

Enviro tracking #	ARNG ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	State ARNG

PART – A PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project name: CT ARNG- Helicopter Training	
2. Project number: (MILCON if applicable)	3. Date prepared: 25 MAY 2016
4. Description and location of the project/proposed action.	
a. Location (Include a detailed map if applicable):	
East Haven Rifle Range, East Haven, CT	
b. Description:	
Connecticut Army National Guard helicopter pilots are required to conduct and record flight hours to maintain mission readiness. Open space at East Haven Rifle Range will be utilized to land helicopters during such practice flights. This training will be conducted once a month (12 times per year) during daylight hours, unless required for emergency purposes.	
c. The proposed action will involve (check all that apply):	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training activities/areas	<input type="checkbox"/> Construction
<input type="checkbox"/> Maintenance/repair/rehabilitation	<input type="checkbox"/> Real estate action
<input type="checkbox"/> Innovative readiness training project	<input type="checkbox"/> Natural resource management
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Explain):	<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental plans/surveys
d. Project size in acres: (if applicable)	Acres of proposed new surface disturbance: (if applicable)
5. Start date of proposed action (dd-mmm-yy): 25 JULY 2016 <i>NOTE: this must be a future date.</i>	
6. Programmed fiscal year: FY2017	
7. End date (if applicable):	

PART B – DECISION ANALYSIS GUIDE

To use a categorical exclusion, the project must satisfy the following three screening criteria: no segmentation, no exceptional circumstances and a qualifying categorical exclusion that covers the project. The following decision tree will guide the application and documentation of these three screening criteria. The criteria were extracted from 32 CFR Section 651.29 and represent the most common screening conditions experienced in the ARNG. **NOTE: Each question in Part B must have an applicable block checked for concurrence with REC.**

1. Is this action segmented (the scope of the action must include the consideration of connected, cumulative, and similar actions)? Yes (go to #30) No (go to #2)
2. Is there reasonable likelihood of significant environmental effects (direct, indirect, and cumulative)? If action meets screening criteria but is assessed in an existing EA or EIS, check NO and proceed to the next question.
 Yes (go to #30) No (go to #3)
3. Is there a reasonable likelihood of significant effects on public health, safety or the environment? If action meets screening criteria but is assessed in an existing EA or EIS, check NO and proceed to the next question.
 Yes (go to #30) No (go to #4)
4. Is there an imposition of uncertain or unique environmental risks? If action meets screening criteria but is assessed in an existing EA or EIS, check NO and proceed to the next question. Yes (go to #30) No (go to #5)
5. Is the project of greater scope or size than is normal for the category of action? If action meets screening criteria but is assessed in an existing EA or EIS, check NO and proceed to the next question.
 Yes (go to #30) No (go to #6)
6. Does the project introduce or employ unproven technology? If action meets screening criteria but is assessed in an existing EA or EIS, check NO and proceed to the next question. Yes (go to #30) No (go to #7)

7. Will there be reportable releases of hazardous or toxic substances as specified in 40 CFR Part 302? If action meets screening criteria but is assessed in an existing EA or EIS, check NO and proceed to the next question.

Yes (go to #30) No (go to #8)

8. If proposed action is in a non-attainment or maintenance area, will air emissions exceed de minimus levels or otherwise require a formal Clean Air Act (CAA) conformity determination? If action meets screening criteria but is assessed in an existing EA or EIS, check NO and proceed to the next question.

Yes (go to #30) No (go to #9) N/A (go to #9)

9. Will the project have effects on the quality of the environment that are likely to be highly controversial? If action meets screening criteria but is assessed in an existing EA or EIS, check NO and proceed to the next question.

Yes (go to #30) No (go to #10)

10. Will the project establish a precedent (or make decisions in principle) for future or subsequent actions that are reasonably likely to have future significant effects? If action meets screening criteria but is assessed in an existing EA or EIS, check NO and proceed to the next question. Yes (go to #30) No (go to #11)

11. Has federal funding been secured for the Innovative Readiness Training (IRT) project?

Not applicable (go to #13) Yes (go to #13) No (go to #12)

12. NOTE: IRT projects not currently funded can secure approved NEPA documentation. However, once funding is secured State ARNG is required to coordinate with ARNG-ILE-T to complete natural and cultural surveys via proponent funding. Confirmed (go to #27)

13. Do you have a species list from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that is less than 90 days old?

Yes (go to #14) ☞ Date of list: 19 APR 2016 No (update species list, return to #13)

14. In reviewing the species list, what determination was made by the State ARNG?

No species present (go to #16)

No affect (go to #16)

May affect but not likely to adversely affect ☞ Date of USFWS concurrence: (go to #16)

May affect likely to adversely affect (go to #15)

15. Does an existing biological opinion cover the action? Yes ☞ Date of BO: (go to #16) No (go to #30)

16. Have the Endangered Species Act, Section 7 requirements been completed?

Yes ☞ Date of documentation: 19 APR 2016 (go to #17) No (complete documentation, return to #16)

17. Does the project involve an undertaking to a building or structure that is 50 years of age or older?

Yes (go to #18) No (go to #20)

18. Has the building or structure been surveyed for the National Register of Historic Places?

Yes (go to #19) No (complete inventory, return to #18)

19. Is the building or structure eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places?

Yes (go to #20) No (go to #20)

20. Does the action involve ground disturbing activities? Yes (go to #21) No (go to #22)

21. Has an archaeological inventory or research been completed to determine if there are any archaeological resources present? Yes (go to #22) No (complete inventory, return to #21)

22. In reviewing the undertaking, under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) (for both above and below ground resources), what determination was made by the State ARNG?

