo Parkway in the Town of Lewiston. Site No. 3 is located on private property situated on Lower River Road in the Town of Lewiston. Site No. 4 is located in Old Fort Niagara, within Fort Niagara State Park, near the village of Youngstown.

Analysis: The proposed action would result in less-than-significant adverse impacts to the immediate area near each site and the surrounding community. Cumulative impacts have been taken into account.

Beneficial impacts would result from the U.S. Border Patrol being better able to meet its mandate in light of budgetary constraints and increased mission requirements.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment Joint Task Force Six Proposed Lighting and Camera Installation Project Nogales, Arizona September 1998 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This Environmental Assessment (EA) addresses potential impacts associated with a proposed lighting and camera installation project covering approximately four miles on the U.S.-Mexico border in Santa Cruz County, Arizona. This document is tiered from the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PETS) completed for a broad scope of JTF-6 activities along the U.S.-Mexico border (U.S. Army 1994). The proposed project site is located along the U.S.-Mexico border in the city of Nogales and extending westward and eastward into Santa Cruz County, Arizona.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Draft Environmental Assessment of Proposed Installation of Communications Towers at U.S. Border Patrol Checkpoints, Falfurrias and Sarita, Texas December 2002 resulting in a FONSI signed on 1/27/03

The U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) maintains checkpoints on the northbound side of U.S. Highway 281 approximately 13 miles south of Falfurrias, Texas, and on the northbound side of U.S. Highway 77 approximately 14 miles south of Santa, Texas. The USBP proposes to construct new communications towers at these checkpoints. The USBP proposes to construct a 152 foot communications tower and associated housing for a backup generator and other equipment at each of the two checkpoints. The tower at the Falfurrias checkpoint would be anchored by three concrete piers spaced in an equilateral triangle 23 feet on a side. These piers would be constructed of reinforced concrete, would measure four feet in diameter, and would be installed to a depth of 38 feet. The tower at the Sarita checkpoint would be anchored on a 26-foot square concrete mat foundation installed to a total depth of 6.25 feet. Dimensions for the equipment housing were not available, but it is estimated that they would measure approximately 15-foot long by 8-foot wide. The towers and equipment shelters would be connected to the main building at each checkpoint by underground electrical conduits that would be installed under the pavement.

Analysis: The Proposed Action would not result in any significant environmental impact. There would be no impacts on land use, geological resources, water resources, wildlife, threatened or endangered species, or cultural resources. The only adverse impacts on vegetation, noise, aesthetics, or solid and hazardous waste concerns would be insignificant. The Proposed Action would have a slight but overall insignificant beneficial impact on the socioeconomic environment of the area through temporary increases on spending

on local businesses during construction and improved public safety for the local communities and legitimate users of the rest areas.

Reference: Draft Programmatic Environmental Assessment for the Installation and Operation of Remote Video Surveillance Systems in the Central Region of the Immigration and Naturalization Service resulting in a FONSI signed on 3/19/03.

The proposed action consists of the expanded use of Remote Video Surveillance (RVS) systems in the Central Region of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) by the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP). At the present time, the proposed action includes the installation of up to 1,556 additional RVS systems in the Central Region over the next 10 years. This number is a planning level analysis. The actual number of RV systems required will vary depending upon enforcement strategies and their function will continually be evaluated on a site-specific basis. The process and guidelines by which the proposed RVS systems would be installed will be identified in this document. In addition, the Proposed Action would include the completion of RVS systems currently in the process of being installed and the operation and maintenance of all existing and Proposed RVS systems.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the PEA and given the identified environmental design measures, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

Reference: Environmental Analysis Document To Support A Categorical Exclusion For The Installation, Operation And Maintenance Of Seventeen Electronic Surveillance Systems Laredo, Texas Immigration And Naturalization Service September 1998 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The U.S. Border Patrol proposes to install, operate and maintain 17 Remote Video Surveillance (RVS) sites along the U.S.—Mexico border near Laredo, Texas. The proposed action would involve minimal construction activities within sites that have been previously disturbed. All sites were surveyed for sensitive biological and cultural resources. Two proposed locations are located within areas that support suitable habitat for endangered species. Since the Chacon Creek site does not have a power source nearby, it is recommended that this site use a solar panel and battery for power, rather than overhead power lines. With implementation of this design change, there would be no impacts to the surrounding brush habitat from additional power (utility) pole installation. The Cenizo Steps proposed pole location should be moved as least 20 feet east of its proposed location. This would move the pole from a brush habitat to a bare ground area, thereby avoiding any potential impacts to brush habitat. No significant adverse effect to any resource (i.e., air quality, water quality, cultural resource, wetlands, protected species, land use, etc.) is expected.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed actions. Increased or enhanced interdiction of illegal drug and alien trafficking would have positive, indirect socioeconomic benefits. Therefore, no further analysis or documentation (Environmental Assessment or Impact Statement) is warranted. The INS, in implementing this decision, will employ all practical means to minimize the potential adverse impacts on the local environment.

Reference: Environmental Analysis Proposed Low-Light Level Remote Video Surveillance System (RVS) For Operation Rio Grande Cameron County, Texas March 2000 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX
Operation Rio Grande is a program initiated by the United States Border Patrol (USBP) in August 1997 to aid in reducing illegal immigration and drug trafficking along the Rio Grande corridor of the McAllen Sector of the USBP. This Environmental Analysis addresses the potential impacts that could result from the installation, operation and maintenance of 20 low-light level remote video surveillance systems (RVSs) in the Port Isabel and Brownsville stations of the McAllen Sector in Cameron County, Texas.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted. The information contained in this Environmental Analysis supports the designation of the proposed action as a Categorical Exclusion (CE) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for a Proposed Remote Video Surveillance (RVS) Site at Ysleta, Texas U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service September 2000 resulting in a FONSI signed in September of 2000

The U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) proposes to install and operate, a Remote Video Surveillance (RVS) tower and system near the U.S. — Mexico border near Ysleta, Texas. The proposed action would involve minimal construction activities within a site that has been previously disturbed. The site was surveyed for sensitive biological and cultural resources. No significant adverse effects to air quality, water quality, cultural resource, wetlands, protected species, or land use are expected.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed actions at the seven proposed RVS site locations. Increased or enhanced interdiction of illegal drug and alien entry and activities would have positive, indirect socioeconomic benefits. Therefore, no further analysis or documentation (Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted. The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, in implementing this decision, will employ all practical means to minimize the potential adverse impacts on the local environment.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for Proposed Installation of Surveillance Equipment in Minnesota, North Dakota and Montana U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service May 2002 resulting in a FONSI signed in May of 2002

The U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) proposes to install and operate 24 Remote Video Surveillance (RVS) systems along the U.S.-Canadian Border in Montana, North Dakota, and Minnesota. The proposed action would involve the placement of RVS systems on previously existing structures and one previously disturbed site. Poles will be put into the ground at three locations where RVS equipment would be mounted. No impacts are anticipated at any of these locations.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed actions at the 22 of the 24 proposed RVS site locations. Two locations are close to potentially eligible railroad bridges. Poles would be constructed approximately 100 yards away from these bridges to avoid any impact to these potentially significant structures. As a result no impacts are anticipated to either of these structures.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for Remote Video Surveillance Systems (RVS) and Communication Towers (CTOW) for the US Border Patrol in the Harlingen, Laredo, and Eagle Pass Stations May 2002 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This Environmental Assessment (EA) evaluated the installation, operation, and maintenance of 43 remote video surveillance systems (RVS) and five communication towers (CTOW) in the Del Rio, Laredo, and McAllen Sectors of the USBP. Of the 43 RVS and five CTOW sites, four of the RVS and two of the CTOW will be placed either on existing structures or replace existing structures. The vast majority of the proposed RVS and CTOW locations are situated in moderately to completely disturbed areas near rail yards, residential developments, agricultural fields, and existing roads.

Analysis: This proposed action is not expected to result in any significant long-term or cumulative adverse impacts on the human or natural environment.

Reference: Final Supplemental Environmental Assessment of Remote Video Surveillance Systems (RVS) and Communication Towers (CTOW) for the US Border Patrol in the Harlingen, Laredo, and Eagle Pass Stations October 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed October 2003

This Supplemental Environmental Assessment (EA) supplements the Final EA of Remote Video Surveillance Systems (RVS) Systems and Communication Towers (CTOW) for the US Border Patrol in the Harlingen, Laredo, and Eagle Pass Stations. This Supplemental EA (SEA) addresses additional effects that may potentially occur relative to proposed construction of an access road for the Walker Tower 2B site and proposed improvements to an existing access road for the Lupes Tower site. Both sites are located within

the Laredo South Station's area of operations. The project consisted of construction of a new access road and upgrade of an existing roadway to provide access to two RVS sites: the Walker Tower 2B and Lupes Tower. The proposed construction consists of grading a 12-foot wide by 1,200-foot long access road at the Walker Tower 2B site and minor improvements to approximately 600 feet of an existing road at the Lupes Tower site.

Analysis: Based upon the results of these EAs, it was concluded that the project was not likely to adversely affect the environment; therefore, further environmental analysis is not warranted.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for Seven Remote Video Surveillance Sites near Naco, Arizona June 2000 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

In this EA the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) proposed to install, operate, and maintain seven Remote Video Surveillance (RVS) sites along the U.S./Mexico border near Naco, Arizona. The proposed action involved minimal construction activities within sites that have been previously disturbed.

Analysis: The EA determined that there would be no significant adverse impacts from the proposed actions at the seven proposed RVS site locations.

Reference: Environmental Assessment For The Installation, Operation And Maintenance Of Fourteen Remote Video Surveillance Systems Eagle Pass, Texas Immigration And Naturalization Service June 1999 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The USBP proposes to install, operate, and maintain 14 Remote Video Surveillance (RVS) sites along the U.S. Mexico border near Eagle Pass, Texas. The proposed action would involve minimal construction activities within sites that have been previously disturbed. All sites were surveyed for sensitive biological and cultural resources. No significant adverse effect to any resource (i.e., air quality, water quality, cultural resource, wetlands, protected species, land use, etc.) is expected.

Analysis: No significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed actions. Increased or enhanced interdiction of illegal drug and alien entry and activities would have positive, indirect socioeconomic benefits. Therefore, no further analysis or documentation is warranted. The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, in implementing this decision, will employ all practical means to minimize the potential adverse impacts on the environment.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Acquisition, Installation, and Operation of Remote Video Surveillance Systems USBP El Centro Sector, California February 2001 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This Environmental Assessment (EA) addresses the potential adverse effects of the proposed installation and operation of 24 remote video surveillance (RVS) systems near Calexico, Imperial County, California. The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and U.S. Border Patrol proposes to install the RVS systems at specific strategic locations along the U.S.-Mexico border to enhance their capabilities of detecting illegal entries into the United States and to assist in the apprehensions of those illegal entrants who are detected.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that construction activities for the proposed RVS sites, outside of the critical habitat area for the endangered peninsular bighorn sheep, would have no adverse impacts to environmental resources in the proposed project area. However, no construction activities should be initiated at the proposed RV sites located in the critical habitat area until the USFWS has issued a Biological Opinion in regards to what level of effect the proposed action could have on endangered species.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Installation of Fencing, Lights, Cameras, Guardrails, and Sensors along the American Canal Extension El Paso, Texas April 1999 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This Environmental Assessment was tiered from the “Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for JTF-6 Activities Along the U.S./Mexico Border and sought install fencing, lights, cameras, guardrails and sensors along portions of the American Canal Extension in El Paso, TX. The entire project was within the city limits of El Paso. The project entailed approximately 20 miles of fencing, permanent stadium-type lights to be installed on poles 60 to 300 feet high in three clusters along the 20-mile project area, and construction of guardrails placed along portions of the project in order to prevent vehicles accessing the levee slopes at inappropriate or unsafe locations. The project also analyzed the installation of surveillance cameras, to provide remote surveillance of the BP patrol area, at critical locations along the project length. Some cameras were to be mounted on existing poles, antennae, or buildings, while others required installation of new poles.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this EA, no significant adverse environmental impacts would result from the proposed action.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Installation, Operation, and Maintenance of a Remote Video Surveillance (RVS) System in Whatcom County, Washington May, 2000 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This project sought to install, operate, and maintain a Remote Video Surveillance system (RVS), with a fiber optic cable video and data transmission subsystem along the U.S.— Canadian border in Whatcom County, Washington. The project will consist of approximately 47 miles of underground fiber optic line and 31 cameras mounted on poles ranging in height from 60 to 80 feet.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this EA, no significant adverse environmental impacts would result from the proposed action.

Reference: Environmental Assessment Installation of Fencing, Lights, Cameras, Guardrails, And Sensors Along The American Canal Extension El Paso District El Paso, Texas April 1999 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This Environmental Assessment is tiered from the “Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for JTF-6 Activities Along the U.S./Mexico Border (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California) “, dated August 1994, prepared for the INS. The El Paso Sector of the United States Border Patrol proposes to install fencing, lights, cameras, guardrails and sensors along portions of the American Canal Extension in El Paso, TX. The project is located near the Rio Grande River in northwestern Texas. The entire project is within the city limits of El Paso. The majority of the Project Location is along a man made canal and levee system. Portions of the canal are at times adjacent to industrial areas, downtown El Paso, and mixed commercial with limited residential development. Border Highway (Route 375) roughly parallels most of the project site.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed actions. Therefore, no further analysis or documentation (Environmental Assessment or Impact Statement) is warranted. The INS, in implementing this decision, will employ all practical means to minimize the potential adverse impacts on the local environment.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Construction of Barrier Systems along a 1.6-Mile Corridor of the United States/Mexico International Boundary (Spring Canyon) in San Diego, California May 1998, Revised July 1998. resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The EA tiers from the 1994 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) Activities along the United States/Mexico Border. The INS proposes to construct a patrol road, secondary fence (including pedestrian, overhead rolling, vehicle swing gates and dog runs), maintenance roads, lighting, and remote video surveillance along a corridor that begins just east of the San Ysidro POE, and stretches 1.6 miles eastward to Arnie’s Point. Construction of these elements would take place entirely within the area defined as the “limits of construction”, which encompass 44.5 acres. The Proposed Action also includes placement of a box culvert in Stewart’s Creek. The box culvert would be placed in Stewart’s

Creek, 1.6 miles west of the San Ysidro POE, and 200 feet east-southeast of the U.S. International Boundary and Water Commission (USIBWC) waste treatment facility. All construction activity associated with the box culvert would take place within a 50' x 100' area. Impact assessment associated with the Proposed Action covers the 44.5 acre limits of construction and the 50' x 100' area. The analysis of project-related potential environmental impacts is documented in the BA prepared for the project. Biological and cultural resource surveys were conducted to identify any sensitive resources potentially affected by the project. Findings were coordinated with the appropriate resource agencies and the areas containing sensitive resources were either identified for avoidance or a mitigation plan developed during project construction. A mitigation plan has been developed and approved by the California State Historic Officer for archeological site number CA-SDI- 10,809, which lies within the limits of construction associated with the Proposed Action. The site is recommended as potentially eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. In order to avoid impacts to the site, a data recovery program will be applied. Data recovery efforts would be conducted while construction would begin along other portions of the corridor. All data recovery would be completed before construction activities commence in the site area.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed actions.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Nogales Infrastructure Improvements Tucson Sector, Nogales Station Santa Cruz County, Arizona October 2003. Resulting in a FONSI signed in October, 2003 The Department of Homeland Security proposes to construct 1.5 miles of all-weather patrol roads, perform 0.5 mile of road improvements, install 1 mile of border fence and maintenance road, and install 15 Remote Video Surveillance (RVS) systems in proximity to the U.S-Mexico border in Nogales, Arizona. Road improvements to the first 0.5 mile of existing road would involve paving with asphalt. Also, up to 60 portable light systems in the area would continue to be utilized to facilitate enforcement operations.

Analysis: The proposed infrastructure improvements would have no significant adverse effects on natural resources within the project corridor. Therefore, no further analysis or documentation is warranted. The Department of Homeland Security, in implementing this decision, would employ all practical means to minimize the potential adverse impacts on the local environment.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for the Installation and Operation of a Relay Tower at Crawford Hill, United States Border Patrol, Nogales Station Santa Cruz County, Arizona Immigration and Naturalization Service November 2002 resulting in a FONSI signed in November of 2002

The Proposed Action is the installation, operation and maintenance of one relay tower along the U.S.-Mexico border within Santa Cruz County, Arizona. The proposed relay tower would be equipped with R.VS equipment. The proposed relay tower is located on Crawford Hill within the City of Nogales. In addition to the relay tower being installed at the Crawford Hill site, the USBP also plans on updating their existing cameras sites within the Nogales Station AO by retrofitting 10 new modem cameras with infrared capabilities at the existing RVS locations. This action would include the removal of non-cameras and replacement with new infrared cameras and would not require any ground disturbing activities.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA and the environmental design measures to be incorporated as part of the Proposed Action, it has been concluded that the Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment. Therefore, no further environmental impact analysis is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for the Installation and Operation of Nine Remote Video Surveillance Systems in the Tucson Sector, Cochise County, Arizona January 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in January of 2003

The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) proposes to install and operate nine Remote Video Surveillance (RVS) systems for the Naco and Douglas U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) Stations. The proposed action includes related permanent road improvements, temporary road improvements, and the installation

of powerlines from adjacent power grids. The proposed action would involve minimal construction activities at the proposed RVS sites. All of the access road construction would involve grading of existing roadways and previously disturbed areas.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Programmatic Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Installation and Operation of Remote Video Surveillance Systems in the Western Region of the Immigration and Naturalization, March 2003, resulting in a FONSI signed March 2003

The USBP Western Region is responsible for approximately 420-miles of the U.S./Canadian border and 511-miles of the U.S./Mexico border, most of which are remote and rugged terrain. Therefore, the USBP has the need for a non-intrusive method for monitoring vast areas with limited resources. Remote Video Surveillance (RVS) systems provide a partial solution to this problem while simultaneously limiting the potential impact to environmental resources. This project sought to analyze the expanded use of RVS systems in the Western Region including the installation of up to 459 additional RVS systems in the Western Region over the next 10 years including the operation and maintenance of all existing and proposed RVS systems. This document described the impacts of the proposed action; however, site-specific surveys and evaluations and tiered NEPA documents will be completed once locations for RVS system installation are identified. This PEA will describe the cumulative effects of the proposed action in conjunction with other on-going and proposed projects.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the PEA it was concluded that the installation and operation of multiple RVS systems would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment.

Reference: Final Report Environmental Assessment for Infrastructure within US Border Patrol Naco-Douglas Corridor Cochise County, Arizona Immigration and Naturalization Service Washington DC August 2000. Resulting in a FONSI signed in August 2000

Infrastructure improvements that will be addressed include, but are not limited, to roads, fences, vehicle barriers, helipads, USBP stations, remote video surveillance (RVS) sites, lights, and checkpoints. The cumulative effect of these improvement projects since 1995 and into the reasonably foreseeable future, and in conjunction with other programs or projects proposed or implemented by other agencies, is the primary focus of this EA.

Analysis: The proposed action would involve minimal construction activities within sites that have been, for the most part, previously disturbed. No significant adverse effects to air quality, water quality, cultural resources, unique areas, soils, protected species, or land use are expected. Based on the findings of this analysis no significant adverse impacts would occur from the preferred alternative.

