

## § 989.8

the requester has prepared environmental documents at its own expense does not commit the Air Force to allow or undertake the proposed action or its alternatives. The requester is not entitled to any preference over other potential parties with whom the Air Force might contract or make similar arrangements.

(d) In no event is the requester who prepares or funds an environmental analysis entitled to reimbursement from the Air Force. When requesters prepare environmental documents outside the Air Force, the Air Force must independently evaluate and approve the scope and content of the environmental analyses before using the analyses to fulfill EIAP requirements. Any outside environmental analysis must evaluate reasonable alternatives as defined in § 989.8.

### § 989.8 Analysis of alternatives.

(a) The Air Force must analyze reasonable alternatives to the proposed action and the “no action” alternative in all EAs and EISs, as fully as the proposed action alternative.

(b) “Reasonable” alternatives are those that meet the underlying purpose and need for the proposed action and that would cause a reasonable person to inquire further before choosing a particular course of action. Reasonable alternatives are not limited to those directly within the power of the Air Force to implement. They may involve another government agency or military service to assist in the project or even to become the lead agency. The Air Force must also consider reasonable alternatives raised during the scoping process (see § 989.18) or suggested by others, as well as combinations of alternatives. The Air Force need not analyze highly speculative alternatives, such as those requiring a major, unlikely change in law or governmental policy. If the Air Force identifies a large number of reasonable alternatives, it may limit alternatives selected for detailed environmental analysis to a reasonable range or to a reasonable number of examples covering the full spectrum of alternatives.

(c) The Air Force may expressly eliminate alternatives from detailed analysis, based on reasonable selection

## 32 CFR Ch. VII (7–1–05 Edition)

standards (for example, operational, technical, or environmental standards suitable to a particular project). In consultation with the EPF, the appropriate Air Force organization may develop written selection standards to firmly establish what is a “reasonable” alternative for a particular project, but they must not so narrowly define these standards that they unnecessarily limit consideration to the proposal initially favored by proponents. This discussion of reasonable alternatives applies equally to EAs and EISs.

(d) Except in those rare instances where excused by law, the Air Force must always consider and assess the environmental impacts of the “no action” alternative. “No action” may mean either that current management practice will not change or that the proposed action will not take place. If no action would result in other predictable actions, those actions should be discussed within the no action alternative section. The discussion of the no action alternative and the other alternatives should be comparable in detail to that of the proposed action.

### § 989.9 Cooperation and adoption.

(a) *Lead and cooperating agency (40 CFR 1501.5 and 1501.6).* When the Air Force is a cooperating agency in the preparation of an EIS, the Air Force reviews and approves principal environmental documents within the EIAP as if they were prepared by the Air Force. The Air Force executes a ROD for its program decisions that are based on an EIS for which the Air Force is a cooperating agency. The Air Force may also be a lead or cooperating agency on an EA using similar procedures, but the MAJCOM EPC retains approval authority unless otherwise directed by HQ USAF. Before invoking provisions of 40 CFR 1501.5(e), the lowest authority level possible resolves disputes concerning which agency is the lead agency.

(b) *Adoption of EA or EIS.* The Air Force, even though not a cooperating agency, may adopt an EA or EIS prepared by another entity where the proposed action is substantially the same as the action described in the EA or EIS. In this case, the EA or EIS must be recirculated as a final EA or EIS but

the Air Force must independently review the EA or EIS and determine that it is current and that it satisfies the requirements of this part. The Air Force then prepares its own FONSI or ROD, as the case may be. In the situation where the proposed action is not substantially the same as that described in the EA or the EIS, the Air Force may adopt the EA or EIS, or a portion thereof, by circulating the EA or EIS as a draft and then preparing the final EA or EIS.

#### § 989.10 Tiering.

The Air Force should use tiered (40 CFR 1502.20) environmental documents, and environmental documents prepared by other agencies, to eliminate repetitive discussions of the same issues and to focus on the issues relating to specific actions. If the Air Force adopts another Federal agency's environmental document, subsequent Air Force environmental documents may also be tiered.

#### § 989.11 Combining EIAP with other documentation.

(a) The EPF combines environmental analysis with other related documentation when practicable (40 CFR 1506.4) following the procedures prescribed by the CEQ regulations and this part.

(b) The EPF must integrate comprehensive planning (AFI 32-7062, Air Force Comprehensive Planning<sup>9</sup>) with the requirements of the EIAP. Prior to making a decision to proceed, the EPF must analyze the environmental impacts that could result from implementation of a proposal identified in the comprehensive plan.

#### § 989.12 AF Form 813, Request for Environmental Impact Analysis.

The Air Force uses AF Form 813 to document the need for environmental analysis or for certain CATEX determinations for proposed actions. The form helps narrow and focus the issues to potential environmental impacts. AF Form 813 must be retained with the EA or EIS to record the focusing of environmental issues.

[64 FR 38129, July 15, 1999; 66 FR 16868, Mar. 28, 2001]

<sup>9</sup>See footnote 1 to § 989.1.

#### § 989.13 Categorical exclusion.

(a) CATEXs define those categories of actions that do not individually or cumulatively have potential for significant effect on the environment and do not, therefore, require further environmental analysis in an EA or an EIS. The list of Air Force-approved CATEXs is in Appendix B. Supplements to this part may not add CATEXs or expand the scope of the CATEXs in Appendix B.

(b) Characteristics of categories of actions that usually do not require either an EIS or an EA (in the absence of extraordinary circumstances) include:

- (1) Minimal adverse effect on environmental quality.
- (2) No significant change to existing environmental conditions.
- (3) No significant cumulative environmental impact.
- (4) Socioeconomic effects only.
- (5) Similarity to actions previously assessed and found to have no significant environmental impacts.

(c) CATEXs apply to actions in the United States and abroad. General exemptions specific to actions abroad are in 32 CFR part 187. The EPF or other decision-maker forwards requests for additional exemption determinations for actions abroad to HQ USAF/ILEB with a justification letter.

(d) Normally, any decision-making level may determine the applicability of a CATEX and need not formally record the determination on AF Form 813 or elsewhere, except as noted in the CATEX list.

(e) Application of a CATEX to an action does not eliminate the need to meet air conformity requirements (see § 989.30).

[64 FR 38129, July 15, 1999; 66 FR 16868, Mar. 28, 2001]

#### § 989.14 Environmental assessment.

(a) When a proposed action is one not usually requiring an EIS but is not categorically excluded, the EPF supports the proponent in preparing an EA (40 CFR 1508.9). Every EA must lead to either a FONSI, a decision to prepare an EIS, or no action on the proposal.

(b) Whenever a proposed action usually requires an EIS, the EPF responsible for the EIAP may prepare an EA