DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

PROPOSED INSTALLATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN PROJECTS AT LUKE AIR FORCE BASE, GLENDALE, MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZONA

Pursuant to provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Title 42 *United States Code* (USC) § 4321 et seq.; Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations at 40 *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) Parts 1500–1508; and 32 CFR Part 989, *Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP),* the United States (US) Air Force (Air Force) prepared the attached Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) to address the potential environmental consequences associated with construction, demolition, and renovation projects at Luke Air Force Base (AFB) in Arizona.

Purpose and Need

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to support Luke AFB's future mission and training requirements associated with F-35 beddown. The construction of new facilities, renovations and repairs of existing facilities, demolition of obsolete facilities, and consolidation of mission support functions would address existing deficiencies in facilities at Luke AFB. Left unchecked, deficiencies in facilities and infrastructure would degrade the Base's ability to meet Air Force current and future mission requirements. The Proposed Action is needed to address the condition, capability, and configuration of Luke AFB's facilities to meet the mission requirements of the 56th Fighter Wing (56 FW) at Luke AFB and its tenant units in a manner that:

- meets all applicable Department of Defense installation master planning criteria, consistent with Unified Facilities Criteria 2-100-01, *Installation Master Planning* (30 Sept 2020); Department of the Air Force Manual 32-1084, *Standard Facility Requirements* (1 April 2018); Air Force Instruction 32-1015, *Integrated Installation Planning* (as amended 4 Jan 2021); and Air Force Policy Directive 32-10, *Installations and Facilities* (20 July 2020);
- remedies facilities and infrastructure deficiencies in order to adequately support current and future strategic missions;
- remains consistent with land use requirements, anti-terrorism/force protection standards, and planning concepts as defined in the Area Development Plans for the Northwest Mission, Flightline, Mission Support, and Community Support districts;
- complies with security requirements and operational safety standards; and
- complies with federal and Air Force mandates for sustainable design and development.

Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives

The EA evaluates five installation development projects at Luke AFB: 1) construction of a new, and demolition of the existing, Combat Arms Training and Maintenance (CATM) facility and Small Arms Range (SAR); 2) construction of a new, and demolition of the existing, Civil Engineer Warehouse (CEW), including construction of a new perimeter fence for the structure; 3) construction of a new, and partial demolition of the existing, Chapel Building; 4) construction of a new, and demolition of the existing, Honor Guard Building and training area; and 5) construction of a new, and renovation of the existing, child development center (CDC), courtyard, and parking lot, including partial demolition of Kachina Road. Overall, the Proposed Action would demolish approximately 56,439 square feet (ft^2) of existing building space and construct approximately 104,825 ft^2 of new building space. The net change in building footprint under the Proposed Action would be an increase of 48,386 ft^2.

Combat Arms Training and Maintenance and Small Arms Range

The 56th Fighter Wing proposes to construct a new CATM and SAR in the Northwest Mission District and to demolish the existing, inadequate, and unsafe facilities currently located in the Flightline District. The CATM and SAR would be located completely indoors; no training would occur outdoors. The proposed CATM and SAR project includes the following elements:

- demolition of two existing buildings (B909 and B918) within the Flightline District, totaling 4,268 ft^2 and 9,524 ft^2, respectively;
- construction of a new 29,170-ft^2 combined CATM and SAR with steel-framed structure, reinforced concrete foundation, masonry walls, and standing seam metal roof. Construction of the CATM would include classrooms, weapons maintenance and cleaning rooms, weapons vault, instructor and administrative area, mechanical/electrical rooms, restrooms, and storage; and
- construction of an additional parking lot for the proposed consolidated CATM and SAR totaling 15,000 ft^2.

The proposed SAR would contain 21 firing points with a 50-meter (164-foot) increase in the distance from the firing line to the target line; the training and mission areas would be designed to meet future growth and safety requirements. Overall, activities associated with the combined CATM and SAR would result in a net increase of 30,378 ft^2 of new structure and parking lot.

Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 1, the new combined CATM and SAR facility would be constructed within the Northwest Mission District, south of West Corsair Street; the two existing facilities located within the Flightline District would be demolished. The current site would be reused for parking.