Reference: Final Report Environmental Assessment For Proposed Installation Of Remote Video Surveillance Equipment Immigration And Naturalization Service San Diego Sector San Diego, October 2002 resulting in a FONSI signed in October of 2002

The proposed action consists of installation, operation, and maintenance of 25 Remote Video Surveillance (RVS) systems near the U.S.-Mexican border within the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) San Diego Sector, California. This EA analyzes the potential for significant adverse or beneficial impacts of the proposed action. Of the 25 RVS systems, 19 would be installed within the footprint of the extant San Diego Border Infrastructure System. The six remaining RVS systems would be installed at previously disturbed sites outside of the Border Infrastructure System.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Supplemental Environmental Assessment for the Acquisition, Installation, And Operation of Remote Video Surveillance Systems, Imperial County, California October 2002 resulting in a FONSI signed in September of 2002 (FONSI date problem)

The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) El Centro Sector proposes to install Remote Video Surveillance (RVS) systems at specific strategic locations along the U.S./Mexico border to enhance their capabilities of deterring, detecting, and assisting in the apprehensions of illegal entries into the United States. The acquisition, installation, and operation of 24 RVS sites were addressed in an Environmental Assessment (EA) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) signed on 16 May 2002. However, shortly after public distribution of the Final EA, the USBP and their RVS design contractor determined that some sites needed to be relocated due to technical issues and/or their inability to gain access to the property. In addition, some sites needed to be redesigned and/or added to accommodate proper transmission and reception of signals. This document updates and supplements the June 2002 EA and addresses only those sites that have been modified or relocated. The design changes and additional RVS systems documented in this Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA) includes the addition of 4 relay sites, 5 equipment sheds, 7 new or relocated RVS sites, and 12 design changes.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis and assuming that all mitigation measures recommended herein are implemented, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the Preferred Alternative. As previously stated, increased or enhanced interdiction of illegal alien entry and drug activities would have positive, indirect socioeconomic benefits.

Reference: Pre-Draft Environmental Assessment for Construction of Barrier Systems Border Field State Park to Gravel Pit and Tin Can Hill Areas San Diego California including Cumulative Impact Assessment for the Multiple Fence System Master Plan April 1999 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This Environmental Assessment analyzes and presents the direct and indirect environmental impacts associated with an Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) proposal to construct patrol roads, secondary fencing (including pedestrian, overhead rolling, and vehicle swing gate and "agent safety zones"), maintenance roads, tight standards, and remote video surveillance (RVS) cameras along two non-contiguous segments of the U.S./Mexico international boundary, in San Diego County, California. The EA also presents a cumulative impact assessment for implementation of the Multiple Fence System Master developed for San Diego, California. The Multiple Fence System Master Plan present a plan for enhanced border control along the international boundary in the U.S. Bord Patrol (USBP) San Diego Sector (Imperial Beach, Chula Vista, and Brown Field stations) using a combination of roads, lighting, and fences. This EA tiers from the 1994 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) Activities along he U.S./Mexico Border, prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Fort Worth District. The Proposed Action would take place in the Border Field State Park to Gravel Pit and Tin Can Hill areas of San Diego County, within the USBP San Diego Sector (Imperial Beach and Brown Field stations). The Proposed Action would occur entirely within an area defined as the "project corridor." The project corridor includes two, non-contiguous segments referred to as the "western segment" and "eastern segmenr" of the project corridor.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment Acquisition, Installation, and Operation of Remote Video Surveillance Systems United States Border Patrol Buffalo Sector Niagara Falls, New York, April 2001 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The USBP proposes to install, operate and maintain Remote Video Surveillance systems (RVS) near Niagara Falls, New York. The Preferred Alternative selects a group of RVS sites that provide an effective video coverage while trying to minimize impacts to environmental resources. Of the alternatives

considered, the preferred alternative would result in the least amount of environmental impacts while providing a strategically effective approach to ensuring the USBP agents' and migrants' health and safety. Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed actions.

- E2* New construction upon or improvement of land where all of the following conditions are met:
- (a) The structure and proposed use are compatible with applicable local planning and zoning standards
 - (b) The site is in a developed area and/or a previously disturbed site
 - (c) The proposed use will not substantially increase the number of motor vehicles at the facility or in the area.
 - (d) The site and scale of construction or improvement are consistent with those of existing, adjacent, or nearby buildings
 - (e) The construction or improvement will not result in uses that exceed existing support infrastructure capacities (roads, sewer, water, parking, etc.)
- CAT IV

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(xvi) Improvements to existing facilities and the construction of small scale hazard mitigation measures in existing developed areas with substantially completed infrastructure, when the immediate project area has already been disturbed, and when those actions do not alter basic functions, do not exceed capacity of other system components, or modify intended land use; provided the operation of the completed project will not, of itself, have an adverse effect on the quality of the human environment;

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

2. Real and Personal Property Related Actions h. Coast Guard new construction upon, or improvement of, land where all of the following conditions are met (Checklist and CED required.): The structure and proposed use are substantially in compliance with prevailing local planning and zoning standards. The site is on heavily developed property and/or located on a previously disturbed site in a developed area. The proposed use will not substantially increase the number of motor vehicles at the facility. The site and scale of construction are consistent with those of existing, adjacent, or nearby buildings.

6. Bridge Administration Actions b. Construction of pipeline bridges for transporting potable water. c. Construction of pedestrian, bicycle, or equestrian bridges and stream gauging cableways used to transport people.

NAVY

Reference: 32CFR775.6

(9) New construction that is consistent with existing land use and, when completed, the use or operation of which complies with existing regulatory requirements and constraints, e.g., a building on a parking lot with associated discharges/runoff within existing handling capacities, a bus stop along a roadway, and a foundation pad for portable buildings within a building complex.

USBP

Reference: Preliminary Draft Amended Environmental Assessment Construction/Renovation Of Border Patrol Checkpoints Near Las Cruces And Alamogordo, New Mexico And El Paso, Texas February 2001 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The project involves construction of two facilities near Alamogordo, New Mexico, renovation of four existing facilities near Las Cruces, New Mexico, and construction of a new facility near El Paso, Texas.

Construction and renovation would occur on land already heavily disturbed and within the highway right-of-ways.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

Reference: Final Draft Environmental Assessment Proposed Construction of Border Patrol Station in Eagle Pass, Texas August 2002 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This Environmental Assessment analyzed the proposed construction and operation of a U. S. Border Patrol (USBP) station in Eagle Pass, Texas. The Proposed Action calls for the construction of a new border patrol station located approximately one mile south of Eagle Pass on Farm-to-Market Road (FM) 1021. The proposed station would be located on an approximately 39-acre site in a rural area, allowing the future possibility of expansion.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment U.S. Border Patrol Station Wilcox, Arizona September 2002 resulting in a FONSI signed in September of 2002

The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) is proposing to relocate the operation of a United States Border Patrol Station (USBPS) to a new facility. The existing and proposed facilities are located in Wilcox, Cochise County. Two additional site locations were considered and eliminated from further consideration due to environmental constraints. The Proposed Alternative would be located within an existing industrial area nearby other non-residential developments within the City limits of Wilcox.

Analysis: Based on the analysis of the resource studies, no significant adverse impacts would result from the Proposed Alternative.

Reference: Preliminary Final Environmental Assessment Immigration and Naturalization Service New 350-Agent Border Patrol Station Campo, California October 2002 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The proposed action consists of building a 350-Agent Border Patrol (USBP) Station near Campo, San Diego. This EA analyzes the potential for significant adverse or beneficial impacts of the proposed action. The proposed action addresses the construction of a 350-Agent USBP station at one of the three locations near Campo, California. A total of 34 acres of land would be acquired. Of this, only 13 acres would be altered. The affected land is currently in open rangeland. The remaining area would serve as a buffer zone and would be used as a turn-out pasture for USBP horse patrols that may occur in the region.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for the Installation of Temporary Vehicle Barriers along the International Border near Calexico, California January 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in January of 2003

This Environmental Assessment (EA) addresses the potential effects, both beneficial and adverse, of the proposed acquisition, installation, and operation of temporary vehicle barriers at various locations along 14.5 miles of the U.S/Mexico border near Calexico, Imperial County, California. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has designated a portion of the proposed project area as critical habitat for the endangered peninsular bighorn sheep. No direct effects to the sheep or its habitat would occur as a result of the Proposed Action Alternative. However, indirect effects could potentially occur if illegal traffic shifts into other areas. The extent of these effects is not quantifiable at this time because UDA and smuggler patterns are at their, discretion and outside the control of the USBP. The placement of any barriers within critical habitat would occur from 1 July through 31 December to ensure that no aspect of the proposed action interferes with the sheep's lambing season. In addition, much of the project corridor is located within

the Vuha Desert Management Area for the proposed threatened flat-tailed horned lizard. USBP would provide biological monitors onsite during placement of the vehicle barriers to ensure no accidental take of the flat-tailed horned lizard would occur.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that placement of temporary vehicle barriers along the international border would have no adverse direct effects to environmental resources in the proposed project area. However, indirect effects could occur to those areas outside of the project corridor because of the potential for shifting traffic patterns by the smugglers and UDAs. The magnitude of these effects is not identifiable or measurable at this time.

Reference: Environmental Assessment Proposed Immigration and Naturalization Service District Office Oakdale, Louisiana August 1996 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This EA analyzed the proposed construction and operation of an Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) District Office. The location of the proposed action is within the northeast portion of the city of Oakdale, Allen Parish, Louisiana. The proposed District Office would be constructed near the Oakdale Federal Detention Center (FDC) and the Oakdale Federal Deportation Center (FDTC). The proposed action would provide necessary parking, storage, office space, and related special space (e.g., conference/training rooms, holding areas) that would meet INS personnel requirements in support of the missions at the Oakdale FDC and the Oakdale FDTC. Depending on the site chosen, the proposed construction would involve clearing, grading, and development on a minimum of three and a maximum of four acres for building space and parking lots.

Analysis: Based on the findings of the Environmental Assessment, and the incorporation of mitigation measures as part of the proposed action, the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment. Therefore, issuance of a Finding of No Significant Impact is warranted and an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Lockdown Dormitory Krome Service Processing Center Miami-Dade County, Florida October 2002 resulting in a FONSI signed in October of 2002
The U.S. Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), proposes to construct and operate a 304-bed lockdown dormitory at the Krome Service Processing Center (SPC) site in Miami-Dade County Florida.

Analysis: The proposed action would result in minimal short and long-term impacts to the immediate area of the project location and the surrounding community. Cumulative impacts have been taken into account. Beneficial impacts would result from the proposed action: the Krome SPC would be able to meet its mission requirements in a facility with adequate resources to serve the current and anticipated migrant population.

Reference: Environmental Assessment on Proposed JTF-6 Projects in West Texas September 1993 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The proposed action would involve four separate projects at several locations in seven southwest Texas counties. The proposed projects are: (1) the repair/upgrade of approximately 150 miles (241 kilometers) of existing roads in Terrell, Brewster, Presidio, Jeff Davis, Culberson, and Hudspeth counties; (2) the construction of helicopter landing zones at radio repeater stations on Christmas Mountain, Santiago Peak, and Tres Hermanos in Brewster County and Mount Livermore in Jeff Davis County; (3) the upgrade of an existing firing range near Fabens in El Paso County; and (4) the construction of a U.S. Border Patrol check station on U.S. Highway 62-180 in El Paso County.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Preliminary Draft Abbreviated Environmental Assessment for Proposed Construction/Renovation of Border Checkpoint Stations near Las Cruces and Alamogordo, New Mexico and Comstock and El Paso, Texas, March 24, 1997 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This project proposes to construct or renovate six border check points: two near Las Cruces, New Mexico; two near Alamogordo, New Mexico; one near El Paso, Texas; and one near Comstock, Texas.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed actions.

Reference: Environmental Assessment U.S. Border Patrol Station, Sierra Blanca, Texas February, 2000 resulting in a FONSI signed in February of 2000

This Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of constructing a U.S. Border Patrol Facility in Sierra Blanca, Texas.. Currently, U.S. Border Patrol Sierra Blanca Sector headquarters facilities are located in the town of Sierra Blartca, Texas. The current station is a 927-square foot building originally built to staff 5 agents. The facility is occupied by 31 agents.

Operational functions such as detention cells and parking are either inadequate or not available. These facilities do not provide sufficient space for current or future border patrol operations.

Analysis: On the basis of the findings of the Environmental Assessment, no significant impact is anticipated from the proposed project on human health or the natural environment. A Finding of No Significant Impact is warranted and an Environmental Impact Statement is not required for this action.

Reference: Environmental Assessment Proposed Construction of the U.S. Border Patrol Station in Laredo, Webb County, Texas May 1998 resulting in a FONSI signed in May of 1998

This Environmental Assessment was prepared for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) proposed land purchase, construction of a U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) station, and relocation of agents to the new facility on an approximately 10-acre tract at the southeast corner of Grand Central Boulevard and the McPherson Road extension in Laredo, Webb County, Texas.

The INS proposes to purchase an approximately 10-acre tract of land from a private landowner in order to construct a USBP station at the southeast corner of Grand Central Boulevard and the McPherson Boulevard extension in Laredo, Webb County, Texas. The USBP agents stationed at the currently leased Laredo North Station would relocate to the new facility when construction is complete. The new station would consist of the following structures or components: a single- story building (30,500 square feet [with a detention area (2,500 sf)]; three aboveground storage tanks (two 10,000-gallon gasoline tanks and one 12,000-gallon diesel tank); a 2,500-sf drive/parking area; a dog kennel for 26 dogs; and a radio tower.

Analysis: The proposed action is not anticipated to have any significant adverse impacts to soils, water, biological, or cultural resources. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated to land use, socioeconomics, hazardous materials and waste, air quality, or noise. In addition, the proposed action is not anticipated to have any long-term adverse impacts to the environment.

Reference: Environmental Assessment Proposed Construction of the U.S. Border Patrol Station in Sanderson, Terrell County, Texas February 12, 2001 resulting in a FONSI signed in February of 2001

This EA addresses the potential impacts of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) proposed property purchase, construction of a U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) station, and relocation of agents from an existing facility to the new facility. The proposed facility would be located on an approximately 33-acre tract of land north of U.S. Highway 90 and west of Highland Plaza Ave. in Sanderson, Terrell County, Texas.

The purpose is to construct a new facility to accommodate an increased number of agents who will be assigned to the Marfa Sector, Sanderson Station. The current Sanderson Station can accommodate up to 5 personnel, but has inadequate ancillary facilities and does not have the capability to expand to include these facilities. A new station would allow for the necessary expansion of agent staff size as well as more efficient and effective operations in a modern facility that can best support the USBP mission. The new

station would consist of the following structures or components: a single-story building (14,000 square feet); one aboveground gasoline storage tank; a 39,858 sf drive/parking area; a dog kennel; and a radio tower.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the United States Border Patrol Station, Alpine, Texas resulting in a FONSI signed in July of 2000

The Immigration and Naturalization Service is proposing to construct a larger Border Patrol station in Alpine that would accommodate an increase from 25 Border Patrol agents to 100. The proposed Border Patrol station would be located on a 5-acre parcel of land along U.S. Highway 67/90, just west of Alpine's city limits, in Bretster County, Texas.

The existing station is located in a leased facility that formerly housed an automobile dealership and is inadequate to meet the station's need for additional office space, alien processing, interweaving and detention, as well as support facilities. Facilities that are proposed are a administration building, a vehicle maintenance shop, a helicopter landing pad, a fuel island, a car wash, a dog kennel, parking, perimeter chain link fence, high pressure sodium lighting security systems for the interior and exterior of site, landscaping with irrigation, and a 40-foot radio tower with satellite dish.

Analysis: The proposed action would not result in any moderate or significant, short or long-term, cumulative adverse effects and, therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement will not be generated for the proposed action.

Reference: Draft Supplemental Environmental Assessment Proposed Phase II Housing Facilities At The United States Border Patrol Station Presidio, Texas February 2001 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX
The Immigration and Naturalization Service is proposing to construct 38 housing units (Phase II) adjacent to the Phase I housing project in order to increase human resources at the Presidio Border Patrol Station (BPS). The proposed housing construction would be located on an 18-acre parcel of land north of the intersection of Erma Avenue and Foothill Boulevard, in the City of Presidio, Presidio County, Texas.

Analysis: In the long-term, human health and safety and vegetation would benefit from the proposed project. Socioeconomics would also benefit from the project with the increase in BP agents and construction workforce. Minimal long-term impact would occur to wildlife, noise, land use and transportation. Short-term impacts would occur to soils, air quality and noise during construction and could occur to human health and safety. No long-term impacts would occur to soils, geology, climate, air quality, groundwater, wetlands and other waters of the United States, floodplains, special status species, environmental justice, cultural resources and irreversible or irretrievable resources. It would not result in any moderate or significant, short or long-term, cumulative adverse effects and, therefore, is recommended. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will not be generated for the proposed action.

Reference: Draft Environmental Assessment Immigration and Naturalization Service Expansion of Parking/Storage Facility and New Traffic Checkpoint at Sonoita, Arizona October 2000 resulting in a FONSI signed on 1/9/00

This Environmental Assessment (EA) addresses the potential effects, beneficial and adverse, of the proposed expansion of the parking and storage facilities at the Sonoita U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) Station, Sonoita, AZ, and the construction of new traffic checkpoint along State Route (SR) 83 at milepost 40.8, approximately eight miles north of Sonoita, AZ. The proposed action would involve construction activities within sites that have been previously disturbed and within the existing right-of-way

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed action. Increased or enhanced interdiction of illegal and drug entry and activities would have positive, indirect socioeconomic benefits.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the U.S. Border Patrol Station, Yuma, Arizona November 2001 resulting in a FONSI signed on 4/17/02

This EA will analyze the impacts of a new U.S. Border Patrol Station (BPS) adjacent to the Yuma Sector Headquarters Complex on the southern edge of Yuma, Arizona. After construction of the new facilities, the staffing would increase from 190 to 350 people. The selected site would be purchased by the U.S. Government to support the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP). The new BPS would cover approximately 50,000 square feet and would include such facilities as the main station, sally port, dog kennels, parking, seized vehicle temporary storage, fuel island, wash station, communication towers, and a two-bay vehicle maintenance shop.

Analysis: On the basis of the findings of the environmental assessment, no significant impact is anticipated from the proposed project on human health or the natural environment. A Finding of No Significant Impact is warranted and an Environmental Impact Statement is not required for this action.

Reference: Environmental Assessment U.S. Border Patrol San Diego Sector Support Facilities at Brown Field San Diego, California October 1999 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This EA analyzed the proposed construction and operation of the San Diego Sector Support Facilities at Brown Field in San Diego, California. Proposed development includes an air operations facility, vehicle maintenance garage, electronics maintenance shop, facilities maintenance shop, parking areas, interior access roads, and associated ancillary functions. This EA evaluates the potential effects of the Proposed Action on the following resource areas: geology and soils, biological resources, cultural resources, water resources, air quality, noise, public health and safety, land use, visual resources, traffic and circulation, utilities and public services, socioeconomics, and hazardous materials and wastes.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

Reference: Draft Environmental Assessment Proposed Construction of Border Patrol Checkpoint at I-35 Mile Marker 29 Laredo, Webb County, Texas March 28, 2002 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The Proposed Action calls for the construction of a checkpoint station located approximately two miles north of the I-35/Camino Colombia exit. Vehicles traveling north on I-35 from the toll road will be forced to pass through the new checkpoint, situated east of the access road.

The Proposed Action could result in potential impacts to a prehistoric site of possible cultural significance identified during the field investigation Site 41WB612 is a lithic scatter with surface and subsurface material covering about 2.07 acres. No diagnostic artifacts or features were recovered, and the period of occupation is unclear. However, the site is contained within a flat eolian plain that appears to be stable below the top layer of loose soil, and the potential for additional subsurface cultural material is good. The layout of the proposed checkpoint is such avoidance of the site is not possible, so it appears that the Proposed Action will impact the site. For this reason, testing of the site for eligibility on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) has been undertaken. The results of the testing will be addressed in a separate document, If the site is determined to be ineligible for inclusion on the NRHP the potential impact on this cultural resource would be considered insignificant.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed actions.