No 106 undertaking; no additional consultation required under NHPA (go to question #27)

No properties affected ☞ Date of SHPO concurrence: (go to #24)

No adverse effect ☞ Date of SHPO concurrence: (go to #24)

Adverse effect (go to #23)

23. Has the State ARNG addressed the adverse effect?

Yes (place date of MOA or existing PA and explanation of stipulations below, go to #24) No (go to #30)

23a. Date of MOA or PA and explanation:

24. Per DoDI 4710.02 did the state ARNG determine that tribal consultation was necessary for this project?

Yes (go to #25) No (Provide reason in block below, go to #27)

24a. Reason for no consultation:

25. Did the Tribes express an interest or respond with concerns about the project?

Yes (go to #26) No Date of MFR: (go to #27)

26. Has the State ARNG addressed the Tribal concerns?

Yes (place date of MOU or explanation in box below, go to #27) No (address concerns, return to #26)

26a. Date of MOU or explanation of how State addressed tribal concerns:

27. Does the project involve an unresolved effect on areas having special designation or recognition such as those listed below? For any yes responses go to #30 otherwise go to #28. If any No response is a result of negotiated and/or previously resolved effects please describe resolution in box 27a below.

Type	Unresolved Effects?	Type	Unresolved Effects?
a. Prime/Unique Farmland	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	e. Wild/Scenic River	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
b. Wilderness Area/National Park	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	f. Coastal Zones	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
c. Sole-Source Aquifer	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	g. 100-Year Floodplains	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
d. Wetlands	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	h. National Wildlife Refuges	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

27a. Resolution:

28. Is this project addressed in a separate EA or EIS review?

Yes (complete information below, go to Part C, Determination) No (go to #29)

Document Title:

Lead Agency:

Date of Decision Document:

29. Does the project meet at least one of the categorical exclusions listed in 32 CFR 651 App B?

Yes (complete information below, go to Part C, Determination) No (go to #30)

Primary CAT EX code: IAW Section II (b)(7)

Reason why CAT EX code applies:


30. At this time your project has not met all the qualifications for using a categorical exclusion under 32 CFR 651. Unless the scope of the project is changed, it will require an Environmental Assessment or possibly an Environmental Impact Statement. If you feel this is in error, please call your NEPA Regional Manager to discuss. If needed, go to Part C Determination.

Additional information (if needed):

PART C – DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation the following is appropriate:

- In accordance with 32 CFR 651 Appendix B, the proposed action qualifies for a categorical exclusion that does not require a record of environmental consideration.
- A record of environmental consideration.
- An environmental assessment.
- A notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.



Signature of Proponent (requestor)
Name: Nelson Benjamin
Date: 9 June 2016



Signature of Environmental Program Manager
Name: Robert Dollak
Date: 26 MAY 2016

Other concurrence (as needed):

Signature
Name:
Title/Division:
Date:

Signature
Name:
Title/Division:
Date:

Signature
Name:
Title/Division:
Date:

Signature
Name:
Title/Division:
Date:

Signature
Name:
Title/Division:
Date:

Signature
Name:
Title/Division:
Date:

Enviro tracking #	ARNG RECORD OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION	State ARNG

1. Project name: CT ARNG- Helicopter Training	
2. Project number: (MILCON if applicable)	3. Date prepared: 25 MAY 2016
4. Start date of proposed action (dd-mmm-yy): 25 JULY 2016	NOTE: this must be a future date.
5. Programmed fiscal year: FY2017	
6. End date (if applicable):	
7. Description and location of the project/proposed action.	
a. Location (Include a detailed map if applicable):	
East Haven Rifle Range, East Haven, CT	
b. Description:	
Connecticut Army National Guard helicopter pilots are required to conduct and record flight hours to maintain mission readiness. Open space at East Haven Rifle Range will be utilized to land helicopters during such practice flights. This training will be conducted once a month (12 times per year) during daylight hours, unless required for emergency purposes.	

8. Choose one of the following:

An existing environmental assessment* adequately covers the scope of this project. Attach FNSI if EA was completed by another federal agency (non-ARNG).
Date of EA (dd-mmm-yy): Lead Agency:


An existing environmental impact statement* adequately covers the scope of this project.
Date of EIS (dd-mmm-yy): Lead Agency:

After reviewing the screening criteria and completing the ARNG environmental checklist, this project qualifies for a categorical exclusion (select below).
CAT EX Code: IAW Section II (b)(7)
CAT EX Code:
CAT EX Code:


This project is exempt from NEPA requirements under the provisions of:
Cite superseding law:

**Copies of the referenced environmental assessment or environmental impact statement can be found in the ARNG Environmental Office within each state.*

9. Remarks (if needed):



Signature of Proponent (requestor)
Name: Neuman, Benjamin
Date: 9 June 2016



Signature of Environmental Program Manager
Name: Robert Dollak
Date: 26 MAY 2016

Proponent Information	
10. Proponent: CT Army National Guard	
11. Address: 360 Broad Street	
12. POC:	
13. Comm. voice:	
14. Proponent POC e-mail:	