Alternative 2

Under Alternative 2, the current CATM and SAR would undergo a minor renovation. Under this alternative, an additional 1,076 ft^2 would be added to the existing CATM facility and an additional 2,756 ft^2 would be added to the existing SAR. The expanded CATM facility would contain larger classrooms, weapon cleaning areas, and maintenance areas, as well as instructor administrative and storage space. The length of the SAR would increase to 25 meters (82 feet) from the firing line to the target line with no additional firing points.

Alternative 3

Under Alternative 3, the current CATM and SAR would undergo major renovations. Under this alternative, an additional 1,076 ft^2 would be added to the existing CATM facility and an additional 7,803 ft^2 would be added to the existing SAR. The expanded CATM facility would contain larger classrooms, weapon cleaning areas, and maintenance areas than those proposed under Alternative 2, as well as instructor administrative and storage space. As with Alternative 2, the length of the firing range would increase to 25 meters (82 feet) from the firing line to the target line; under Alternative 3, the SAR would have an additional seven firing points.

Civil Engineer Warehouse

The 56 FW proposes to construct a new CEW and parking areas and to demolish the existing warehouse (B325). The proposed warehouse would be located directly north of the footprint of the existing warehouse, north of Gillespie Street. The 56th Civil Engineer Squadron personnel would continue to work from the current warehouse until the new warehouse is constructed. The proposed CEW Project includes the following elements:

- demolition of the existing approximately 11,630 ft^2 warehouse and approximately 30,526 ft^2 storage yard totaling 42,156 ft^2;
- construction of an approximately 10,131-ft^2 pre-engineered metal structure and adjacent storage yard totaling 9,000 ft^2; and
- construction of a new perimeter fence totaling 9,000 linear feet, encompassing the northern portion of the structure and the existing warehouse (B325), which would allow for the extended storage yard.

Overall, activities associated with the proposed CEW would result in a net decrease of 1,499 ft^2 of new structure and 21,526 ft^2 of storage yard.

Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 1, the existing warehouse would be demolished, and additional parking would be constructed in the existing warehouse footprint. A newly constructed warehouse totaling 10,131 ft^2 with a storage yard totaling 9,000 ft^2 would be constructed just north of the existing warehouse.

No other alternatives were identified for this project.

Chapel Building

The 56 FW proposes to construct a new Chapel Building and parking area in the Mission Support District and to demolish a portion of the existing chapel (B799). Chapel functions would continue to be held in the existing chapel until the new chapel is complete. The proposed Chapel Building project would include the following elements:

- demolition of approximately 6,400 ft^2 of the northern portion of the existing chapel structure (B799), which would become an outdoor sanctuary/community space or additional parking;
- construction of a 25,000-ft^2 two-story facility in the undeveloped lot west of the existing chapel parking lot; and
- construction of two parking lots located to the north and south of the proposed Chapel Building, totaling approximately 23,248 ft^2.

Overall, activities associated with the proposed Chapel Building would result in a net increase of 18,600 ft^2 of new structure and 23,248 ft^2 of new parking lot.

Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 1, a portion of the existing chapel (B799) would be demolished and used for other purposes, and a new, larger Chapel Building would be constructed west of the existing structure. Two additional parking lots would be constructed north and south of the proposed Chapel Building.

No other alternatives were identified for this project.

Honor Guard Building

The 56 FW proposes to construct a new Honor Guard Building, training area, and parking area in the Mission Support District and to demolish the existing Honor Guard Building. Currently, the Honor Guard is conducting training in the parking lot of B156. The proposed Honor Guard Building project would include the following elements:

- demolition of the existing, condemned Honor Guard Building totaling approximately 24,617 ft^2 as well as a shaded training area and parking lot;
- construction of a new 4,000-ft^2 Honor Guard Building with two entrances/exits from Homer Drive and Mitchell Street; and
- construction of a 2,300-ft^2 shaded training area located directly north of the proposed facility.

The area considered for the construction of the proposed Honor Guard Building is a cleared, vacant lot. Overall, activities associated with the proposed building would result in a net decrease of 20,617 ft^2 of building space and a net decrease of 18,317 ft^2 of impervious surface area.

Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 1, the existing Honor Guard Building (B156) would be demolished, and a new Honor Guard Building would be constructed in a nearby vacant lot**.** The proposed location for the proposed Honor Guard Building is the only vacant lot that could meet anti-terrorism/force protection standards.

No other alternatives were identified for this project.

Child Development Center

The 56 FW proposes to construct a new CDC, courtyard/playground, and parking area and to renovate the existing CDC in the Community Support District. The existing CDC, located in B1111, B1118, and B1119, would continue to be used until the new CDC is complete. The proposed CDC project would include the following elements:

- construction of a fully functional 36,524-ft^2 CDC with activity rooms, a kitchen, administrative and staff areas, and utility rooms;
- demolition of 550 feet of Kachina Road; (24,750 ft^2);
- construction of a fully fenced courtyard and outdoor playground adjacent to the facility;
- construction of a parking lot totaling 12,000 ft^2; and
- renovation of the existing CDC to be repurposed for other uses.

Overall, activities associated with the proposed CDC project would result in a net increase of 36,524 ft^2 of new structure and 12,000 ft^2 of new parking lot. The CDC would be constructed in accordance with the draft Facilities Criteria 4-740-14F, *Design: Air Force Child Development Centers* (2015).

Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 1, a new CDC facility would be constructed and each area within the proposed facility would be compartmentalized to allow for any changes in childcare needs, including varying age ranges over time, activities throughout the day, and safety requirements to ensure all children are monitored. Under this alternative, the CDC would have a single point of entry for regular traffic and security, with emergency exits for any immediate evacuation precautions. The larger square footage would be expected to increase potential enrollment and would allow families currently on the waiting list to enroll their children at the CDC.

Alternative 2

Under Alternative 2, the CDC would be moved to an existing facility on Base at the Youth Center, which is located less than 0.25 mile from the existing CDC. The Youth Center is considered “underutilized” and has enough space for expansion of the CDC. This alternative would require several renovations to the Youth Center and conversion of a wing of the building to address the capacity issues facing the current CDC. This alternative would increase fragmentation and distribution of building maintenance.

Summary of Findings

Potentially affected environmental resources were identified through communications with state and federal agencies and review of past environmental documentation. Specific environmental resources with the potential for environmental consequences include land use; air quality; geological, water, biological, and cultural resources; infrastructure, transportation, and utilities; noise; hazardous materials and waste; safety; socioeconomics; and environmental justice and protection of children.

In the summary of findings, the term Proposed Action Alternatives is used to refer to Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 when impacts are the same for all alternatives. Where differences occur between alternatives, potential impacts are summarized by each alternative.

Land Use

No significant adverse effects to land use would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives. The construction and demolition projects under the Proposed Action would occur entirely within the existing boundaries of Luke AFB. These projects would be implemented on lands dedicated to their existing missions and no changes to land use would occur. No land use change would occur under the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Geological Resources

No significant effects to geological resources would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives. The construction, demolition, and/or renovation activities associated with the CEW, Honor Guard, Chapel, CDC, and CATM and SAR projects would result in soil disturbances during excavation of foundation materials or removal of impervious surfaces. Soil erosion potential would be short term and limited to construction and demolition activities. With proper project site analyses and implementation of best management practices (BMPs), the potential for increased soil erosion and sedimentation would be expected to be low and could be managed with structural controls such as stormwater diversion, detention ponds, wattles, silt fences, berms, and erosion control mats. No impacts to prime farmland would occur because no prime farmland occurs within Luke AFB.

Air Quality

No significant effects to air quality would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives. The estimated total annual emissions of the Proposed Action Alternatives would not exceed the *de minimis* or Prevention of Significant Deterioration permitting thresholds for any criteria pollutant or precursor. In addition, any dust emissions from construction, demolition, or renovation projects larger than 0.1 acre would be managed per the requirements of a Rule 310 Dust Permit from the Maricopa County Air Quality Department. Therefore, impacts from the Proposed Action Alternatives on regional air quality would be expected to be minor and short term based on the findings of the Air Conformity Applicability Model.