Reference: Draft Environmental Assessment New Building Construction San Angelo, Tom Green County, Texas February 2002 resulting in a FONSI signed on 5/1/03

This Environmental Assessment (EA) addresses site-specific actual and potential cumulative effects, beneficial and adverse, of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) activity regarding construction of office space for the Anti-Smuggling Unit of the Del Rio Sector.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis and assuming that all mitigation measures recommended herein are implemented, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the Proposed Action. As

previously stated, increased or enhanced interdiction of illegal drug activities would have positive, indirect socioeconomic benefits.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for Construction of New Border Station, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan Chippewa County January 1999 resulting in a FONSI signed in January 1999.

The proposed action involves the construction of a 48,000 gross square feet building on the existing government owned site, and an adjacent 0.33 acre parcel to be purchased by the General Services Administration (GSA) from the State of Michigan. The total square footage includes canopied areas. The new facility will provide expanded office, lobby, and storage space, a firing range, five primary inspection lanes, a garage, and a secondary inspection building to allow the search of buses and private vehicles. The proposed action will allow the U.S. Customs Service, U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, and U.S. Department Agriculture Plant Protection and Quarantine Service to efficiently carry out their missions at the International Bridge border crossing at Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan. According to the definitions in the U.S. Border Station Design Guide, this station is expanding from a 'small' station to a "medium" station. The U.S. Department of Agriculture Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) has also submitted a request for space at this location, a result of the increased passage of produce from Asia through Canada.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed actions.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Construction of a Physical Security Training Facility, Building 15, for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) at Glynco, Georgia resulting in a FONSI signed on 9/19/2000.

The proposed action would consist of construction a new building (Building #15) at the intersection of Legislative Drive and Records Avenue to house the physical security training that is presently being conducted in Building #146. The building would be called the Physical Security Training Facility. The work would include:

- (1) Construction of a 12,000 square foot, one-story, standing seam galvanized steel roofed building, with architectural concrete masonry for the exterior bearing walls;
- (2) Site improvements consisting of storm drainage, walkways and landscaping;
- (3) Connection to the FLETC-wide underground chilled water and natural gas distribution loops. The new chilled water loop (supply and return lines) would connect to the nearest existing valve pit located approximately 800 feet southeast of the new facility;
- (4) Restoration of a roughly 5,000 square-foot existing paved area for parking;
- (5) Relocation of the training activities from Building #146; and
- (6) Modification and reuse of the existing training facility for other ongoing FLETC activities.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this analysis no significant adverse impacts would occur from these activities.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Administration Building Construction Project, Building 93, FLETC Glynco, Georgia resulting in an undated, but signed, FONSI.

This Environmental Assessment describes those environmental impacts that would result from the proposed construction of the new administration building which would be located northeast of FLETC Avenue. A new administration building would consolidate safety and environmental, finance, procurement, security, and other offices from many scattered locations into one location. The personnel would work in a modern, spacious, healthful and more comfortable environment.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this analysis no significant adverse impacts would occur from these activities.

Reference: Draft Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for Construction of Multi-Activity Center FLETC, Glynco, Georgia August 2002 resulting in a FONSI signed on 9/3/2002. The Multi-Activity Center would consist of one 2-story building (approximately 20,000 square feet) that includes rooms for short-term ammo storage, a weapons display area, weapons storage, classrooms, and office space. The project also includes parking and would result in disturbance to an area of approximately 5.5 acres.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this analysis no significant adverse impacts would occur from these activities.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for Mock Port of Entry and Border Patrol Station and Related Facilities at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center Glynco, Georgia resulting in a FONSI signed in July of 2001.

INS, US Customs, and US Border Patrol constructed a training center at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) located in Glynco, GA. The facilities included a training center (23,000 sqft) 36 parking spaces, and various outdoor training areas. Specifically, a new single story building was constructed to contain a single classroom, a mock port of entry, a mock border patrol station, various training rooms for specific exercises, office spaces, rest rooms, break rooms, and storage areas. The project also included fabrication of outdoor venues to simulate traffic circulation at Ports of Entry. The site was a total of 5 acres and was previously vacant and wooded.

Through coordination with the appropriate resource agencies, the Environmental Assessment determined there would be no significant adverse impacts to the environment from this action. In an effort to reduce impacts during construction, INS and FLETC implemented several Best Management Practices (BMP5) including: avoiding construction near wetlands, using existing tree cover or new plantings to shield historic bunkers near the site, using native plants species, applying energy conservation to design techniques, and using BMPs for erosion, sedimentation and dust control. With the incorporation of the mitigation measures, the EA determined there were no significant impacts to the human environment, nor were any cumulative or irreversible impacts anticipated.

Analysis: Though this project was larger than this CE would allow, and didn't meet the requirements that the site in a developed area and/or on a previously disturbed site, this project still resulted in a FONSI.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Various Road Improvements from Canyon City, California to the Imperial County Line San Diego County, California US Border Patrol March 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in March 2003.

This project analyzed the potential for impact from 1) the placement of up to 50 portable lights, as needed, within 60 feet of the border from the Pacific Crest Trail to the Imperial County line; 2) night vision scope pad and access road construction; 3) installation/repair of four drainage structures; 4) the installation of a 300-foot bollard fence section near Jacumba; 5) blasting activities; and 6) the installation of two water wells and holding tanks by the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP). All activities would take place between Canyon City, California and the Imperial County line in San Diego County, California.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this analysis no significant adverse impacts would occur from these activities.

Reference: Draft Environmental Assessment Joint Task Force Six Proposed Fence and Road Improvement Project Naco, Cochise County, Arizona, March 2000 resulting in a FONSI signed on August 3, 2000.

The Proposed Action would involve the extension of an existing landing mat fence located east of the Port of Entry (POE) for a distance of one mile near Naco, Arizona. From the ending point of the proposed landing mat fence, a proposed vehicle barrier would extend another three miles to the east. Additionally, two Arizona crossings (low water crossings) would be constructed at two separate ephemeral stream crossings west of the POE. Finally, the Proposed Action would involve improvements to the border road for a four-mile segment east of the POE and a six-mile segment west of the POE. A Programmatic

Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) was prepared in 1994 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6), proposed activities which facilitate Law Enforcement Agencies (LEAs) missions to reduce illegal drug activity along the southwestern border of the U.S. The PEIS addresses the cumulative effects of past and reasonably foreseeable projects undertaken by JTF-6 for numerous LEAs in the four southwestern states (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California). This Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Proposed Action tiers from the 1994 PETS (U.S. Army 1994). Cooperating agencies involved with the Proposed Action include the U.S. Border Patrol, the INS, and JTF-6.

Analysis: Based on the results of the EA and the environmental design measures to be incorporated as part of the Proposed Action, it has been concluded that the Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Installation of Fencing, Lights, Cameras, Guardrails, and Sensors along the American Canal Extension El Paso, Texas April 1999 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This Environmental Assessment was tiered from the "Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for JTF-6 Activities Along the U.S./Mexico Border and sought install fencing, lights, cameras, guardrails and sensors along portions of the American Canal Extension in El Paso, TX. The entire project was within the city limits of El Paso. The project entailed approximately 20 miles of fencing, permanent stadium-type lights to be installed on poles 60 to 300 feet high in three clusters along the 20-mile project area, and construction of guardrails placed along portions of the project in order to prevent vehicles accessing the levee slopes at inappropriate or unsafe locations. The project also analyzed the installation of surveillance cameras, to provide remote surveillance of the BP patrol area, at critical locations along the project length. Some cameras were to be mounted on existing poles, antennae, or buildings, while others required installation of new poles.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this EA, no significant adverse environmental impacts would result from the proposed action.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment Area Lighting, Fencing, and Roadways at International Border San Diego, California August 1997 resulting in a FONSI signed in August of 1997

This Environmental Assessment (EA) prepared for the Los Angeles District for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) Lighting, Fencing and Roads Project at the International Border San Diego, California. The INS proposes to implement a system of lighting, fencing, and roadways. The project consists of parallel construction of lighting, fencing, and roadways (total length about 7.3 miles) up to approximately 150 feet north of the existing border fence, originating at Arnies Point (approximately seven miles east of the Pacific Ocean) and terminating at the San Ysidro Mountain foothills to the east.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Border Road and Fence; Construction and Repair Tecate to Canyon City, San Diego County, California October 1993 resulting in a FONSI signed in October of 1993

This document analyzes the actions to be taken for border road construction and repair, and fence construction and repair. This PEA has been prepared to assess any environmental concerns associated with this action segments; the installation and/or repair of fencing; and the installation of culverts on about 10 miles of the U.S./Mexico border in the vicinity of Tecate, California. The project will include some widening of roads. A detailed project description is included in Section 4.0 of this FEA.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Conversion of Vehicle Barriers to Landing Mat Fence Naco, Arizona Immigration and Naturalization Service Washington, D.C. October 2002 resulting in a FONSI signed in October of 2002

The proposed action is to convert 1.2 miles of vehicle barriers east of Naco, Arizona into landing mat fence. The project involved the conversion of 1.2 miles of existing vehicle barriers with 10-foot support poles into landing mat fence with little or no additional ground disturbance. The Preferred Alternative would involve minimal construction activities within an area that has been previously disturbed.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis and assuming that all mitigation measures recommended herein are implemented, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the Preferred Alternative.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Joint Task Force Six Operations JT089-93, JT094-93 and JT265-93 Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona February 1993 resulting in a FONSI signed in February of 1993

The purpose of JTF—6 Operations in Douglas, Arizona is to provide routine maintenance to existing drag and mountain roads, along the U.S.—Mexico Border and to install fences at the U.S. Border Patrol Station in Douglas, Arizona. The proposed project includes three components: JT 265—93, the maintenance, of 24 miles of an existing drag road east and west of Douglas, Arizona. JT 094—93, the maintenance of about one mile of mountain road east of Douglas, Arizona. JT 089—93, the installation of fences at the U. S. Border Patrol Station at Douglas, Arizona. The road maintenance will consist of light scraping, installation of culverts, grading and shaping for drainage, placing gravel in a slowly flowing wash and resetting existing cattle guards. Road projects will be maintained within their existing width. Limited turnarounds and passing areas will be coordinated with on—site monitors.

Analysis: A review of this Environmental Assessment and coordination with the appropriate agencies indicate that the actions, as proposed by the Joint Task Force Six Operation for road maintenance and fence installation, will not have a significant impact on the quality of the physical or biological environment. All requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) have been satisfied; therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment For Naco Roadway and Fence Construction Naco, Cochise County, Arizona April 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in March of 2003 (FONSI date problem)

This EA analyzed infrastructure improvements, including the construction of 4 miles of roads and approximately 1.5 miles of fence. The 4 miles of road improvement would occur along the northern edge of the existing border road, 2 miles east and west of the Naco port of entry (POE), with a new access road to the border from the newly constructed Naco Highway. Landing mat or bollard fence, beginning approximately 1 mile west of the POE and continuing for a distance of 1 mile would replace existing vehicle barriers. An additional 0.5 miles of bollard fence would be installed in the natural washes and drains that transect the proposed road.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis and assuming that all design measures recommended herein are implemented, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the Proposed Action Alternative.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for the Proposed New River Safety Barrier and Border Fence Project Calexico, California January 2004 resulting in a FONSI signed in January of 2004

The USBP proposes to install, operate and maintain a retractable Safety Barrier that would deter the flow of illegal aliens north via the New River without impeding the flow of the water. In addition to the Safety Barrier, 5-miles of border barrier fence would also be constructed. The Safety Barrier is a retractable gate style fence made of tubular aluminum fingers that will be adjusted to the depth of the channel bottom. The Border Patrol agents will engage the barrier upon the detection of illegal alien activity in the river. As the illegal aliens are apprehended or turned back, the barrier would be disengaged allowing it to remain up and out of the channel until it is activated again. One or two permanent stadium style lights will also be

installed to assist in detecting illegal aliens at night. These lights would be located within 30-feet of the Safety Barrier Bridge, facing south, to ensure that agents can clearly see the river at night. Along with the Safety Barrier, 200- feet of chain link fence from the international border to the Safety Barrier Bridge along both outer banks of the New River will be constructed.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the environmental assessment and the environmental design measures to be incorporated as part of the Proposed Action, the Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment. Therefore, no further environmental impact analysis is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Various Road Improvements from Canyon City, California to The Imperial County Line San Diego County, California U.S. Border patrol March 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in March of 2003

The proposed actions consists of: 1) the placement of up to 50 portable lights, as needed, within 60 feet of the border from the Pacific Crest Trail to the Imperial County line; 2) night vision scope pad and access road construction; 3) installation/repair of four drainage structures; 4) the installation of a 300-foot bollard fence section near Jacumba; 5) blasting activities; and 6) the installation of two water wells and holding tanks by the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP). All activities would take place between Canyon City, California and the Imperial County line in San Diego County, California.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this analysis and assuming that all mitigation measures recommended herein are implemented, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the Proposed Action Alternative.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment Immigration and Naturalization Service Us Border Patrol Pedestrian Fence along the International Border, USBP El Paso Sector, Texas January 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed on 1/7/03

The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) proposes to improve and extend an existing pedestrian (chain-link) fence for the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) El Paso Sector, near Anapra, New Mexico. The Proposed Action Alternative includes the improvement of 0.2 miles along the eastern end of the existing fence and the horizontal extension of 0.17 miles and 0.41 miles of the current eastern and western ends, respectively. The proposed action would involve the excavation and removal of approximately 0.1 cubic yards of soil from each hole where fence poles would be located, but would not significantly affect the existing environment. The footprint of the proposed fence was surveyed for sensitive biological and cultural resources.

Analysis: No major, long-term, adverse impacts are anticipated to any resources analyzed within this document. Therefore, no further analysis or documentation (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted. The INS, in implementing this decision, would employ all practical means necessary to minimize the potential adverse impacts on the local environment.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment Joint Task Force Six Proposed Fence Road Repair and Improvement Project Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona February 2001 resulting in a FONSI signed in February of 2001

A Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), prepared in 1994 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and JTF-6, addressed proposed projects that facilitate missions to reduce illegal drug activity trafficking. This Environmental Assessment (EA) tiers from the 1994 PEIS. This EA addresses the potential impacts associated with a proposed fence and road improvement project along the U.S.-Mexico border in Cochise County, Arizona. The Proposed Action includes landing mat fence extension, installation of permanent lighting, road and hydrological repairs and improvements, and road maintenance. The Proposed Action specifically addresses the extension of an existing landing mat fence east of the Port of Entry (POE) for a distance of two miles, installation of permanent lighting east of the POE for a distance of 0.8 of a mile and west of the POE for a distance of one mile; repair/improvement of the border road and hydrological conditions east of the POE for a distance of 4 miles and west of Whitewater

Draw for a distance of 4 miles; and road maintenance west of the road repair section for a distance of eight miles near Douglas, Arizona.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment JTF-6 Fence Construction Project Yuma County, Arizona May 1998 resulting in a FONSI signed in May of 1998

This Environmental Assessment (EA) addresses the potential impacts associated with the proposed fence construction along the U.S.-Mexico border in Yuma County, Arizona. The Proposed Action would involve the construction of a fence two feet north of the U.S.-Mexico border beginning at the existing landing mat fence and extending approximately 3.3 miles to the east, south of Yuma, Arizona and north of San Luis, Mexico. Materials to be used for the proposed fence would either be steel landing mat or sheet metal fence. A Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) was prepared in 1994 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) proposed projects that facilitate Law Enforcement Agencies (LEAs) missions to reduce illegal drug activity along the southwestern border of the U.S. The PEIS addresses the cumulative effects of past and reasonably-foreseeable projects undertaken by JTF-6 for numerous LEAs in the four southwestern states (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California). This Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Proposed Action tiers from the PEIS completed for JTF-6 and INS activities along the U.S.-Mexico border (U.S. Army 1994) Due to potential problems obtaining rights-of-entry, the proposed action may not be implemented. If the proposed action cannot be implemented, then the environmentally preferred alternative (install the light poles 90 ft closer to the border) or the no action alternative may be selected. Both of these alternatives for installation of the light poles would be more compatible with the USBP mission and would not significantly affect the resources contained within the Douglas area.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Supplemental Environmental Assessment for Various Infrastructure and Road Improvements from Canyon City, California to the Imperial County Line San Diego County, California November 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in November of 2003

The propose actions consists the construction of six night vision scope pads and access road construction and maintenance, 2.2 miles of road improvements to the SDG&E Road, an approximately 467-foot section of bypass road construction, and the installation of an approximately 650- foot section of fence and vehicle barriers. These improvements are proposed by the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) and would take place between Tecate and Tierra del Sol, California.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this analysis and assuming that all mitigation measures recommended herein are implemented, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the Proposed Action Alternative.

