FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
PROPELLANT LOADING FACILITY AT THE LITTLE MOUNTAIN TEST FACILITY
HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH

Pursuant to provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Title 42 United States Code (USC) Sections 4321 to 4347 and the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) NEPA implementing procedures, the Department of the Air Force (DAF) prepared the attached Environmental Assessment (EA) to identify and evaluate the potential environmental consequences associated with construction and operation of a Propellant Loading Facility (PLF) at the Little Mountain Test Facility (LMTF). The EA, incorporated by reference into this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), also provides environmental protection measures to avoid or reduce potential adverse impacts.

PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to support the production and deployment of the Sentinel Program. A PLF is required for the fueling and short-term storage of completed Post Boost Attitude Control Modules, which are responsible for positioning the reentry vehicle during the portion of the missile's trajectory that occurs outside the Earth's atmosphere. The Post Boost Attitude Control Modules is propelled by a liquid propulsion system known as the post boost propulsion system. This capability is essential to support the production and deployment of the Sentinel Program.

The Proposed Action is needed to support the increasing testing needs of the Air Force Nuclear Weapon Center, DoD, and the Department of Energy, particularly in regard to the Sentinel Program. The increased testing needs of these organizations require a dedicated PLF by June 2030. Currently, the PLF mission is being conducted in World War II era buildings located at Hill AFB that will not meet future Sentinel weapon safety standards. Additionally, the current facilities cannot support the anticipated Post Boost Attitude Control Modules throughput volumes for the Sentinel Program.

PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

The Proposed Action would construct a PLF that would be responsible for loading hypergolic liquid propellants (e.g., hydrazine, nitrogen tetroxide, mixed oxides of nitrogen-3) into the Post Boost Attitude Control Modules during the production and deployment phases of the Sentinel Program. Additional functions that would be performed at the PLF include service valve cap installation, inspections, mass properties determination, temporary storage of fueled Post Boost Attitude Control Modules (1 to 3 days), and packaging for shipment. It is anticipated that construction of the proposed PLF would take approximately 4 months to complete, utilizing approximately 50 to 100 construction workers.

The proposed facility would total approximately 30,000 square feet and would consist of an administrative wing (approximately 8,000 square feet) attached to a high bay wing (approximately 22,000 square feet). The administrative wing would consist of personnel workspaces and support areas, including office space, locker/restrooms, and storage

space. The high bay wing would include a laboratory area for the testing of hypergolic fuels, hypergolic liquid propellants storage and testing, and a conference room. The proposed laboratory area would require a fueling cell, ventilation systems, associated screen and control rooms, and a receiving area equipped with a loading dock to accommodate forklifts and delivery trucks. Overhead bridge cranes would be installed throughout the high bay wing to facilitate shipping and receiving. Two emergency generators would be located on-site. Construction would include the addition of parking space and an access road off the existing main vehicular drive to support full-time workers as well as deliveries and shipments during facility operations. Once the facility is operational, it is anticipated that six personnel would be required on-site.

Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Analysis (EA Section 2.3)

This EA has considered all reasonable alternatives. Alternatives dismissed from further consideration did not meet the purpose and need for the Proposed Action or established selection standards and criteria. The EA briefly describes three alternatives considered but eliminated from further analysis: renovation of an existing facility at the LMTF, construction of a new PLF at Hill AFB, and renovation of an existing facility at Hill AFB.

Description of the No-Action Alternative (EA Section 2.2)

Under the No Action Alternative, the DAF would not construct a PLF to support the Sentinel Program, and no changes to the existing environment would occur.

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS

Environmental analyses focused on the following areas: Air Quality, Soils and Topography, Biological Resources, Infrastructure, and Hazardous Materials and Waste/Health and Safety. DAF has concluded that no significant impacts would result to these resources from implementation of the Proposed Action, as summarized below.

Air Quality (EA Section 3.1)

No significant impacts have been identified. The Proposed Action would result in short- and long-term, minor, adverse impacts to air quality, primarily due to an increase in criteria pollutant emissions during construction and the proposed use of new combustion equipment (e.g., generators) during PLF operations. Increased air emissions would not be expected to impact the region's ability to comply with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for regulated pollutants and would not hamper efforts to maintain compliance with all NAAQS under current requirements. No *de minimis* indicators would be exceeded as a result of construction or operations emissions.

Soils and Topography (EA Section 3.2)

No significant impacts have been identified. The Proposed Action would result in short- and long-term, minor, adverse impacts to soils and topography. Fill would be placed to permanently alter the topography at the proposed site to approximately match the elevation of the existing access road into the LMTF. Impacts to soils would result from

vegetation removal, grading, filling, and the placement of new structures, and short-term impacts associated with increased erosion potential. None of the soils affected are considered to be prime farmland soils and all are locally or regionally common.

Biological Resources (EA Section 3.3)

No significant impacts have been identified. The Proposed Action would result in short- and long-term, negligible, adverse impacts to biological resources due to temporary and permanent vegetation removal and wildlife displacement and disturbance due to increased noise and human activity/traffic. While quality wildlife habitat is not prevalent in this area (the site consists primarily of nonnative grasses), some degree of habitat disruption may occur. A total of one federally listed species and 27 state species of concern (as identified by Hill AFB in conjunction with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS]) may occur at Hill AFB and/or its associated properties (including the LMTF). Additionally, two species proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act were also identified as potentially present in the vicinity of the proposed PLF site. It was determined that the federally listed species (yellow-billed cuckoo) would be unlikely to occur in the vicinity of the project area due to a lack of suitable habitat, including nesting and foraging habitat; therefore, the Proposed Action would not affect this species.

