

1 FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT  
2 PROPELLANT LOADING FACILITY AT THE LITTLE MOUNTAIN TEST FACILITY  
3 HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH  
4

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

13 **PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION**

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

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

28 **PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 20 **SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS**

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

### 25 ***Air Quality (EA Section 3.1)***

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

### 34 ***Soils and Topography (EA Section 3.2)***

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

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

#### 4 ***Biological Resources (EA Section 3.3)***

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

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

#### 27 ***Infrastructure (EA Section 3.4)***

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

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

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

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

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

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

37 **GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT CONSULTATIONS**

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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

**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.

\_\_\_\_\_

DANIEL L. CORNELIUS, Colonel, USAF  
Installation Commander, 75th Air Base Wing

\_\_\_\_\_

Date