Reference: Pre-Draft Environmental Assessment for Construction of Barrier Systems Border Field State Park to Gravel Pit and Tin Can Hill Areas San Diego California including Cumulative Impact Assessment for the Multiple Fence System Master Plan April 1999 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This Environmental Assessment analyzes and presents the direct and indirect environmental impacts associated with an Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) proposal to construct patrol roads, secondary fencing (including pedestrian, overhead rolling, and vehicle swing gate and "agent safety zones"), maintenance roads, tight standards, and remote video surveillance (RVS) cameras along two non-contiguous segments of the U.S./Mexico international boundary, in San Diego County, California. The EA also presents a cumulative impact assessment for implementation of the Multiple Fence System Master developed for San Diego, California. The Multiple Fence System Master Plan present a plan for enhanced

border control along the international boundary in the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) San Diego Sector (Imperial Beach, Chula Vista, and Brown Field stations) using a combination of roads, lighting, and fences. This EA tiers from the 1994 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) Activities along the U.S./Mexico Border, prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Fort Worth District. The Proposed Action would take place in the Border Field State Park to Gravel Pit and Tin Can Hill areas of San Diego County, within the USBP San Diego Sector (Imperial Beach and Brown Field stations). The Proposed Action would occur entirely within an area defined as the "project corridor." The project corridor includes two, non-contiguous segments referred to as the "western segment" and "eastern segment" of the project corridor.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Lighting Projects

Reference: Draft Environmental Assessment for Operation Rio Grande Interim Lighting August 1997 - June 1999 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

Operation Rio Grande is a strategy initiated by the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP), a law enforcement branch of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), in August 1997 to aid in reducing illegal immigration and drug trafficking along the Rio Grande corridor of the McAllen Sector of the USBP. This EA addresses the interim effects of a portion of Operation Rio Grande in the Brownsville and Port Isabel stations of the McAllen Sector, and will be superseded by an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Operation Rio Grande McAllen Sector. This EA is tiered from the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) completed for a broad scope of INS Joint Task Force-6 (JTF-6) activities along the U.S.-Mexico border (USACE, 1994). The continuation and expansion of Operation Rio Grande through the actions covered by this EA will increase the efficiency and safety of the USBP agents in the McAllen Sector as they fulfill their obligations under U.S. laws and directives. The proposed action is the interim use of lights in the McAllen Sector stations of Brownsville and Port Isabel pending completion of an EIS on Operation Rio Grande. This action is intended to reduce the influx of illegal immigration and drugs into these two stations,

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Installation of Portable Lights within the Naco Corridor Cochise County, Arizona December 2001 resulting in a FONSI December 2001

This EA analyzed the acquisition and the intermittent operation of approximately 30 to 50 portable lights. These proposed lights would be deployed anywhere along the 10.5-mile corridor along the US/Mexico border, three miles to the east and 7.5 miles to the west of the POE at Naco, on an as needed basis. A total of 202 sites, along the 10.5-mile corridor, have been designated for light placement.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA and the environmental design measures to be incorporated as part of the proposed action, it was concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Reference: Environmental Assessment Installation of Fencing, Lights, Cameras, Guardrails, And Sensors Along The American Canal Extension El Paso District El Paso, Texas April 1999 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This Environmental Assessment is tiered from the "Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for JTF-6 Activities Along the U.S./Mexico Border (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California)", dated August 1994, prepared for the INS. The El Paso Sector of the United States Border Patrol proposes to install fencing, lights, cameras, guardrails and sensors along portions of the American Canal Extension in

El Paso, TX. The project is located near the Rio Grande River in northwestern Texas. The entire project is within the city limits of El Paso. The majority of the Project Location is along a man made canal and levee system. Portions of the canal are at times adjacent to industrial areas, downtown El Paso, and mixed commercial with limited residential development. Border Highway (Route 375) roughly parallels most of the project site.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed actions. Therefore, no further analysis or documentation (Environmental Assessment or Impact Statement) is warranted. The INS, in implementing this decision, will employ all practical means to minimize the potential adverse impacts on the local environment.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment Area Lighting, Fencing, and Roadways at International Border San Diego, California August 1997 resulting in a FONSI signed in August of 1997

This Environmental Assessment (EA) prepared for the Los Angeles District for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) Lighting, Fencing and Roads Project at the International Border San Diego, California. The INS proposes to implement a system of lighting, fencing, and roadways. The project consists of parallel construction of lighting, fencing, and roadways (total length about 7.3 miles) up to approximately 150 feet north of the existing border fence, originating at Arnie's Point (approximately seven miles east of the Pacific Ocean) and terminating at the San Ysidro Mountain foothills to the east.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for the Proposed New River Safety Barrier and Border Fence Project Calexico, California January 2004 resulting in a FONSI signed in January of 2004 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The USBP proposes to install, operate and maintain a retractable Safety Barrier that would deter the flow of illegal aliens north via the New River without impeding the flow of the water. In addition to the Safety Barrier, 5-miles of border barrier fence would also be constructed. The Safety Barrier is a retractable gate style fence made of tubular aluminum fingers that will be adjusted to the depth of the channel bottom. The Border Patrol agents will engage the barrier upon the detection of illegal alien activity in the river. As the illegal aliens are apprehended or turned back, the barrier would be disengaged allowing it to remain up and out of the channel until it is activated again. One or two permanent stadium style lights will also be installed to assist in detecting illegal aliens at night. These lights would be located within 30-feet of the Safety Barrier Bridge, facing south, to ensure that agents can clearly see the river at night. Along with the Safety Barrier, 200- feet of chain link fence from the international border to the Safety Barrier Bridge along both outer banks of the New River will be constructed.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the environmental assessment and the environmental design measures to be incorporated as part of the Proposed Action, the Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment. Therefore, no further environmental impact analysis is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Various Road Improvements from Canyon City, California to The Imperial County Line San Diego County, California U.S. Border patrol March 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in March of 2003

The proposed actions consists of: 1) the placement of up to 50 portable lights, as needed, within 60 feet of the border from the Pacific Crest Trail to the Imperial County line; 2) night vision scope pad and access road construction; 3) installation/repair of four drainage structures; 4) the installation of a 300-foot bollard fence section near Jacumba; 5) blasting activities; and 6) the installation of two water wells and holding tanks by the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP). All activities would take place between Canyon City, California and the Imperial County line in San Diego County, California.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this analysis and assuming that all mitigation measures recommended herein are implemented, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the Proposed Action Alternative.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment Joint Task Force Six Proposed Lighting Project Naco, Cochise County, Arizona April 5, 1999 resulting in a FONSI signed on April 5, 1999

A Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PETS), prepared in 1994 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and JTF-6, proposed projects that facilitate LEA missions to reduce illegal drug trafficking. The PEIS addresses the cumulative effects of past and reasonably foreseeable actions undertaken by JTF-6 for numerous LEAs in the four southwestern states (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California). This Environmental Assessment WA tiers from the 1994 PETS (U.S. Army 1994). This EA addresses the potential impacts associated with a proposed lighting project along the U.S.-Mexico border in Cochise County, Arizona. The Proposed Action involves the installation of approximately 40 lighting poles placed approximately 60 feet north of the international border one mile west of the truck Port of Entry (POE) and one mile east of the POE at Naco, Arizona. A secondary usage of these poles may be for camera equipment at a later date.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment Joint Task Force Six Proposed Lighting Project Yuma County, Arizona Imperial County, California May 1999 resulting in a FONSI signed in April of 1999 (FONSI date problem)

A Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PETS), prepared in 1994 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and JTF-6, proposed projects that facilitate LEA missions to reduce illegal drug trafficking. The PEIS addresses the cumulative effects of past and reasonably foreseeable actions undertaken by JTF-6 for numerous LEAs in the four southwestern states (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California). This Environmental Assessment WA tiers from the 1994 PEIS (U.S. Army 1994). This EA addresses the potential impacts associated with a proposed lighting project along the U.S.-Mexico border in Yuma County, Arizona and Imperial County, California. The Proposed Action involves the installation of lighting poles placed at either the 60-foot ROW or at a line 150 feet north of the international border in southern and western Yuma County, Arizona. Another segment of lights is proposed for areas adjacent to the Wellton-Mohawk Bypass Drain running north/south, west of Gadsden and Yuma, Arizona. A final segment of lights is proposed for the public access POE parking lot of the Andrade Reservation in Imperial County, California. Approximately 154 total poles would be installed in these areas. A secondary usage of these poles may be for camera equipment at a later date.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment Portable Lights within the Naco Corridor Cochise County, Arizona December 2001 resulting in a FONSI signed in December of 2001

The proposed action would include the acquisition and the intermittent operation of approximately 30 to 50 portable lights. These proposed lights would be deployed anywhere along the 10-mile corridor along the US/Mexico border, three miles to the east, and 7.5 miles to the west of the POE at Naco, on an as needed basis. A total of 202 sites, along the 10.5-mile corridor, have been designated for light placement, when needed.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA and the environmental design measures to be incorporated as part of the proposed action, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Reference: Final Report Environmental Assessment for Permanent Lighting Structures near Calexico, California February 2002 resulting in a FONSI signed in February of 2002

The US Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and US Border Patrol (USBP) propose to install lighting systems at specific strategic locations along the All American Canal near Calexico, California to enhance their capabilities of detecting illegal entries into the United States and to assist in the apprehensions of those illegal entrants who are detected. The Proposed Action would require that 12.25 miles of the All American Canal levee roadway have permanent lighting structures installed.

Analysis: Based on the findings outlined in this document, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed actions at the proposed lighting structure site locations. Therefore, no further analysis or documentation (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Supplemental Environmental Assessment for the Proposed JTF-6 Light Pole Installation Mission Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona March 1998 resulting in a FONSI signed in March 1998

This SEA analyzed the potential impacts of installing lights and light poles along a 5-mile corridor, which is located 150 ft north of the United States-Mexico border near Douglas, in Cochise County, Arizona. Additionally the project entailed the construction of an 8-ft wide right-of-way to facilitate installation of the poles. This road would be maintained by the USBP to assist in the continual maintenance of the light and light poles.

Analysis: There would be no significant adverse effects to the natural environment associated with the proposed project. This conclusion was further supported by other NEPA documents, including: The August 1997 JTF-6 Fence and Road Construction EA (U.S. Army 1997) The Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) prepared in 1994 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and JTF-6 Additional existing EAs (U.S. Army 1991, 1993, 1996) that were completed for various construction activities in the same vicinity as the proposed action.

Vehicle Barriers

Reference: Environmental Assessment Installation of Fencing, Lights, Cameras, Guardrails, And Sensors Along The American Canal Extension El Paso District El Paso, Texas April 1999 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This Environmental Assessment is tiered from the "Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for JTF-6 Activities Along the U.S./Mexico Border (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California) ", dated August 1994, prepared for the INS. The El Paso Sector of the United States Border Patrol proposes to install fencing, lights, cameras, guardrails and sensors along portions of the American Canal Extension in El Paso, TX. The project is located near the Rio Grande River in northwestern Texas. The entire project is within the city limits of El Paso. The majority of the Project Location is along a man made canal and levee system. Portions of the canal are at times adjacent to industrial areas, downtown El Paso, and mixed commercial with limited residential development. Border Highway (Route 375) roughly parallels most of the project site.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed actions. Therefore, no further analysis or documentation (Environmental Assessment or Impact Statement) is warranted. The INS, in implementing this decision, will employ all practical means to minimize the potential adverse impacts on the local environment.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for the Installation of Temporary Vehicle Barriers along the International Border near Calexico, California January 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in January of 2003

This Environmental Assessment (EA) addresses the potential effects, both beneficial and adverse, of the proposed acquisition, installation, and operation of temporary vehicle barriers at various locations along 14.5 miles of the U.S/Mexico border near Calexico, Imperial County, California. The U.S. Fish and

Wildlife Service (USFWS) has designated a portion of the proposed project area as critical habitat for the endangered peninsular bighorn sheep. No direct effects to the sheep or its habitat would occur as a result of the Proposed Action Alternative. However, indirect effects could potentially occur if illegal traffic shifts into other areas. The extent of these effects is not quantifiable at this time because UDA and smuggler patterns are at their discretion and outside the control of the USBP. The placement of any barriers within critical habitat would occur from 1 July through 31 December to ensure that no aspect of the proposed action interferes with the sheep's lambing season. In addition, much of the project corridor is located within the Vuha Desert Management Area for the proposed threatened flat-tailed horned lizard. USBP would provide biological monitors onsite during placement of the vehicle barriers to ensure no accidental take of the flat-tailed horned lizard would occur.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that placement of temporary vehicle barriers along the international border would have no adverse direct effects to environmental resources in the proposed project area. However, indirect effects could occur to those areas outside of the project corridor because of the potential for shifting traffic patterns by the smugglers and UDAs. The magnitude of these effects is not identifiable or measurable at this time.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment U.S. Border Patrol Temporary Vehicle Barriers Naco and Douglas, Arizona November 2002 resulting in a FONSI October of 2002 (FONSI Date Problem)
The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) is planning to install a temporary vehicle barriers along a 25-mile corridor starting west of Black Draw, Arizona (approximately 28 miles east of Douglas) to the border of the eastern boundary of the Sari Pedro Riparian National Conservation Area (NCA), approximately 11 miles west of Naco.

The proposed action would allow the placement of temporary vehicle barriers at various locations along a 25-mile corridor within the Naco and Douglas AOs. The eastern terminus of the proposed corridor would be just west of Black Draw in the San Bernardino Valley, and the western limit is near the eastern boundary of the San Pedro Riparian NCA. The barriers would be placed in high illegal traffic areas on an as-needed basis and relocated to other areas, as USBP intelligence dictates. Thus, the entire corridor would not be barricaded at any given time.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the BA and the environmental design measures to be incorporated as part of the proposed action, it has concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant effect on the environment. For this reason no further environmental analysis is needed.

New Road Construction

Reference: Supplemental Environmental Assessment JTF-6 Fence and Road Construction, Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona July 1997 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This Environmental Assessment (EA) addresses the potential for significant adverse or beneficial environmental impacts in accordance with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). This document was tiered from existing EAs completed for previous construction activities (U.S. Army 1991a, 1993) in the same vicinity, and a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement completed for Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) activities along the U.S.-Mexico border (U.S. Army 1994). The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and the U.S. Border Patrol, Tucson Sector are proposing to replace approximately six miles of fence, construct 0.5 miles of new road, and improve 0.8 miles of road along the U.S.-Mexico border at Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona. Approximately 1.3 miles would be of decorative fence, with the remaining 4.9 miles of steel landing mat.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Supplemental Environmental Assessment Immigration and Naturalization Service Border Road Maintenance and Construction, Tecate to Campo, San Diego County, California April 1997 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This supplemental Environmental Assessment (EA) assesses the potential for significant adverse or beneficial environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives in accordance with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The proposed action involves approximately three miles of new road construction, which includes two miles of riparian area rehabilitation and one mile of highly erodible land rehabilitation on corresponding abandoned road sections, and approximately six miles of maintenance to existing border roads along the U.S.-Mexico border between Tecate and Campo, San Diego County, California. A Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) was prepared in 1994 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) proposed projects that facilitate law enforcement agencies (LEAs) missions to reduce illegal drug activity along the southwestern border of the U.S. (U.S. Army 1994b). The PEIS addressed the cumulative effects of past and reasonably foreseeable projects undertaken by JTF-6. Additionally, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USCOE), Los Angeles District, prepared two EAs (Tecate to Canyon City; Campo to Jacumba) for border road maintenance and construction activities in this region (U.S. Army 1993 and 1994a). This EA is a supplement to the JTF-6 PETS, and tiers from the PEIS and the two previous EAs.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA and the environmental design measures to be incorporated as part of the proposed action, it has been concluded that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Reference: Pre-Draft Environmental Assessment for Construction of Barrier Systems Border Field State Park to Gravel Pit and Tin Can Hill Areas San Diego California including Cumulative Impact Assessment for the Multiple Fence System Master Plan April 1999 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This Environmental Assessment analyzes and presents the direct and indirect environmental impacts associated with an Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) proposal to construct patrol roads, secondary fencing (including pedestrian, overhead rolling, and vehicle swing gate and "agent safety zones"), maintenance roads, tight standards, and remote video surveillance (RVS) cameras along two non-contiguous segments of the U.S./Mexico international boundary, in San Diego County, California. The EA also presents a cumulative impact assessment for implementation of the Multiple Fence System Master developed for San Diego, California. The Multiple Fence System Master Plan present a plan for enhanced border control along the international boundary in the U.S. Bord Patrol (USBP) San Diego Sector (Imperial Beach, Chula Vista, and Brown Field stations) using a combination of roads, lighting, and fences. This EA tiers from the 1994 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) Activities along he U.S./Mexico Border, prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Fort Worth District. The Proposed Action would take place in the Border Field State Park to Gravel Pit and Tin Can Hill areas of San Diego County, within the USBP San Diego Sector (Imperial Beach and Brown Field stations). The Proposed Action would occur entirely within an area defined as the "project corridor." The project corridor includes two, non-contiguous segments referred to as the "western segment" and "eastern segmenr" of the project corridor.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Supplemental Environmental Assessment of Remote Video Surveillance Systems (RVS) and Communication Towers (CTOW) for the US Border Patrol in the Harlingen, Laredo, and Eagle Pass Stations October 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed October 2003

This Supplemental Environmental Assessment (EA) supplements the Final EA of Remote Video Surveillance Systems (RVS) Systems and Communication Towers (CTOW) for the US Border Patrol in the Harlingen, Laredo, and Eagle Pass Stations. This Supplemental EA (SEA) addresses additional effects that

may potentially occur relative to proposed construction of an access road for the Walker Tower 2B site and proposed improvements to an existing access road for the Lupes Tower site. Both sites are located within the Laredo South Station's area of operations. The project consisted of construction of a new access road and upgrade of an existing roadway to provide access to two RVS sites: the Walker Tower 2B and Lupes Tower. The proposed construction consists of grading a 12-foot wide by 1,200-foot long access road at the Walker Tower 2B site and minor improvements to approximately 600 feet of an existing road at the Lupes Tower site.

Analysis: Based upon the results of these EAs, it was concluded that the project was not likely to adversely affect the environment; therefore, further environmental analysis is not warranted.

Reference: Final Supplemental Environmental Assessment for Various Infrastructure and Road Improvements from Canyon City, California to the Imperial County Line San Diego County, California November 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in November of 2003

The proposed actions consist of the construction of six night vision scope pads and access road construction and maintenance, 2.2 miles of road improvements to the SDG&E Road, an approximately 467-foot section of bypass road construction, and the installation of an approximately 650-foot section of fence and vehicle barriers. These improvements are proposed by the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) and would take place between Tecate and Tierra del Sol, California.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this analysis and assuming that all mitigation measures recommended herein are implemented, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the Proposed Action Alternative.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment Proposed JTF-6 mission JT423-98 Marfa, Texas February 1998 resulting in a FONSI signed in February of 1998

The scope of this EA addresses the potential impacts of proposed improvements on approximately 89.7 miles of existing road rights-of-way, construction of 1.8 miles of new road, and construction of some support facilities (e.g., helicopter landing pads, K-Span buildings, landing strips, obstacle course, etc.) in the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) Marfa Sector in Presidio and Jeff Davis counties, Texas. In addition, this EA also addresses the potential cumulative impacts associated with a Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) action in west Texas. A Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) was prepared in 1994 for the INS and JTF-6 proposed projects that facilitate Law Enforcement Agency (LEA) missions to reduce illegal drug activity along the southwestern border of the United States. The PEIS addresses the cumulative effects of past and future projects undertaken by JTF-6 for numerous LEAs within the four southwestern states (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California). This EA tiers from the PEIS.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for the Proposed JTF-6 missions JT513/515/425-98 Laredo, Texas January 1998 resulting in a FONSI signed in January of 1998

This Environmental Assessment addresses the potential impacts of proposed improvements on approximately 239.8 miles of existing road and ranch road rights-of-way in the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) Laredo area in Webb County and Carrizo Springs area in Maverick and Dimmit counties, Texas, and the potential cumulative impacts associated with a Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) action in the Laredo area. The Proposed Action seeks to improve 170.3 miles of existing, deteriorated roads and to construct 69.5 miles of new roads in Webb, Maverick, and Dimmit counties, Texas. A Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) was prepared in 1994 for the INS and JTF-6 proposed projects that facilitate Law Enforcement Agency (LEAs) missions to reduce illegal drug activity along the southwestern border of the United States. The PEIS addresses the cumulative effects of past and future projects undertaken by JTF-6 for numerous LEAs within the four southwestern states (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California). This EA tiers from the PEIS.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment For Naco Roadway and Fence Construction Naco, Cochise County, Arizona April 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in March of 2003 (FONSI date problem)
This EA analyzed infrastructure improvements, including the construction of 4 miles of roads and approximately 1.5 miles of fence. The 4 miles of road improvement would occur along the northern edge of the existing border road, 2 miles east and west of the Naco port of entry (POE), with a new access road to the border from the newly constructed Naco Highway. Landing mat or bollard fence, beginning approximately 1 mile west of the POE and continuing for a distance of 1 mile would replace existing vehicle barriers. An additional 0.5 miles of bollard fence would be installed in the natural washes and drains that transect the proposed road.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis and assuming that all design measures recommended herein are implemented, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the Proposed Action Alternative.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Ephriam Ridge Reclamation United States Border Patrol Tucson Sector, Nogales Station Santa Cruz County, Arizona March 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in March of 2003

The U.S. Border Patrol (USBP), Nogales Station, proposes to reclaim Ephriam Ridge, which is located in Santa Cruz County, Arizona. This action includes stabilizing the ridge to prevent soils from washing against the border fence. Failure to take any action could cause the fence to collapse under the weight of the soil. The proposed action addresses the effects of erosion control, fencing, grading, and construction of a central access road down Ephriam Ridge in an effort to reduce erosion. The proposed action includes modification of site topography, soil stabilization, installation of sediment basins, revegetation, and replacing the fence within the presently degraded area.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

Reference: Environmental Assessment Area Lighting, Fencing, and Roadways at the International Border San Diego, California resulting in a FONSI August 1997

The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) sought to implement a combined lighting, fencing, and roadway system along the U.S. border in three sections of 3.0 miles, 2.1 miles, and 2.25 each. The 7.35-mile long project originated about seven miles east of the Pacific Ocean, immediately north of the International Boundary between the United States and Mexico and terminates at the San Ysidro Mountain foothills. The project consisted of the installation of the following components approximately 150 feet north of the Border: (1) 45-foot high concrete light poles, spaced on average every 400 feet; (2) approximate 15-foot high security style fencing; and (3) 30-foot wide all-weather roadways parallel and adjacent to the fence both on the north and south sides.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this EA, no significant adverse environmental impacts would result from the proposed action. This determination is well supported, as it ties from our duplicates the work of multiple environmental analysis documents including: The 1997 Final EA for the INS Multi-Tiered Pilot Fence Project The 1993 Final EA for the JTF-6 San Diego Area Lighting System Project The 1993 Final EA for the JTF-6 San Diego Area Border Fence Project The Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PBS) prepared by the Fort Worth District to address the various measures to minimize illegal entries along the international border.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment Area Lighting, Fencing, and Roadways at International Border San Diego, California August 1997 resulting in a FONSI signed in August of 1997

This Environmental Assessment (EA) prepared for the Los Angeles District for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) Lighting, Fencing and Roads Project at the International Border San Diego, California. The INS proposes to implement a system of lighting, fencing, and roadways. The project consists of parallel construction of lighting, fencing, and roadways (total length about 7.3 miles) up to approximately 150 feet north of the existing border fence, originating at Arnie's Point (approximately seven miles east of the Pacific Ocean) and terminating at the San Ysidro Mountain foothills to the east. Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

E3* Acquisition, installation, operation, and maintenance of equipment, devices, and/or controls necessary to mitigate effects of DHS missions on health and the environment, including the execution of appropriate real estate agreements. Examples include but are not limited to:

- (a) Pollution prevention and pollution control equipment required to meet federal, tribal, state, or local requirements
 - (b) Noise abatement measures, including construction of noise barriers, installation of noise control materials, or planting native trees and/or native vegetation for use as a noise abatement measure
 - (c) Devices to protect human or animal life, such as raptor electrocution prevention devices, fencing to restrict wildlife movement on to airfields, fencing and grating to prevent accidental entry to hazardous or restricted areas, and rescue beacons to protect human life
- CAT IV

NAVY

Reference: 32CFR775.6

(7) Alteration of and additions to existing structures to conform or provide conforming use specifically required by new or existing applicable legislation or regulations, e.g., hush houses for aircraft engines and scrubbers for air emissions.