Consultation with the USFWS under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (consultation pending – available documentation is provided in Appendix C of the EA) is anticipated to result in concurrence that the Proposed Action would not affect federally listed species. It is understood that further consultation may be required should additional impacts be identified following implementation of the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action would also avoid and minimize impacts to biological resources by following the methodologies described in the most recent Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan for Hill AFB and its associated properties (including the LMTF).

Infrastructure (EA Section 3.4)

No significant impacts have been identified. The Proposed Action would result in short- and long-term, negligible, adverse impacts to the electrical grid and short-term and long-term, minor, adverse impacts to transportation at the LMTF. Intermittent utility disruptions may occur during utility line connections associated with construction of the PLF; however, power needs during both construction and operation of the proposed PLF are expected to be well within the energy capacity of the LMTF. During construction, increased traffic would temporarily degrade Levels of Service on key roadways during peak commute periods, though these roadways would be working within capacity levels. Increased construction traffic would also temporarily increase traffic safety risks, especially from trucks, though safety risks would decrease after the first month of construction with the reduced truck requirements. Post-construction, an increase in onsite personnel (approximately six onsite personnel would be required for operation of the proposed PLF) and truck traffic associated with transportation of the Post Boost Attitude

Control Modules (approximately three trucks daily) would continue to contribute to daily traffic, although to a much lesser extent than during construction.

Hazardous Materials and Waste/Health and Safety (EA Section 3.5)

No significant impacts have been identified. The Proposed Action would result in short-term, negligible, adverse impacts associated with hazardous materials/waste, which would be managed in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations, as well as Hill AFB's Hazardous Waste Management Plan and the Hill AFB supplement to Air Force Instruction 32-7086 (*Hazardous Materials Management*). The proposed PLF would handle, store, and transfer toxic hypergolic propellants (e.g., hydrazine, nitrogen tetroxide, mixed oxides of nitrogen-3), as well as high-pressure helium and nitrogen pressurants. These materials are classified as hazardous under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and pose potential risks due to their toxicity, corrosivity, and reactivity. The proposed PLF would store a minimum operational quantity of 2,526 pounds of hydrazine and 4,005 pounds of nitrogen tetroxide, with a maximum storage of approximately 4,103 pounds of hydrazine and 6,256 pounds of nitrogen tetroxide. Depending on the quantity of hazardous waste generated, the LMTF may be required to upgrade its waste generator status as a Small Quantity Generator to that of a Large Quantity Generator, which would represent an administrative and procedural modification that would not be expected to result in substantial environmental impacts. As a Large Quantity Generator, the LMTF would be subject to more stringent federal and state requirements for waste storage, labeling, employee training, recordkeeping, and emergency preparedness.

With adherence to proper design controls, applicable regulations, Hill AFB protocols/plans, and mitigation measures such as the design features described in more detail in the Draft EA, the proposed PLF's hazardous materials and waste operations are not expected to cause significant adverse environmental consequences. Potential impacts would be limited to localized, short-term effects in the unlikely event of a spill or release, which would be mitigated through established emergency response and containment system.

The Proposed Action may result in short-term, negligible, adverse impacts to human health and safety during construction of the proposed PLF, due to the risks inherent to construction work. Construction and operation of the proposed PLF would be conducted in accordance with applicable DAF safety regulations, Occupational Safety and Health Administration standards, and Defense Explosives Safety Regulation 6055.09 requirements. Personnel would be trained and certified in hazardous material handling, personal protective equipment use, and emergency response protocols.

GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT CONSULTATIONS

Tribal consultation letters were emailed to federally recognized tribes in November 2025. Appendix B of the EA identifies the government-to-government consultation conducted during this analysis and provides copies of or examples of relevant correspondence.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND AGENCY CONSULTATION

In November 2025, letters were sent to federal, state, and local agencies potentially affected by the Proposed Action, informing them of the intent to prepare the EA and requesting their input. Responses received will be incorporated into the Final EA. Copies of this coordination are included in Appendix A of the EA. Additionally, compliance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act was conducted through coordination and consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the Utah State Historic Preservation Office, respectively. Consultation letters and responses are included in Appendix C of the EA.

A Notice of Availability (NOA) for public review of the Draft EA and FONSI was published in the Standard Examiner on January 12 2026. The documents were made available for review online at https://www.hill.af.mil/Home/Environmental and at the Weber County Library Main Branch, 2464 Jefferson Avenue, Ogden, Utah 84401. The public review and comment period lasted for 30 days, beginning from the date of publication of the NOA and ending on February 10, 2026. All comments received regarding the Draft EA are provided in Appendix A of the Final EA.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Based on my review of the facts and analyses contained in the attached EA, conducted under the provisions of NEPA, I conclude that the implementation of the Proposed Action would not have a significant environmental impact, would not involve an element of high risk or uncertainty on the human environment, and its effects on the quality of the human environment are not highly controversial. The DAF further finds that proposed measures to minimize impacts are documented in the EA. Accordingly, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. This analysis fulfills the requirements of NEPA and was completed in accordance with DoD's NEPA implementing procedures.

_____ _____

MARCIA L. QUIGLEY, Col, USAF
Director, Space Force Mission Sustainment
(Engineering, Logistics, & Force Protection)

Date