(29) Installation of devices to protect human or animal life, e.g., raptor electrocution prevention devices, fencing to restrict wildlife movement onto airfields, and fencing and grating to prevent accidental entry to hazardous areas.

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

2. Real and Personal Property Related Actions r. Installation of devices to protect human or animal life, such as raptor electrocution prevention devices, fencing to restrict wildlife movement on to airfields, and fencing and grating to prevent accidental entry to hazardous areas. (Checklist and CED required.)

BLM

Reference: Department of the Interior Departmental Manual – Part 516 5.4 Categorical Exclusions

H. Other (8) Installation of minor devices to protect human life (e.g. grates across mines.)

E4* Removal or demolition, along with subsequent disposal of debris to permitted or authorized off-site locations, of non-historic buildings, structures, other improvements, and/or equipment in compliance with applicable environmental and safety requirements.

CAT IV

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(xii) Demolition of structures and other improvements or disposal of uncontaminated structures and other improvements to permitted off-site locations, or both;

(xiii) Physical relocation of individual structures where FEMA has no involvement in the relocation site selection or development;

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

2. Real and Personal Property Related Actions o. Demolition of buildings, structures, or fixtures and disposal of subsequent building, structure, or fixture waste materials. (Checklist and CED required.)

E5 Natural resource management activities to enhance native flora and fauna, including site preparation and landscaping. CAT II (USCG, BTS, S&T)

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(xi) Planting of indigenous vegetation

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B. Section II

(d)(1) Land regeneration activities using only native trees and vegetation, including site preparation. This does not include forestry operations (REC required).

FAA

Reference: FAA Order 5050.4A Chapter 3, Section 23.

(a) (7) Landscaping generally, and landscaping or construction of physical barriers to diminish impact of airport blast and noise.

NAVY

Reference: 32CFR775.6

(33) Reintroduction of endemic or native species (other than endangered or threatened species) into their historic habitat when no substantial site preparation is involved.

USBP

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Ephriam Ridge Reclamation United States Border Patrol Tucson Sector, Nogales Station Santa Cruz County, Arizona March 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in March of 2003

The U.S. Border Patrol (USBP), Nogales Station, proposes to reclaim Ephriam Ridge, which is located in Santa Cruz County, Arizona. This action includes stabilizing the ridge to prevent soils from washing against the border fence. Failure to take any action could cause the fence to collapse under the weight of the soil. The proposed action addresses the effects of erosion control, fencing, grading, and construction of a central access road down Ephriam Ridge in an effort to reduce erosion. The proposed action includes modification of site topography, soil stabilization, installation of sediment basins, revegetation, and replacing the fence within the presently degraded area.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

E6 Construction or reconstruction of roads on previously disturbed areas on DHS facilities, where runoff, erosion, and sedimentation issues are mitigated through implementation of Best Management Practices. CAT II (USCG, BTS, S&T) INS

USBP

Reference: Supplemental EA USBP Hwy 94 (Dulzura) Check Point and Helipad and Truck Inspection Lane Improvements. San Diego County, CA resulting in a FONSI March 2002

This Supplemental Environmental Assessment from the USBP proposed construction and operation of a helipad (20 ft x 20 ft) and to widen the shoulder of Highway 94 for a total of 165 ft in length to create a truck inspection lane at the Duizura Check Point. The total area of the action was 22,500 sq ft. All activities took place within the existing check point boundaries and no additional lands were disturbed. The site for the truck lane was previously disturbed land and all of the 6 trees taken out to accommodate the inspection lane were relocated.

Through coordination with the appropriate resource agencies, this Supplemental EA determined there would be no significant adverse impacts to the environment from this action. In an effort to reduce impacts during the construction phase, USBP implemented several environmental design measures including: Implementing construction BMPs to address noise, air pollution and erosion.

Limiting construction to the non-nesting season for migratory birds. If this could not be done, then surveys for nesting birds would be completed and mitigation measures employed if they are found to be necessary. Helicopters would be maintained at the highest standards and hovering during take off and landing would be limited.

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

2. Real and Personal Property Related Actions q. Minor renovations and additions to buildings, roads, airfields, grounds, equipment, and other facilities that do not result in a change in functional use of the real property (e.g. realigning interior spaces of an existing building, extending an existing roadway in a developed area a short distance, installing a small antenna on an already existing antenna tower, adding a small storage shed to an existing building, etc.). (Checklist and CED required.) u. Routine repair and maintenance of buildings, roads, airfields, grounds, equipment, and other facilities which do not result in a change in functional use, or an impact on a historically significant element or setting

FAA

Reference: FAA Order 5050.4A Chapter 3, Section 23.

(a) (5) Construction, relocation or repair of entrance and service roadway.

E7 Construction of exercise and training trails for non-motorized use in areas that are not environmentally sensitive and that are located on DHS facilities, where run-off, erosion, and sedimentation are mitigated through implementation of Best Management Practices. CAT II (USCG, BTS, S&T)

DOE

Reference: 10 CFR Pt. 1021, Subpt. D. App. B

B1.13 Construction, acquisition, and relocation of onsite pathways and short onsite access roads and railroads.

USBP

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment Proposed JTF-6 mission JT423-98 Marfa, Texas February 1998 resulting in a FONSI signed in February of 1998

The scope of this EA addresses the potential impacts of proposed improvements on approximately 89.7 miles of existing road rights-of-way, construction of 1.8 miles of new road, and construction of some support facilities (e.g., helicopter landing pads, K-Span buildings, landing strips, obstacle course, etc.) in the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) Marfa Sector in Presidio and Jeff Davis counties, Texas. In addition, this EA also addresses the potential cumulative impacts associated with a Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) action in west Texas.

A Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) was prepared in 1994 for the INS and JTF-6 proposed projects that facilitate Law Enforcement Agency (LEA) missions to reduce illegal drug activity along the southwestern border of the United States. The PEIS addresses the cumulative effects of past and

future projects undertaken by JTF-6 for numerous LEAs within the four southwestern states (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California). This EA tiers from the PEIS.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment on Proposed JTF-6 mission JT032-93 Laredo, Texas July 1993 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The proposed action, Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) Mission JT032-93, would involve four separate actions at several locations in six south Texas counties. The proposed action would involve (1) repair and construction of approximately 150 miles of existing fire breaks along highway right-of-ways, (2) the repair/upgrade of approximately six miles of road along the Rio Grande within or near Laredo, (3) the upgrade/repair of three small-arms firing ranges at Freer, Hebbronville, and Laredo (4) the construction of a fitness/obstacle course at the Laredo Junior College in Laredo, Texas.

Analysis: Based on the finding of this environmental assessment and the mitigations which would be utilized during the construction phase, no significant impacts would occur during the proposed project.

E8* Construction of aquatic and riparian habitat in streams and ponds, using native materials or best natural resource management practices. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- (a) Installing or repairing gabions with stone from a nearby source
- (b) Adding brush for fish habitat
- (c) Stabilizing stream banks through bioengineering techniques
- (d) Removing and controlling exotic vegetation, not including the use of herbicides or non-native biological controls. CAT III (USCG, FLETC)

DOE

Reference: 10 CFR Pt. 1021, Subpt. D. App. B

B1.20 Small-scale activities undertaken to protect, restore, or improve fish and wildlife habitat, fish passage facilities (such as fish ladders or minor diversion channels), or fisheries.

USBP

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Southerly International Border Water Improvement Project March 2000 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act of 1974, Public Law 93- 320, authorized the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities in the Colorado River Basin to control the, salinity of water delivered to Mexico by the International Boundary and Water Commission. The purpose of this Environmental Assessment (EA) is to identify some proposed options developed by the Bureau of Reclamation, Yuma Area Office, and the International Boundary and Water Commission for the delivery of water to Mexico across the land boundary at San Luis, Arizona. Currently, water is delivered through the Sanchez Mejrada Canal at the southerly International Boundary (SIB). The water flow at the SIB fluctuates and flow variations render deliveries at the SIB unpredictable for both quantity and quality. This Environmental Assessment considers the following three alternatives to providing improved flows and less salty water to Mexico at the SIB: 1) Install variable speed motor controllers at the SIB Boundary Pumping Plant (BPP) and construct a diversion channel from the BPP to the Bypass Drain, 2) Install variable speed motor controllers at the SIB BPP without the construction of a diversion canal; and 3) no action.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Supplemental Environmental Assessment Immigration and Naturalization Service Border Road Maintenance and Construction, Tecate to Campo, San Diego County, California April 1997 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This supplemental Environmental Assessment (EA) assesses the potential for significant adverse or beneficial environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives in accordance with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The proposed action involves approximately three miles of new road construction, which includes two miles of riparian area rehabilitation and one mile of highly erodible land rehabilitation on corresponding abandoned road sections, and approximately six miles of maintenance to existing border roads along the U.S.-Mexico border between Tecate and Campo, San Diego County, California.

A Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) was prepared in 1994 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) proposed projects that facilitate law enforcement agencies (LEAs) missions to reduce illegal drug activity along the southwestern border of the U.S. (U.S. Army 1994b). The PEIS addressed the cumulative effects of past and reasonably foreseeable projects undertaken by JTF-6. Additionally, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USCOE), Los Angeles District, prepared two EAs (Tecate to Canyon City; Campo to Jacumba) for border road maintenance and construction activities in this region (U.S. Army 1993 and 1994a). This EA is a supplement to the JTF-6 PEIS, and tiers from the PEIS and the two previous EAs.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA and the environmental design measures to be incorporated as part of the proposed action, it has been concluded that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment Joint Task Force Six Proposed Fence Road Repair and Improvement Project Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona February 2001 resulting in a FONSI signed in February of 2001

A Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), prepared in 1994 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and JTF-6, addressed proposed projects that facilitate missions to reduce illegal drug activity trafficking. This Environmental Assessment (EA) tiers from the 1994 PEIS.

This EA addresses the potential impacts associated with a proposed fence and road improvement project along the U.S.-Mexico border in Cochise County, Arizona. The Proposed Action includes landing mat fence extension, installation of permanent lighting, road and hydrological repairs and improvements, and road maintenance. The Proposed Action specifically addresses the extension of an existing landing mat fence east of the Port of Entry (POE) for a distance of two miles, installation of permanent lighting east of the POE for a distance of 0.8 of a mile and west of the POE for a distance of one mile; repair/improvement the border road and hydrological conditions east of the POE for a distance of 4 miles and west of Whitewater Draw for a distance of 4 miles; and road maintenance west of the road repair section for a distance of eight miles near Douglas, Arizona.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

- E9* Except in environmentally sensitive areas, construction, operation, modification, or closure of:
- (a) Wells for drinking water, sampling, and watering landscaping at DHS facilities
 - (b) Septic systems in accordance with State and local environmental and health requirements
 - (c) Field instruments, such as stream-gauging stations, flow-measuring devices, telemetry systems, geo-technical monitoring tools, geophysical exploration tools, water-level recording devices, well logging systems, water sampling systems, ambient air monitoring equipment CAT III
(USCG, BTS, S&T)

FAA

Reference: FAA Order 5050.4A Chapter 3, Section 23.

(a) (7) Landscaping generally, and landscaping or construction of physical barriers to diminish impact of airport blast and noise.

USBP

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Various Road Improvements from Canyon City, California to The Imperial County Line San Diego County, California U.S. Border patrol March 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed in March of 2003

The proposed actions consists of: 1) the placement of up to 50 portable lights, as needed, within 60 feet of the border from the Pacific Crest Trail to the Imperial County line; 2) night vision scope pad and access road construction; 3) installation/repair of four drainage structures; 4) the installation of a 300-foot bollard fence section near Jacumba; 5) blasting activities; and 6) the installation of two water wells and holding tanks by the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP). All activities would take place between Canyon City, California and the Imperial County line in San Diego County, California.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this analysis and assuming that all mitigation measures recommended herein are implemented, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the Proposed Action Alternative.

Final Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Construction of a Temporary Border Patrol Station at Santa Teresa, New Mexico March 1995 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The proposed action is to construct a new United States Border Patrol station on a 15-acre site approximately 3 miles north of the Santa Teresa port of entry in Doña Ana County, New Mexico. The site is under lease to the Immigration and Naturalization Service for \$1 per year for 99 years. Construction would involve site preparation installation of security fencing, set up of portable buildings and a radio tower, drilling a water well, connection to municipal electrical power, installation of a septic system, construction of two ponding areas, installation of pavement, walkways, curbs, parking lights, and an above-ground fuel tank. The existing floor plan in the portable buildings would be modified and a vehicle canopy would be installed. A firing range and a horse barn with arena would be constructed at a later date.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

HAZARDOUS/RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

F1 Routine procurement, handling, recycling, and off-site disposal of hazardous material/waste that complies with applicable requirements. Examples include but are not limited to:

- (a) Process-related chemicals and metals used in repair, maintenance, alteration, and manufacturing
- (b) Routine transportation, distribution, use, storage, treatment, and disposal of solid waste, medical waste, radiological and special hazards conducted in accordance with all federal, state, local and tribal laws and regulations.
- (c) Hazardous waste minimization and recycling activities CAT I

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B. Section II

(h)(4) Routine management, to include transportation, distribution, use, storage, treatment, and disposal of solid waste, medical waste, radiological and special hazards (for example, asbestos, PCBs, lead-based paint, or unexploded ordnance), and/or hazardous waste that complies with EPA, Army, or other regulatory agency requirements. This CX is not applicable to new construction of facilities for such management purposes.

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

4. Operational Actions d.....the routine movement, handling, and distribution of non-hazardous and hazardous materials and wastes in accordance with applicable regulations.

FDA

Reference: 21 CFR 25.30

(m) Disposal of low-level radioactive waste materials (as defined in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission regulations at 10 CFR 61.2) and chemical waste materials generated in the laboratories serviced by the contracts administered by FDA, if the waste is disposed of in compliance with all applicable Federal, State, and local requirements.

DOE

Reference: 10 CFR Pt. 1021, Subpt. D. App. B

B2.6 Packaging, transportation, and storage of radioactive materials from the public domain, in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act upon a request by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or other cognizant agency, which would include a State that regulates radioactive materials under an agreement with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or other agencies that may, under unusual circumstances, have responsibilities regarding the materials that are included in the categorical exclusion. Covered materials are those for which possession and use by Nuclear Regulatory Commission licensees has been categorically excluded under 10 CFR 51.22(14) or its successors. Examples of these radioactive materials (which may contain source, byproduct or special nuclear materials) are density gauges, therapeutic medical devices, generators, reagent kits, irradiators, analytical instruments, well monitoring equipment, uranium shielding material, depleted uranium military munitions, and packaged radioactive waste not exceeding 50 curies.

F2 Use of instruments that contain hazardous, radioactive, and radiological materials. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- (a) Gauging devices, tracers, analytical instruments, and other devices containing sealed radiological and radioactive sources
- (b) Industrial radiography
- (c) Devices used in medical and veterinary practices
- (d) Installation, maintenance, non-destructive tests, and calibration CAT I

AIR FORCE

Reference: 32 CFR989 App. B

A2.3.27. Normal or routine basic and applied scientific research confined to the laboratory and in compliance with all applicable safety, environmental, and natural resource conservation laws.

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B. Section II

(h)(1) Use of gauging devices, analytical instruments, and other devices containing sealed radiological sources; use of industrial radiography; use of radioactive material in medical and veterinary practices; possession of radioactive material incident to performing services such as installation, maintenance, leak tests, and calibration; use of uranium as shielding material in containers or devices; and radioactive tracers (REC required).

NASA

NASA provides an exclusion from EIS production, though not necessarily from EA production at CFR 14 Sec 1216.305 (c) (3) which states:

Excluded are devices with millicurie quantities or less of radioactive materials used as instrument detectors and small radioisotope heaters used for local thermal control, provided they are properly contained and shielded.

USBP

Reference: Programmatic Environmental Assessment for GAMMA Imaging Inspection Systems resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

In March 2004, The United States (U.S.) Customs and Border Protection (CBP), analyzed A new method of conducting inspections involves the use of Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII) equipment based on technologies such as low-energy X-ray or low-energy gamma radiation sources to “see” into cargo containers and identify potential contraband. The Applied Technology Division (ATD) of CBP has examined gamma-imaging technologies for their suitability as parts of CBP’s inspection program. The Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA) documents a top-level evaluation of the potential environmental consequences resulting from deploying, installing, and operating of gamma imaging systems to inspect cargoes at air, sea and land ports of entry (POEs) throughout the U.S. and Puerto Rico. Analysis: After considering all relevant factors and issues, the PEA concludes that Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII) equipment would not significantly affect the physical, cultural, and socioeconomic environments. However this PEA mentioned that site-specific analyses will be performed for each location in the U.S. or Puerto Rico, where CBP installs VACIS II, Mobile VACIS, Pallet VACIS and/or Rail VACIS. Each site-specific analysis will be reported in a Supplemental Environmental Document, which will tier off of this PEA in accordance with 40 CFR Part 1508.28.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for Pulsed Fast Neutron Analysis Cargo Inspection System Test Facility at Ysleta Port of Entry Commercial Cargo Facility, El Paso, Texas 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed on XXXXX

This EA analyzed an extended real-life trial of Pulsed Fast Neutron Analysis (PFNA) system, a radiation-based method of Non-Intrusive Inspection Technology that allows CBP to examine cargoes without having to physically unload the cargo containers. Based on a review of candidate locations having a high volume of incoming commercial traffic, the Ysleta Commercial Cargo Facility in El Paso, Texas was identified as the best test site. Under the proposed action, the government will construct a test facility (approximately 9 months) and operate it with the commercial stream-of-commerce (for a maximum period of 6 months). Analysis: The EA analyzed the many potential environmental consequences and determined that all impacts would be negligible or minor. With the exception of radiation, the effects and consequences of the proposed action are not unlike constructing and operating a drive-through tollbooth plaza. With regard to radiation and air quality, a very small amount (a fraction of 1 percent of EPA’s allowable threshold) is released to the atmosphere. A small amount of solid radioactive waste will be disposed of using licensed contractors who typically handle hospital waste. Analyses have shown that the system is safe to operators, cargo and the general public. A stowaway in the cargo vehicle will be subjected to a maximum radiation dose the same as OSHA allows for general public over the course of a year. Weapons of mass destruction will not be initiated by the system. Analysis of possible accidents shows that worst-case radiation doses are below acceptable standards. The EA concluded that this trial would not significantly affect the physical, cultural, and socioeconomic environments.

Reference: Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Gamma Imaging Inspection Systems, Department of Homeland Security, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Applied Technology Division, March 12, 2004 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

Customs and Border Protection wrote this PEA to analyze the use of Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII) equipment based on technologies such as low-energy X-ray or low-energy gamma radiation sources to “see” into cargo containers and identify potential contraband. The PEA evaluated potential environmental consequences resulting from deploying, installing, and operating the four different configurations of

gamma imaging systems [known as the Vehicle and Cargo Inspection System (VACIS)] to inspect cargoes at air, sea and land ports of entry (POEs) throughout the U.S. and Puerto Rico.

Analysis: The PEA analyzed the likely environmental consequences, including the radiological consequences, and concluded that VACIS is not expected to significantly affect the physical, cultural, and socioeconomic environments.

DOE

Reference: 10 CFR Pt. 1021, Subpt. D. App. B

B2.6 Packaging, transportation, and storage of radioactive materials from the public domain, in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act upon a request by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or other cognizant agency, which would include a State that regulates radioactive materials under an agreement with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or other agencies that may, under unusual circumstances, have responsibilities regarding the materials that are included in the categorical exclusion. Covered materials are those for which possession and use by Nuclear Regulatory Commission licensees has been categorically excluded under 10 CFR 51.22(14) or its successors. Examples of these radioactive materials (which may contain source, byproduct or special nuclear materials) are density gauges, therapeutic medical devices, generators, reagent kits, irradiators, analytical instruments, well monitoring equipment, uranium shielding material, depleted uranium military munitions, and packaged radioactive waste not exceeding 50 curies.

B3.12 Siting, construction (or modification), operation, and decommissioning of microbiological and biomedical diagnostic, treatment and research facilities (excluding Biosafety Level-3 and Biosafety Level-4; reference: Biosafety in Microbiological and Biomedical Laboratories, 3rd Edition, May 1993, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Public Health Service, Centers of Disease Control and Prevention, and the National Institutes of Health (HHS Publication No. (CDC) 93-8395)) including, but not limited to, laboratories, treatment areas, offices, and storage areas, within or contiguous to an already developed area (where active utilities and currently used roads are readily accessible). Operation may include the purchase, installation, and operation of biomedical equipment, such as commercially available cyclotrons that are used to generate radioisotopes and radiopharmaceuticals, and commercially available biomedical imaging and spectroscopy instrumentation.

B7.2 Approval of import or export of small quantities of special nuclear materials or isotopic materials in accordance with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 and the "Procedures Established Pursuant to the Nuclear Non Proliferation Act of 1978" (43 FR 25326, June 9, 1978).

NRC

Reference: 10 CFR § 51.22

14) Issuance, amendment, or renewal of materials licenses issued pursuant to 10 CFR Parts 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 40 or part 70 authorizing the following types of activities:

- (i) Distribution of radioactive material and devices or products containing radioactive material to general licensees and to persons exempt from licensing.
- (ii) Distribution of radiopharmaceuticals, generators, reagent kits and/or sealed sources to persons licensed pursuant to 10 CFR 35.18.
- (iii) Nuclear pharmacies.
- (iv) Medical and veterinary.
- (v) Use of radioactive materials for research and development and for educational purposes.
- (vi) Industrial radiography.
- (vii) Irradiators.
- (viii) Use of sealed sources and use of gauging devices, analytical instruments and other devices containing sealed sources.
- (ix) Use of uranium as shielding material in containers or devices.

- (x) Possession of radioactive material incident to performing services such as installation, maintenance, leak tests and calibration.
- (xi) Use of sealed sources and/or radioactive tracers in well-logging procedures.
- (xii) Acceptance of packaged radioactive wastes from others for transfer to licensed land burial facilities provided the interim storage period for any package does not exceed 180 days and the total possession limit for all packages held in interim storage at the same time does not exceed 50 curies.
- (xiii) Manufacturing or processing of source, byproduct, or special nuclear materials for distribution to other licensees, except processing of source material for extraction of rare earth and other metals.
- (xiv) Nuclear laundries.
- (xv) Possession, manufacturing, processing, shipment, testing, or other use of depleted uranium military munitions.
- (xvi) Any use of source, byproduct, or special nuclear material not listed above which involves quantities and forms of source, byproduct, or special nuclear material similar to those listed in paragraphs (c)(14) (i) through (xv) of this section (Category 14).

NEPA WORKING GROUP CONSENSUS

As a R&D lab Environmental Measurements Laboratory uses instruments that have sealed sources such as Gas Chromatographs that have a Ni source. These instruments are found in commercial labs, hospital labs, and teaching institutions. When such an instrument is discarded, the source is removed and disposed of as radioactive waste. The use of analytical instruments should not require an EA. As part of the instrument design process, the engineers follow Design in Safety Protocol. The instrument is designed to minimize or protect the worker (user) and the environment (public) from adverse health effects or physical injury including pollution prevention and waste minimization in the design process. Environmental Safety & Health is part of the design process, not an after thought. We also calibrate instruments or devices with known quantified radiological sources. There are Standard Operating Procedures to perform this work that eliminate any adverse effects to the worker or the environment.

Alfred Crescenzi
Industrial Hygienist-Laboratory Safety Officer
United States Department of Homeland Security

F3 Use, transportation, and placement of Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) approved, sealed, small source radiation devices for scanning vehicles and packages where radiation exposure to employees or the public does not exceed 0.1 rem per year and where systems are maintained within the NRC license parameters at existing facilities. CAT II (USCG, BTS, SS)

AIR FORCE

Reference: 32 CFR989 App. B

A2.3.27. Normal or routine basic and applied scientific research confined to the laboratory and in compliance with all applicable safety, environmental, and natural resource conservation laws.

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B. Section II

(h)(1) Use of gauging devices, analytical instruments, and other devices containing sealed radiological sources; use of industrial radiography; use of radioactive material in medical and veterinary practices; possession of radioactive material incident to performing services such as installation, maintenance, leak tests, and calibration; use of uranium as shielding material in containers or devices; and radioactive tracers (REC required).

NASA

NASA provides an exclusion from EIS production, though not necessarily from EA production at CFR 14 Sec 1216.305 (c) (3) which states:

Excluded are devices with millicurie quantities or less of radioactive materials used as instrument detectors and small radioisotope heaters used for local thermal control, provided they are properly contained and shielded.

USBP

Reference: Programmatic Environmental Assessment for GAMMA Imaging Inspection Systems resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

In March 2004, The United States (U.S.) Customs and Border Protection (CBP), analyzed A new method of conducting inspections involves the use of Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII) equipment based on technologies such as low-energy X-ray or low-energy gamma radiation sources to “see” into cargo containers and identify potential contraband. The Applied Technology Division (ATD) of CBP has examined gamma-imaging technologies for their suitability as parts of CBP’s inspection program. The Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA) documents a top-level evaluation of the potential environmental consequences resulting from deploying, installing, and operating of gamma imaging systems to inspect cargoes at air, sea and land ports of entry (POEs) throughout the U.S. and Puerto Rico. Analysis: After considering all relevant factors and issues, the PEA concludes that Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII) equipment would not significantly affect the physical, cultural, and socioeconomic environments. However this PEA mentioned that site-specific analyses will be performed for each location in the U.S. or Puerto Rico, where CBP installs VACIS II, Mobile VACIS, Pallet VACIS and/or Rail VACIS. Each site-specific analysis will be reported in a Supplemental Environmental Document, which will tier off of this PEA in accordance with 40 CFR Part 1508.28.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for Pulsed Fast Neutron Analysis Cargo Inspection System Test Facility at Ysleta Port of Entry Commercial Cargo Facility, El Paso, Texas XXX 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This EA analyzed an extended real-life trial of Pulsed Fast Neutron Analysis (PFNA) system, a radiation-based method of Non-Intrusive Inspection Technology that allows CBP to examine cargoes without having to physically unload the cargo containers. Based on a review of candidate locations having a high volume of incoming commercial traffic, the Ysleta Commercial Cargo Facility in El Paso, Texas was identified as the best test site. Under the proposed action, the government will construct a test facility (approximately 9 months) and operate it with the commercial stream-of-commerce (for a maximum period of 6 months). Analysis: The EA analyzed the many potential environmental consequences and determined that all impacts would be negligible or minor. With the exception of radiation, the effects and consequences of the proposed action are not unlike constructing and operating a drive-through tollbooth plaza. With regard to radiation and air quality, a very small amount (a fraction of 1 percent of EPA’s allowable threshold) is released to the atmosphere. A small amount of solid radioactive waste will be disposed of using licensed contractors who typically handle hospital waste. Analyses have shown that the system is safe to operators, cargo and the general public. A stowaway in the cargo vehicle will be subjected to a maximum radiation dose the same as OSHA allows for general public over the course of a year. Weapons of mass destruction will not be initiated by the system. Analysis of possible accidents shows that worst-case radiation doses are below acceptable standards. The EA concluded that this trial would not significantly affect the physical, cultural, and socioeconomic environments.

Reference: Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Gamma Imaging Inspection Systems, Department of Homeland Security, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Applied Technology Division, March 12, 2004 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

Customs and Border Protection wrote this PEA to analyze the use of Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII) equipment based on technologies such as low-energy X-ray or low-energy gamma radiation sources to “see” into cargo containers and identify potential contraband. The PEA evaluated potential environmental consequences resulting from deploying, installing, and operating the four different configurations of gamma imaging systems [known as the Vehicle and Cargo Inspection System (VACIS)] to inspect cargoes at air, sea and land ports of entry (POEs) throughout the U.S. and Puerto Rico.

Analysis: The PEA analyzed the likely environmental consequences, including the radiological consequences, and concluded that VACIS is not expected to significantly affect the physical, cultural, and socioeconomic environments.

DOE

Reference: 10 CFR Pt. 1021, Subpt. D. App. B

B2.6 Packaging, transportation, and storage of radioactive materials from the public domain, in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act upon a request by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or other cognizant agency, which would include a State that regulates radioactive materials under an agreement with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or other agencies that may, under unusual circumstances, have responsibilities regarding the materials that are included in the categorical exclusion. Covered materials are those for which possession and use by Nuclear Regulatory Commission licensees has been categorically excluded under 10 CFR 51.22(14) or its successors. Examples of these radioactive materials (which may contain source, byproduct or special nuclear materials) are density gauges, therapeutic medical devices, generators, reagent kits, irradiators, analytical instruments, well monitoring equipment, uranium shielding material, depleted uranium military munitions, and packaged radioactive waste not exceeding 50 curies.

B3.12 Siting, construction (or modification), operation, and decommissioning of microbiological and biomedical diagnostic, treatment and research facilities (excluding Biosafety Level-3 and Biosafety Level-4; reference: Biosafety in Microbiological and Biomedical Laboratories, 3rd Edition, May 1993, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Public Health Service, Centers of Disease Control and Prevention, and the National Institutes of Health (HHS Publication No. (CDC) 93-8395)) including, but not limited to, laboratories, treatment areas, offices, and storage areas, within or contiguous to an already developed area (where active utilities and currently used roads are readily accessible). Operation may include the purchase, installation, and operation of biomedical equipment, such as commercially available cyclotrons that are used to generate radioisotopes and radiopharmaceuticals, and commercially available biomedical imaging and spectroscopy instrumentation.

B7.2 Approval of import or export of small quantities of special nuclear materials or isotopic materials in accordance with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 and the “Procedures Established Pursuant to the Nuclear Non Proliferation Act of 1978” (43 FR 25326, June 9, 1978).

NRC

Reference: 10 CFR § 51.22

14) Issuance, amendment, or renewal of materials licenses issued pursuant to 10 CFR Parts 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 40 or part 70 authorizing the following types of activities:

- (i) Distribution of radioactive material and devices or products containing radioactive material to general licensees and to persons exempt from licensing.
- (ii) Distribution of radiopharmaceuticals, generators, reagent kits and/or sealed sources to persons licensed pursuant to 10 CFR 35.18.
- (iii) Nuclear pharmacies.
- (iv) Medical and veterinary.
- (v) Use of radioactive materials for research and development and for educational purposes.
- (vi) Industrial radiography.

- (vii) Irradiators.
- (viii) Use of sealed sources and use of gauging devices, analytical instruments and other devices containing sealed sources.
- (ix) Use of uranium as shielding material in containers or devices.
- (x) Possession of radioactive material incident to performing services such as installation, maintenance, leak tests and calibration.
- (xi) Use of sealed sources and/or radioactive tracers in well-logging procedures.
- (xii) Acceptance of packaged radioactive wastes from others for transfer to licensed land burial facilities provided the interim storage period for any package does not exceed 180 days and the total possession limit for all packages held in interim storage at the same time does not exceed 50 curies.
- (xiii) Manufacturing or processing of source, byproduct, or special nuclear materials for distribution to other licensees, except processing of source material for extraction of rare earth and other metals.
- (xiv) Nuclear laundries.
- (xv) Possession, manufacturing, processing, shipment, testing, or other use of depleted uranium military munitions.
- (xvi) Any use of source, byproduct, or special nuclear material not listed above which involves quantities and forms of source, byproduct, or special nuclear material similar to those listed in paragraphs (c)(14) (i) through (xv) of this section (Category 14).

NEPA WORKING GROUP CONSENSUS

As a R&D lab Environmental Measurements Laboratory uses instruments that have sealed sources such as Gas Chromatographs that have a Ni source. These instruments are found in commercial labs, hospital labs, and teaching institutions. When such an instrument is discarded, the source is removed and disposed of as radioactive waste. The use of analytical instruments should not require an EA. As part of the instrument design process, the engineers follow Design in Safety Protocol. The instrument is designed to minimize or protect the worker (user) and the environment (public) from adverse health effects or physical injury including pollution prevention and waste minimization in the design process. Environmental Safety & Health is part of the design process, not an after thought. We also calibrate instruments or devices with known quantified radiological sources. There are Standard Operating Procedures to perform this work that eliminate any adverse effects to the worker or the environment.

Alfred Crescenzi
 Industrial Hygienist-Laboratory Safety Officer
 United States Department of Homeland Security

TRAINING AND EXERCISES

G1 Training of homeland security personnel, including international, tribal, state, and local agency representatives using existing facilities where the training occurs in accordance with applicable permits and other requirements for the protection of the environment. This exclusion does not apply to training that involves the use of live chemical, biological, or radiological agents except when conducted at a location designed and constructed for that training. Examples include but are not limited to:

- (a) Administrative or classroom training
- (b) Tactical training, including but not limited to training in explosives and incendiary devices, arson investigation and firefighting, and emergency preparedness and response
- (c) Vehicle and small boat operation training
- (d) Small arms and less-than-lethal weapons training
- (e) Security specialties and terrorist response training

- (f) Crowd control training, including gas range training
- (g) Enforcement response, self-defense, and interdiction techniques training
- (h) Techniques for use in fingerprinting and drug analysis CAT IV

USDA-ARS

Reference: 7 CFR 1b.3

(4) Educational and informational programs and activities;

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B. Section II

(i)(2) Training entirely of an administrative or classroom nature.

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

3. Training a. Defense preparedness training and exercises conducted on Coast Guard controlled property that do not involve undeveloped property or increased noise levels over adjacent property and that involve a limited number of personnel, such as exercises involving primarily electronic simulation or command post personnel. (Checklist and CED required.) b. Defense preparedness training and exercises conducted on other than USCG property, where the lead agency or department is not USCG or DOT and the lead agency or department has completed its NEPA analysis and documentation requirements. c. Simulated exercises, including tactical and logistical exercises that involve small numbers of personnel. d. Training of an administrative or classroom nature.

DOE

Reference: 10 CFR Pt. 1021, Subpt. D. App. B

B1.2 Training exercises and simulations (including, but not limited to, firing-range training, emergency response training, fire fighter and rescue training, and spill cleanup training).

APHIS

Reference: 7CFR372.5 (c) and 7CFR1b.3 (a)

7CFR1b.3 (a) (4) Educational and informational programs and activities;

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(v) Training activities and both training and operational exercises utilizing existing facilities in accordance with established procedures and land use designations

USBP

Reference: Environmental Assessment on Proposed JTF-6 Projects in West Texas September 1993 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The proposed action would involve four separate projects at several locations in seven southwest Texas counties. The proposed projects are: (1) the repair/upgrade of approximately 150 miles (241 kilometers) of existing roads in Terrell, Brewster, Presidio, Jeff Davis, Culberson, and Hudspeth counties; (2) the construction of helicopter landing zones at radio repeater stations on Christmas Mountain, Santiago Peak, and Tres Hermanos in Brewster County and Mount Livermore in Jeff Davis County; (3) the upgrade of an existing firing range near Fabens in El Paso County; and (4) the construction of a U.S. Border Patrol check station on U.S. Highway 62-180 in El Paso County.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for the Construction of Weapons Training Facility for the U.S. Border Patrol Tactical Unit (BORTAC) April 1995 resulting in a FONSI signed in April of 1995
The proposed training facility will be constructed at Range 8, Meyer Range Complex, Ft Bliss, Texas. Range S was previously used as a firing range and will require only minor modifications.
Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted. A final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) was completed on November 30, 1994, describing cumulative environmental impacts.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment on Proposed JTF-6 mission JT032-93 Laredo, Texas July 1993 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX
The proposed action, Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) Mission JT032-93, would involve four separate actions at several locations in six south Texas counties. The proposed action would involve (1) repair and construction of approximately 150 miles of existing fire breaks along highway right-of-ways, (2) the repair/upgrade of approximately six miles of road along the Rio Grande within or near Laredo, (3) the upgrade/repair of three small-arms firing ranges at Freer, Hebbronville, and Laredo (4) the construction of a fitness/obstacle course at the Laredo Junior College in Laredo, Texas.
Analysis: Based on the finding of this environmental assessment and the mitigations which would be utilized during the construction phase, no significant impacts would occur during the proposed project.

Reference: Environmental Assessment of Joint Task Force Six, Small Arms Firing Range Sweetwater, Texas April 1992 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX
Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) is proposing to provide Federal, State, and local law/drug enforcement agencies with a small arms firing range. In addition, this operation will provide deployment and sustainment engineering training for a military construction unit. The project will be the renovation of an existing small arms firing range located near Sweetwater, Texas.
Analysis: Based upon the results of this Environmental Assessment and the results of coordination, it has been concluded that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse effect on the human environment nor is it environmentally controversial. In addition, the reconstruction of the firing range near Sweetwater, Texas will not constitute a major Federal action of sufficient magnitude to warrant preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Joint Task Force Six Operation 23-90/20-91 Nogales, Santa Cruz County, Arizona July 1991 resulting in a FONSI signed in July of 1991
This Environmental Assessment prepared for the Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) Project, Nogales, Santa Cruz County, Arizona. This Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared to analyze the proposed project, located east of Nogales, Arizona, along the United States and Mexico border, which consists of construction of a firearms training facility on 50 acres of city—owned land; improving about 12 miles of roadway; and construction of about a mile of new roadway, including one wood bridge across a large wash.
Analysis: I have considered the available information contained in this Environmental Assessment and it is my determination that the proposed project will not result in a significant effect on the existing environment. Therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (E) is not required.

FLETC

Reference: Environmental Assessment for the Construction of a Physical Security Training Facility, Building 15, for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) at Glynco, Georgia resulting in a FONSI signed on 9/19/2000.
The proposed action would consist of construction a new building (Building #15) at the intersection of Legislative Drive and Records Avenue to house the physical security training that is presently being

conducted in Building #146. The building would be called the Physical Security Training Facility. The work would include:

- (1) Construction of a 12,000 square foot, one-story, standing seam galvanized steel roofed building, with architectural concrete masonry for the exterior bearing walls;
- (2) Site improvements consisting of storm drainage, walkways and landscaping;
- (3) Connection to the FLETC-wide underground chilled water and natural gas distribution loops. The new chilled water loop (supply and return lines) would connect to the nearest existing valve pit located approximately 800 feet southeast of the new facility;
- (4) Restoration of a roughly 5,000 square-foot existing paved area for parking;
- (5) Relocation of the training activities from Building #146; and
- (6) Modification and reuse of the existing training facility for other ongoing FLETC activities.

Analysis: Based upon the findings of this analysis no significant adverse impacts would occur from these activities.

Reference: An Amendment to Include a Covered Outdoor Firing Range to an Environmental Assessment for the Canine Enforcement Training Center Front Royal, Virginia, Department of the Treasury U.S. Customs Service, National Logistics Center 6026 Lakeside Boulevard Indianapolis, Indiana 46278. Original document dated April 1, 1994; Amendment dated January 3, 1995. resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This is an addendum to include a Covered Outdoor Firing Range to the original Environmental Assessment that encompassed both Site "A", the 13.4 acre main campus, and Site "B", location of proposed construction of new facilities on a 282 acre tract of land, (hereafter referred to as the Master Plan). The following is a description of the proposed covered outdoor firing range at Site "B".

Analysis: There is no anticipated adverse environmental effect as the range will be used only during scheduled class times and will be maintained on a regular basis keeping lead particulates confined to the concrete slab and the bullet trap. Rain and snow runoff will be controlled by the roof covering and downspouts minimizing the potential for any lead particulates to enter into the local watershed. The sound generated will be attenuated by the enclosed design and sound absorbing materials creating a possible reduction in the current noise level.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment, U.S. Customs Service Firearms Training Facility Harpers Ferry, West Virginia July 2002, resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This Final Environmental Assessment analyzed the construction of the Firearms training facility on a 104-Acre Parcel: The proposed Harpers Ferry Firearms Training Facility would be constructed on an approximately 104-acre site within Jefferson County, West Virginia. Construction of the Harpers Ferry Training Facility, under this alternative would utilize 60-acres transferred to the U.S. Customs Service from the National Park Service, along with administrative jurisdiction, as required by PL 106-246 and the "Agreement to Transfer Administrative Jurisdiction of Land" and a 45-foot right-of-way. A 7-acre privately-owned parcel and a 37-acre privately-owned parcel would need to be acquired for implementation of this alternative.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed actions.

Reference: Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact Explosives Range Modification Federal Law Enforcement Training Center Glynco, Georgia October 1995. resulting in a FONSI signed on October 10, 1995

This EA analyzed the construction of a classroom building, ammunition/explosives storage bunkers and associated site improvements. The building would be at the location of the existing explosives range trailer at the northeast quadrant of the FLETC property, east of the driver training course.

(ii) Preparation, revision, and adoption of regulations, directives, manuals, and other guidance documents related to actions that qualify for categorical exclusions

FAA

Reference: FAA order 1050.1d Chapter 31 (a)

(5) Policy and planning documents not intended for or which do not cause direct implementation of project or system actions

Reference: FAA Order 5050.4A Chapter 3, Section 23.

(b) (6) Issuance of airport policy and planning documents including the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS), Airport Improvement Program (AIP) priority system, advisory circulars on planning, design, and development programs which are not intended for direct implementation or which are issued by FAA as administrative and technical guidance to the public.

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

1. Administrative Actions: e. Preparation of guidance documents that implement, without substantive change, the applicable Commandant Instruction or other Federal agency regulations, procedures, manuals, and other guidance documents.

6. Bridge Administration Actions e. Promulgation of operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. f. Identification of advance approval waterways under 33 CFR 115.70.

7. Regulatory Actions a. Regulations concerning vessel operation safety standards (e.g., regulations requiring: certain boaters to use approved equipment which is required to be installed such as an ignition cut-off switch, or carried on board, such as personal flotation devices (PFDS), and/or stricter blood alcohol concentration (BAC) standards for recreational boaters, etc.), equipment approval, and/or equipment carriage requirements (e.g. personal flotation devices (PFDs) and visual distress signals (VDS's)). b. Congressionally mandated regulations designed to improve or protect the environment (e.g., regulations implementing the requirements of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, such as those requiring vessels to have the capability to transmit and receive on radio channels that would allow them to receive critical safety and navigation warnings in U.S. waters, regulations to increase civil penalties against persons responsible for the discharge of oil or hazardous substances into U.S. waters, etc.). (Checklist and CED required.) c. Regulations which are editorial or procedural, such as those updating addresses or establishing application procedures. d. Regulations concerning internal agency functions or organization or personnel administration, such as funding, establishing Captain of the Port boundaries, or delegating authority. e. Regulations concerning the training, qualifying, licensing, and disciplining of maritime personnel. f. Regulations concerning manning, documentation, admeasurement, inspection, and equipping of vessels. g. Regulations concerning equipment approval and carriage requirements. h. Regulations establishing, disestablishing, or changing the size of Special Anchorage Areas or anchorage grounds. (Checklist and CED not required for actions that disestablish or reduce the size of the Area or grounds). i. Regulations establishing, disestablishing, or changing Regulated Navigation Areas and security or safety zones. (Checklist and CED not required for actions that disestablish or reduce the size of the area or zone. For temporary areas and zones that are established to deal with emergency situations and that are less than one week in duration, the checklist and CED are not required. For temporary areas and zones that are established to deal with emergency situations and that are one week or longer in duration, the checklist and CED will be prepared and submitted after issuance or publication.) j. Special local regulations issued in conjunction with a regatta or marine parade; provided that, if a permit is required, the environmental analysis conducted for the permit included an analysis of the impact of the regulations. (Checklist and CED not required) k. Regulations in aid of navigation, such as those concerning rules of the road, International Regulations for the Prevention of Collisions at Sea (COLREGS), bridge-to-bridge communications, vessel traffic services, and marking of navigation systems.

H2 Issuance of grants for the conduct of security-related research and development or the implementation of security plans or other measures at existing facilities.

FAA

Reference: FAA order 1050.1d Chapter 31 (a)

(3) Planning grants which do not imply a project commitment

Reference: FAA Order 5050.4A Chapter 3, Section 23.

(b) (3) Issuance of airport planning grants.

(b) (8) Issuance of grants for preparation of noise exposure maps and noise compatibility programs per sections 103(a) and 104(a) of the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979 and 14 CFR Part 150 determinations on noise exposure maps and approval of noise compatibility programs.

USDA-ARS

Reference: 7 CFR 1b.3

(2) Activities which deal solely with the funding of programs, such as program budget proposals, disbursements, and transfer or reprogramming of funds;

H3 Issuance of planning documents and advisory circulars on planning for security measures which are not intended for direct implementation or are issued as administrative and technical guidance

APHIS

Reference: 7CFR372.5 (c) and 7CFR1b.3 (a)

7CFR1b.3 (a) (1) Policy development, planning and implementation which relate to routine activities, such as personnel, organizational changes, or similar administrative functions;

USDA-ARS

Reference: 7 CFR 1b.3

(6) Activities which are advisory and consultative to other agencies and public and private entities, such as legal counseling and representation;

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(ii) Preparation, revision, and adoption of regulations, directives, manuals, and other guidance documents related to actions that qualify for categorical exclusions

FAA

Reference: FAA order 1050.1d Chapter 31 (a)

(5) Policy and planning documents not intended for or which do not cause direct implementation of project or system actions

Reference: FAA Order 5050.4A Chapter 3, Section 23.

(b) (6) Issuance of airport policy and planning documents including the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS), Airport Improvement Program (AIP) priority system, advisory circulars on planning, design, and development programs which are not intended for direct implementation or which are issued by FAA as administrative and technical guidance to the public.

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

1. Administrative Actions: e. Preparation of guidance documents that implement, without substantive change, the applicable Commandant Instruction or other Federal agency regulations, procedures, manuals, and other guidance documents.

6. Bridge Administration Actions e. Promulgation of operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. f. Identification of advance approval waterways under 33 CFR 115.70.

7. Regulatory Actions a. Regulations concerning vessel operation safety standards (e.g., regulations requiring: certain boaters to use approved equipment which is required to be installed such as an ignition cut-off switch, or carried on board, such as personal flotation devices (PFDS), and/or stricter blood alcohol concentration (BAC) standards for recreational boaters, etc.), equipment approval, and/or equipment carriage requirements (e.g. personal flotation devices (PFDs) and visual distress signals (VDS's)). b. Congressionally mandated regulations designed to improve or protect the environment (e.g., regulations implementing the requirements of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, such as those requiring vessels to have the capability to transmit and receive on radio channels that would allow them to receive critical safety and navigation warnings in U.S. waters, regulations to increase civil penalties against persons responsible for the discharge of oil or hazardous substances into U.S. waters, etc.). (Checklist and CED required.) c. Regulations which are editorial or procedural, such as those updating addresses or establishing application procedures. d. Regulations concerning internal agency functions or organization or personnel administration, such as funding, establishing Captain of the Port boundaries, or delegating authority. e. Regulations concerning the training, qualifying, licensing, and disciplining of maritime personnel. f. Regulations concerning manning, documentation, admeasurement, inspection, and equipping of vessels. g. Regulations concerning equipment approval and carriage requirements. h. Regulations establishing, disestablishing, or changing the size of Special Anchorage Areas or anchorage grounds. (Checklist and CED not required for actions that disestablish or reduce the size of the Area or grounds). i. Regulations establishing, disestablishing, or changing Regulated Navigation Areas and security or safety zones. (Checklist and CED not required for actions that disestablish or reduce the size of the area or zone. For temporary areas and zones that are established to deal with emergency situations and that are less than one week in duration, the checklist and CED are not required. For temporary areas and zones that are established to deal with emergency situations and that are one week or longer in duration, the checklist and CED will be prepared and submitted after issuance or publication.) j. Special local regulations issued in conjunction with a regatta or marine parade; provided that, if a permit is required, the environmental analysis conducted for the permit included an analysis of the impact of the regulations. (Checklist and CED not required) k. Regulations in aid of navigation, such as those concerning rules of the road, International Regulations for the Prevention of Collisions at Sea (COLREGS), bridge-to-bridge communications, vessel traffic services, and marking of navigation systems.

- H4 Issuance or revocation of certificates or other approvals, including but not limited to:
- (a) Airmen certificates
 - (b) Security procedures at general aviation airports
 - (c) Airport security plans

FAA

Reference: FAA order 1050.1d Chapter 31 (a)

(8) the approval or issuance of certificates covering medicals for airmen, delegated authority, ground schools, out-of-agency training, and aircraft repair or maintenance not affecting noise, emissions, or wastes.

Reference: FAA Order 5050.4A Chapter 3, Section 23.

(b) (7) Issuance of certificates and related actions under the Airport Certification Program (14 CFR Part 139).

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

1. Administrative Actions: e. Preparation of guidance documents that implement, without substantive change, the applicable Commandant Instruction or other Federal agency regulations, procedures, manuals, and other guidance documents.
6. Bridge Administration Actions e. Promulgation of operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges.
- f. Identification of advance approval waterways under 33 CFR 115.70.
7. Regulatory Actions a. Regulations concerning vessel operation safety standards (e.g., regulations requiring: certain boaters to use approved equipment which is required to be installed such as an ignition cut-off switch, or carried on board, such as personal flotation devices (PFDS), and/or stricter blood alcohol concentration (BAC) standards for recreational boaters, etc.), equipment approval, and/or equipment carriage requirements (e.g. personal flotation devices (PFDs) and visual distress signals (VDS's)). b. Congressionally mandated regulations designed to improve or protect the environment (e.g., regulations implementing the requirements of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, such as those requiring vessels to have the capability to transmit and receive on radio channels that would allow them to receive critical safety and navigation warnings in U.S. waters, regulations to increase civil penalties against persons responsible for the discharge of oil or hazardous substances into U.S. waters, etc.). (Checklist and CED required.) c. Regulations which are editorial or procedural, such as those updating addresses or establishing application procedures. d. Regulations concerning internal agency functions or organization or personnel administration, such as funding, establishing Captain of the Port boundaries, or delegating authority. e. Regulations concerning the training, qualifying, licensing, and disciplining of maritime personnel. f. Regulations concerning manning, documentation, admeasurement, inspection, and equipping of vessels. g. Regulations concerning equipment approval and carriage requirements. h. Regulations establishing, disestablishing, or changing the size of Special Anchorage Areas or anchorage grounds. (Checklist and CED not required for actions that disestablish or reduce the size of the Area or grounds). i. Regulations establishing, disestablishing, or changing Regulated Navigation Areas and security or safety zones. (Checklist and CED not required for actions that disestablish or reduce the size of the area or zone. For temporary areas and zones that are established to deal with emergency situations and that are less than one week in duration, the checklist and CED are not required. For temporary areas and zones that are established to deal with emergency situations and that are one week or longer in duration, the checklist and CED will be prepared and submitted after issuance or publication.) j. Special local regulations issued in conjunction with a regatta or marine parade; provided that, if a permit is required, the environmental analysis conducted for the permit included an analysis of the impact of the regulations. (Checklist and CED not required) k. Regulations in aid of navigation, such as those concerning rules of the road, International Regulations for the Prevention of Collisions at Sea (COLREGS), bridge-to-bridge communications, vessel traffic services, and marking of navigation systems.

BLM

Reference: Department of the Interior Departmental Manual – Part 516 5.4 Categorical Exclusions

H. Other

(5) Issuance of special recreation permits to individuals or organized groups for search and rescue training, orienteering or similar activities and for dog trials, endurance horse races or similar minor events.

DOE

Reference: 10 CFR Pt. 1021, App. A

A3 Adjustments, exceptions, exemptions, appeals, and stays, modifications, or rescissions of orders issued by the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

UNIQUE CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION FOR THE U.S. VISIT PROGRAM

II* A portable or relocatable facility or structure used to collect traveler data at or adjacent to an existing port of entry that does not significantly disturb land, air, or water resources and does not individually or cumulatively have a significant environmental effect. The building footprint of the facility must be less than 5000 square feet and the facility or structure must not foreclose future land use alternatives. CAT III

Reference: DHS, US Visit, Administrative Record for Categorical Exclusion F-2 Temporary Facilities On Or Adjacent To Existing Port Facilities, 2004.

This document offers an extensive analysis to support the inclusion of CE F-2, now I-1, in these procedures. Some of the documents summarized in this analysis are referenced and summarized individually in this document.

NAVY

Reference: 32CFR775.6

9) New construction that is consistent with existing land use and, when completed, the use or operation of which complies with existing regulatory requirements; e.g., a building on a parking lot with associated discharges/runoff within existing handling capacities, a bus stop along a roadway, and a foundation pad for portable buildings within a building complex.

DOE

Reference: 10 CFR Pt. 1021, Subpt. D. App. B

B1.22 Relocation of buildings (including, but not limited to, trailers and prefabricated buildings) to an already developed area (where active utilities and currently used roads are accessible).

USBP

Reference: Environmental Assessment for Operation Desert Grip, USBP Tucson and Yuma Sector, Arizona resulting in a FONSI May 2002

The USBP implemented Operation Desert Grip which required temporarily placing two trailers within the area of high illegal alien crossings. These trailers acted as housing and office space for five agents stationed there 24 hours, seven days a week. They were located on the side of an existing road, and had self contained water and sewage systems.

The project was coordinated with USFWS to address potential impacts to the Sonoran Pronghorn. USBP operations had the potential to impact the Sonoran Pronghorn, a federally listed endangered species. In accordance with the emergency consultation required under Section 7 of the ESA, USBP and USFWS implemented the following mitigation measures:

- Helicopter missions were kept to a minimum

- Vehicles stayed on roads when possible

- The number of ground personnel and vehicles were kept to a minimum

- Removal of vegetation was kept to a minimum

- At the completion of the operation, the area was cleared and re-vegetated to return it to as natural a state as possible

USBP provided \$25,000 for support to place temporary waters on adjacent lands to draw animals away from the operations and mitigate for their impact

USBP provided \$25,000 for monitoring of resources from past, future, and current UDA and USBP activity in the region

USBP assisted refuge staff in developing documentation of monthly law enforcement actions taking place on the refuge

Analysis: This is an example of a temporary facility that does not significantly impact the environment and does not foreclose future land use alternatives. The trailers were placed in a previously disturbed area adjacent to existing roads, and they will be removed upon completion of Operation Desert Grip. The potential impacts of the action surrounded its operational aspects, rather than installation of the temporary facilities.

Reference: Environmental Assessment for Four Temporary Camp Details on the Tohono O'Odham Nation, USBP Tucson Sector, Arizona resulting in a FONSI signed in July of 2003

The USBP implemented Operation Desert Grip in 2002 and this EA proposed expanding these operations by placing an additional four temporary camps on the Tohono O'Odham Nation. The four camp sites included trailers that acted as housing and office space for five agents stationed there 24 hours, seven days a week. They were located in areas that were previously disturbed or sparsely vegetated and the Tohono O'Odham Nation was consulted to choose each location. No grading or excavation was required for the installation and the 27 ft trailers were placed along existing roads. Trailers served as administrative, mess, and housing units. All fuel, grey water and solid waste was handled by a contractor and did not impact the site. The total disturbed area was 0.5 acres and upon completion of Operation Desert Grip, they will be removed and the area will be returned to pre-project condition. Environmental design measures implemented by the USBP, Tucson Sector include:

Maintenance of secondary spill containment and clean up measures at every site

If any cultural remains were found, the TON and AZ State Historic Office were contacted

Each camp was located away from endangered or threatened species to the greatest extent possible

Analysis: This EA is very similar to the previous one. The action of installing temporary trailers for Desert Grip Operation was the same; however, the placement on Tribal land created a different set of considerations in terms of mitigation or environmental design measures. Cultural resources and endangered species were not specifically an issue, but they were still considered in the environmental design.

Additionally, spill response was addressed as a preventative measure. The trailers were placed in a previously disturbed area adjacent to the existing roads, and they will be removed upon completion of the operation. This is an additional example of a temporary facility that did not significantly impact the environment or foreclose future land use alternatives.

Reference: Supplemental Environmental Assessment for the Expansion of Operation Desert Grip USBP Tucson and Yuma Sectors, AZ resulting in a FONSI signed in July of 2003

The USBP implemented Operation Desert Grip in 2002 and this EA proposed expanding these operations by placing an additional two temporary camps in the Tucson Sector and refurbishing another temporary at O'Neal Pass. The installation of the two camp sites included trailers that acted as housing and office space for five agents stationed there 24 hours, seven days a week. They were located in areas that were previously disturbed or sparsely vegetated. No grading or excavation was required for the installation and the 27 ft trailers were placed along existing roads. The trailers served as administrative, mess and housing units for the agents. All fuel, grey water and solid waste were handled by a contractor and did not impact the site. The Yuma Sector proposed to modify the temporary camp at O'Neal pass from a camp trailer to metal storage boxes that have been modified into living quarters. The two 15 ft x 25 ft storage boxes served as administrative, mess and housing units. They disturbed area is 0.5 acres and upon completion of Operation Desert Grip, they will be removed and the area will be returned to pre-project conditions.

Environmental Design Measures implemented included:

No off road traffic if possible

Reduced impacts to Sonoran Pronghorn by helicopter flyovers

Reduced the amount of vegetation removed

Minimized helicopter flights and coordinate the flights currently conducted

Increased the record of activity (monitor)

Analysis: As with the previous two EAs, this action involved installation of temporary trailers for Operation Desert Grip. The trailers or metal boxes were placed in a previously disturbed area adjacent to the existing roads, and they will be removed upon completion of the operation. The EA concluded that temporary trailers did not significantly impact the environment nor foreclose future land use alternatives.

Reference: Draft Environmental Assessment Immigration and Naturalization Service New Palo Parado Temporary Traffic Checkpoint Station Nogales, Arizona October 2000 resulting in a FONSI signed on 1/8/2001

This Environmental Assessment (EA) addresses the potential effects, beneficial and adverse, of the proposed construction of a new temporary checkpoint station (Palo Parado) at milepost 15.6 on Interstate 19 (near Nogales, AZ). The project will require the placement of 2,454 cubic yards of fill in two locations to level the ground. One area will be filled and extended by 12 feet to support an inspection point and a second area will be leveled to use for parking. A third area near the frontage road will be graded and used for temporary storage of and placement of portable toilets. A fourth area may be used in the future placement of an administrative trailer. If this site is used, a platform (approximately 12 ft x 20 ft) would be constructed on the shoulder of the road to provide a level site for the trailer. The total project area is approximately one acre in size and will occur within the existing Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) right-of-way.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed action. Increased or enhanced interdiction of illegal and drug entry and activities would have positive, indirect socioeconomic benefits.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Construction of a Temporary Border Patrol Station at Santa Teresa, New Mexico March 1995 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The proposed action is to construct a new United States Border Patrol station on a 15-acre site approximately 3 miles north of the Santa Teresa port of entry in Doña Ana County, New Mexico. The site is under lease to the Immigration and Naturalization Service for \$1 per year for 99 years. Construction would involve site preparation installation of security fencing, set up of portable buildings and a radio tower, drilling a water well, connection to municipal electrical power, installation of a septic system, construction of two ponding areas, installation of pavement, walkways, curbs, parking lights, and an above-ground fuel tank. The existing floor plan in the portable buildings would be modified and a vehicle canopy would be installed. A firing range and a horse barn with arena would be constructed at a later date.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

UNIQUE CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION FOR THE FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER

J1* Prescribed burning, wildlife habitat improvement thinning, and brush removal for southern yellow pine at the FLETC facility in Glynco, Georgia. No more than 200 acres will be treated in any single year. These activities may include up to 0.5 mile of low-standard, temporary road construction to support these operations.
CAT III

USFS

Reference: FSH 1909.15—Environmental Policy and Procedures Handbook Chapter 30—Categorical Exclusion From Documentation

31.2—Categories of Action for Which a Project or Case File and Decision Memo Are Required. Routine, proposed actions within any of the following categories may be excluded from documentation in an EIS or an EA; however, a project or case file is required and the decision to proceed must be documented in a decision memo (sec. 32). As a minimum, the project or case file should include any records prepared, such as (1) the names of interested and affected people, groups, and agencies contacted; (2) the determination that no extraordinary circumstances exist; (3) a copy of the decision memo (sec 30.5 (2)); (4) a list of the people notified of the decision; (5) Copy of the notice required by 36 CFR Part 217, or any other notice used to inform interested and affected persons of the decision to proceed with or to implement an action

that has been categorically excluded. Maintain a project or case file and prepare a decision memo for routine, proposed actions within any of the following categories.

* * * * *

10. Harvest of live trees not to exceed 50 acres, requiring no more than 1/2 mile of temporary road construction. Do not use this category for even-aged regeneration harvest or vegetation type conversion. The proposed action may include incidental removal of trees for landings, skid trails, and road clearing. Examples include but are not limited to:

- a. Removal of individual trees for sawlogs, specialty products, or fuelwood.
- b. Harvest of trees to reduce the fuel loading in an overstocked stand adjacent to residential area and construction of a short temporary road to access the stand.
- c. Commercial thinning of overstocked stands to achieve the desired stocking level to increase health and vigor.

11. Salvage of dead and/or dying trees not to exceed 250 acres, requiring no more than 2 mile of temporary road construction. The proposed action may include incidental removal of green trees for landings, skid trails, and road clearing. Examples include but are not limited to:

- a. Harvest of a portion of a stand damaged by a wind or ice event and construction of short temporary road to access the damaged trees.
- b. Harvest of fire damaged trees.

12. Sanitation harvest of trees to control insects or disease not to exceed 250 acres, requiring no more than 1/2 mile of temporary road construction, including removal of infested/infected trees and adjacent green trees up to two tree lengths away if determined necessary to control the spread of insects or disease. The proposed action may include incidental removal of green trees for landings, skid trails, and road clearing. Examples include but are not limited to:

- a. Felling and harvest of trees infested with southern pine beetles and immediately adjacent green trees to control expanding infestations.
- b. Harvest of green trees infested with mountain pine beetle and trees already killed by beetles.

NAVY

Reference: 32CFR775.6

(32) Routine maintenance of timber stands, including issuance of down-wood firewood permits, hazardous tree removal, and sanitation salvage.

ARMY

Reference: 32 CFR 651 Appendix B. Section II

(g)(1) Routine repair and maintenance of buildings, airfields, grounds, equipment, and other facilities.

Examples include, but are not limited to: Removal and disposal of asbestos-containing material (for example, roof material and floor tile) or lead-based paint in accordance with applicable regulations; removal of dead, diseased, or damaged trees; and repair of roofs, doors, windows, or fixtures (REC required for removal and disposal of asbestos-containing material and lead-based paint or work on historic structures).

INS

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment Immigration and Naturalization Service Brush and Small Tree Thinning Operation near Jacumba, California November 2001 resulting in a FONSI in October of 2001 (FONSI date problem)

This Environmental Assessment (EA) addresses the potential effects, beneficial and adverse, of the proposed brush and small tree thinning operation near Jacumba, California. The proposed action would involve hand-clearing brush within an 18 acre site within Boundary Creek. Large trees, as requested by the landowner, would remain on the site. Riparian habitat would be thinned within the proposed project area.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the proposed action. Mitigation measures regarding schedule, frequency, and method of clearing/thinning have been incorporated to ensure no significant effects occur. No significant adverse effects to air quality, water quality, cultural resources, unique areas, soils, protected species, or land use are expected as a result of the proposed action.

BLM

Reference: Department of the Interior Departmental Manual – Part 516 5.4 Categorical Exclusions

C. Forestry.

(2) Sale and removal of individual trees or small groups of trees which are dead, diseased, injured or which constitute a safety hazard, and where access for the removal requires no more than maintenance to existing roads.

(4) Precommercial thinning and brush control using small mechanical devices.

UNIQUE CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS FOR THE CUSTOMS AND BORDER PATROL

K1 Road dragging of existing roads and trails to maintain a clearly delineated right-of-way and to provide evidence of foot traffic, and that will not expand the width, length, or footprint of the road or trail.
CAT III

DOE

Reference: 10 CFR Pt. 1021, Subpt. D. App. B

B1.31 Relocation/operation of machinery and equipment

CEQ

Sec. 1508.18 Major Federal action.

"Major Federal action" includes actions with effects that may be major and which are potentially subject to Federal control and responsibility. Major reinforces but does not have a meaning independent of significantly (Sec. 1508.27). Actions include the circumstance where the responsible officials fail to act and that failure to act is reviewable by courts or administrative tribunals under the Administrative Procedure Act or other applicable law as agency action.

USBP

Reference: Draft Environmental Assessment for the Joint Task Force Six Operation 91024 Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona April 1991 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

The proposed project, located approximately 20 miles east of Douglas, Arizona, along the United States/Mexican border, consists of establishing an approximate 3 mile stretch of road to be used as a drag road; it will be maintained at a width of approximately 20 feet; it will be laid immediately adjacent to the international fence, except where environmental constraints recommend modification or movement to avoid and/or minimize impacts. The drag road establishment project involves removing rocks, leveling/grading operations and installing a number of culverts and/or gabion fords to cross existing washes.

Analysis: It was determined that the proposed project will not result in a significant effect on the existing environment.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Joint Task Force Six Operations JT089-93, JT094-93 and JT265-93 Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona February 1993 resulting in a FONSI signed in February of 1993

The purpose of JTF—6 Operations in Douglas, Arizona is to provide routine maintenance to existing drag and mountain roads, along the U.S.—Mexico Border and to install fences at the U.S. Border Patrol Station in Douglas, Arizona. The proposed project includes three components:

JT 265—93, the maintenance, of 24 miles of an existing drag road east and west of Douglas, Arizona.

JT 094—93, the maintenance of about one mile of mountain road east of Douglas, Arizona.

JT 089—93, the installation of fences at the U. S. Border Patrol Station at Douglas, Arizona.

The road maintenance will consist of light scraping, installation of culverts, grading and shaping for drainage, placing gravel in a slowly flowing wash and resetting existing cattle guards. Road projects will be maintained within their existing width. Limited turnarounds and passing areas will be coordinated with on—site monitors.

Analysis: A review of this Environmental Assessment and coordination with the appropriate agencies indicate that the actions, as proposed by the Joint Task Force Six Operation for road maintenance and fence installation, will not have a significant impact on the quality of the physical or biological environment. All requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) have been satisfied; therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

K2 Repair and maintenance of existing border fences that do not involve expansion in width or length of the project, and will not encroach on adjacent habitat. CAT II

FEMA

Reference: § 10.8 (d) (2)

(xv) Repair, reconstruction, restoration, elevation, retrofitting, upgrading to current codes and standards, or replacement of any facility in a manner that substantially conforms to the preexisting design, function, and location; [SE, in part]

INS

Reference: 28 CFR Part 61 Appendix C:

10. Actions Which Normally Do Not Require Either An Environmental Impact Statement Or An Environmental Assessment: (a) Construction projects for existing facilities including but not limited to: Remodeling; replacement of building systems and components; maintenance and operations repairs and general improvements when such projects do not significantly alter the initial occupancy and program of the facility or significantly impact upon the environment.

USCG

Reference: Figure 2-1 Coast Guard Categorical Exclusions

2. Real and Personal Property Related Actions q. Minor renovations and additions to buildings, roads, airfields, grounds, equipment, and other facilities that do not result in a change in functional use of the real property (e.g. realigning interior spaces of an existing building, extending an existing roadway in a developed area a short distance, installing a small antenna on an already existing antenna tower, adding a small storage shed to an existing building, etc.). (Checklist and CED required.) u. Routine repair and maintenance of buildings, roads, airfields, grounds, equipment, and other facilities which do not result in a change in functional use, or an impact on a historically significant element or setting. v. Routine repair and maintenance to waterfront facilities, including mooring piles, fixed floating piers, existing piers, and unburied power cables. w. Minor renovations and additions to waterfront facilities, including mooring piles, fixed floating piers, existing piers, and unburied power cables, which do not require special, site-specific regulatory permits. (Checklist and CED required.) x. Routine grounds maintenance and activities at units and facilities. Examples include localized pest management actions and actions to maintain improved grounds (such as landscaping, lawn care and minor erosion control measures) that are conducted in accordance with applicable Federal, state, and local directives.

6. Bridge Administration Actions a. Modification or replacement of an existing bridge on essentially the same alignment or location. Excluded are bridges with historic significance or bridges providing access to undeveloped barrier islands and beaches.

DOE

Reference: 10 CFR Pt. 1021, Subpt. D. App. B

B1.11 Installation of fencing, including that for border marking, that will not adversely affect wildlife movements or surface water flow.

USBP

Reference: Final Supplemental Environmental Assessment for the Replacement and Maintenance of the San Diego Surf Fence San Diego, California May 2002 resulting in a FONSI signed in March and April (two signatures) of 2002

The proposed action consists of replacement and maintenance of the Pacific Ocean surf fence by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) in San Diego, California. This Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA) analyzes the potential for significant adverse or beneficial impacts of the proposed action. This document is a supplement to the Final Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Joint Task Force Six Operation (JT 305-93/306-93) Border Fence Construction San Diego County, California prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Los Angeles District in 1993. This proposed action is the replacement and maintenance of the surf fence from the toe of Monument Mesa extending west approximately 465 feet into the Pacific Ocean beyond the low mean tide line. All proposed work would be conducted by units from Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) with the support of INS and USBP. Since the original construction, the fence has been compromised due to vandalism and the effects of the continuous weathering and corrosion from saltwater. As a result, the surf fence has been compromised to a point where illegal entry into the United States is possible. INS and USBP need to replace and maintain the surf fence in order to fulfill their mission of maintaining and controlling the border region of the United States.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the SEA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

Reference: Final Report Supplemental Environmental Assessment for the Replacement and Maintenance of the San Diego Surf Fence San Diego, California May 2002 resulting in a FONSI signed in March and April (two signatures) of 2002

The primary purpose of the proposed action is to replace and maintain the Pacific Ocean surf fence to enhance the U.S. Border Patrol's capability to gain, maintain, and extend control of the U.S./Mexico border. This proposed action is the replacement and maintenance of the existing surf fence from the toe of Monument Mesa extending west approximately 465 feet into the Pacific Ocean beyond the low mean tide line.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the Supplemental EA and the environmental design measures to be incorporated as part of the Proposed Action, it has been concluded that the Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Reference: Supplemental Environmental Assessment JTF-6 Fence and Road Construction, Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona July 1997 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX

This Environmental Assessment (EA) addresses the potential for significant adverse or beneficial environmental impacts in accordance with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). This document was tiered from existing EAs completed for previous construction activities (U.S. Army 1991a, 1993) in the same vicinity, and a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement completed for Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) activities along the U.S.-Mexico border (U.S. Army 1994). The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and the U.S. Border Patrol, Tucson Sector are proposing to replace

approximately six miles of fence, construct 0.5 miles of new road, and improve 0.8 miles of road along the U.S.-Mexico border at Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona. Approximately .13 miles would be of decorative fence, with the remaining 4.9 miles of steel landing mat.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Border Fence Construction and Road Repair Naco, Cochise County, Arizona JTF-6 Operation JT044-94 resulting in a FONSI signed in April of 1994
This Environmental Assessment prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), Los Angeles District (LAD) for the Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) project for Naco, Arizona. JTF—6 coordinates all Title 10 Department of Defense support to Federal, state and local law enforcement agencies as requested by Operation Alliance and approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the efforts to disrupt illegal drug operations along the southwest land border and protect national security. The purpose of JTF—6 Operation at Naco, Arizona, is to assist law enforcement agencies in the prevention of illegal importation of drugs along the U.S./Mexico border. The proposed project consists of replacing 3 miles of existing chain-link fencing with 10 feet high steel landing mat fencing, installation of culverts and repair of approximately 1 mile of existing road parallel to the fence along International Boundary at Naco, Arizona.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.

Reference: Final Report Environmental Assessment for Infrastructure within US Border Patrol Naco-Douglas Corridor Cochise County, Arizona August 2000 resulting in a FONSI signed XXXX
The Proposed Alternative would allow the infrastructure projects currently approved or funded and those anticipated to be completed over the next five years. Infrastructure improvements that will be addressed include, but are not limited, to roads, fences, vehicle barriers, helipads, USBP stations, remote video surveillance (RVS) sites, lights, and checkpoints. The cumulative effect of these improvement projects since 1995 and into the reasonably foreseeable future, and in conjunction with other programs or projects proposed or implemented by other agencies, is the primary focus of this EA.

Analysis: Based on the findings of this analysis and assuming that all mitigation measures recommended herein are implemented, no significant adverse impacts would occur from the preferred alternative

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment JTF-6 Border Fence Construction and Maintenance Calexico, Imperial County, California March 1997 resulting in a FONSI signed in March of 1997
This Environmental Assessment (EA) assesses the potential for significant adverse or beneficial environmental impacts of the proposed action which involves approximately 5.75 miles of fence replacement and the concurrent removal of 5.75 miles of existing fence by JTF-6, along the U.S.-Mexico border, near Calexico, Imperial County, California. This document was tiered from the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement completed for Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) activities along the U.S.-Mexico border (U.S. Army 1994b). A Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) was prepared in 1994 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and JTF-6 proposed projects that facilitate law enforcement agencies (LEAs) missions to reduce illegal drug activity along the southwestern border of the U.S. The PEIS addresses the cumulative effects of past and reasonably foreseeable projects undertaken by JTF-6 for numerous LEAs in the four southwestern states (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California). Construction of approximately 2.5 miles of landing mat fence on the west side of the Calexico port-of-entry and 3.25 miles of ballard fence on the east side of the Calexico port-of-entry is proposed to replace the existing chainlink fence. The new fence would be placed approximately two feet north of the international boundary. Proposed fence construction activities would occur within a 25 feet wide area

north of the U.S. -Mexico border. An existing unimproved road parallel to the existing fence would be used during construction and no road improvements are planned under the proposed action.

Analysis: There would be no significant adverse affects to the natural environment associated with the proposed projects.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment Immigration and Naturalization Service Us Border Patrol Pedestrian Fence along the International Border, USBP El Paso Sector, Texas January 2003 resulting in a FONSI signed on 1/7/03

The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) proposes to improve and extend an existing pedestrian (chain-link) fence for the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) El Paso Sector, near Anapra, New Mexico. The Proposed Action Alternative includes the improvement of 0.2 miles along the eastern end of the existing fence and the horizontal extension of 0.17 miles and 0.41 miles of the current eastern and western ends, respectively. The proposed action would involve the excavation and removal of approximately 0.1 cubic yards of soil from each hole where fence poles would be located, but would not significantly affect the existing environment. The footprint of the proposed fence was surveyed for sensitive biological and cultural resources.

Analysis: No major, long-term, adverse impacts are anticipated to any resources analyzed within this document. Therefore, no further analysis or documentation (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted. The INS, in implementing this decision, would employ all practical means necessary to minimize the potential adverse impacts on the local environment.

Reference: Final Environmental Assessment for Border Road and Fence; Construction and Repair Tecate to Canyon City, San Diego County, California October 1993 resulting in a FONSI signed in October of 1993 This document analyzes the actions to be taken for border road construction and repair, and fence construction and repair. This PEA has been prepared to assess any environmental concerns associated with this action segments; the installation and/or repair of fencing; and the installation of culverts on about 10 miles of the U.S/Mexico border in the vicinity of Tecate, California. The project will include some widening of roads. A detailed project description is included in Section 4.0 of this FEA.

Analysis: Based upon the results of the EA, it has been concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant adverse impact on the natural or human environment, and no further NEPA analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Statement) is warranted.