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, expressed in terms of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e), do not have a regulatory threshold; however, estimated emissions for CO_2e demonstrated that CO_2e emissions from the Proposed Action Alternatives would be low when compared to GHG emissions of 25,000 metric tons or more associated with large GHG sources.

Water Resources

No significant effects to water resources would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Surface Water and Stormwater – No natural surface waters are present on Luke AFB. Demolition, construction, and renovation of buildings under the Proposed Action Alternatives would require the short-term use of additional water for dust control. Mitigation measures to control surface runoff from construction sites would minimize sedimentation in washes and opportunities for surface water and stormwater contamination.

Groundwater – The construction, demolition, and renovation projects under the Proposed Action Alternatives would have the potential to impact groundwater if stormwater runoff from construction, demolition and renovation sites contained contaminates and entered the underground aquifer. Stormwater is managed in accordance with the BMPs in the Base's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. These controls, combined with the relatively low rainfall in the region and groundwater resources that are 400–800 feet below the ground surface, would minimize the potential for groundwater contamination.

Floodplains – None of the Proposed Action Alternatives are located within a regulatory floodplain. No impacts to floodplains would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Biological Resources

No significant effects to biological resources would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Vegetation – The areas designated for developments under the Proposed Action Alternatives are highly disturbed or developed. Due to the lack of intact native vegetation in the areas proposed for development and the minimal vegetation clearing associated with the proposed construction and demolition activities, no significant impacts to vegetation would be anticipated to occur.

Terrestrial Wildlife – There is limited suitable habitat for wildlife on Luke AFB because the Installation is highly developed. The Installation supports relatively common wildlife species such as small mammals. It is possible that bats may roost on some of the buildings scheduled for demolition. Buildings and the surrounding construction area would be checked for roosting bats prior to demolition. The bat maternity season is generally from early May through mid- to late-August. The noise and movement temporarily caused by construction and demolition activities would have negligible short-term impacts on wildlife.

Wetlands and Aquatic Resources – No wetlands are present on Luke AFB; therefore, no impacts to wetlands and aquatic resources would be anticipated to occur under the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Threatened or Endangered Species and Other Protected Species – Luke AFB does not contain habitat for either the federally listed threatened yellow-billed cuckoo *(Coccyzus americanus)* or the endangered California least tern *(Sterna antillarum browni)*. The Air Force has determined that the Proposed Action Alternatives would have "no effect" on federally listed threatened or endangered species. In addition, no impacts to bald or golden eagles would be expected because suitable habitat for these species does not exist on Luke AFB. Migratory birds would have the potential to nest in buildings proposed for demolition; however, all project areas would be checked prior to construction and demolition activities for nesting birds or the presence of migratory species such as the western burrowing owl that may be present year-round.

Invasive Species – Soil disturbance associated with either demolition or new construction could create seed beds conducive to the establishment of invasive plant species. Areas that are disturbed would be monitored for invasive plants after project completion. Any invasive species found during development would be eliminated. If invasive plants do become established, the site would be managed under the Base's Integrated Pest Management Plan. Contractors would follow Luke AFB plans and procedures to prevent the spread of invasive plants. However, most of the construction area would be occupied by new buildings and associated parking areas, limiting the potential for establishment of invasive plant species.

Cultural Resources

No significant effects to cultural resources would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Archaeological Sites – Under the Proposed Action Alternatives, no known archaeological sites are located within the direct (50-meter) area of potential effects (APE). Six archaeological sites are located within the indirect (800-meter) APE; however, all projects under the Proposed Action Alternatives are located within highly developed areas and would not be anticipated to impact archaeological sites.

Historic Architectural Properties – The demolition of Buildings B156, B799, B909, and B910 would have no impact on cultural resources. These buildings were previously surveyed and determined ineligible for inclusion on the NRHP.

Traditional Cultural Properties – No sacred sites, human remains, associated grave goods, unassociated grave goods, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony have been identified or recovered on Luke AFB. No impacts to these sites would be anticipated under the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Infrastructure, Transportation, and Utilities

No significant adverse effects to infrastructure, transportation, or utilities would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Potable Water Supply – Change in demand for potable water would be expected to be minimal. The existing potable water supply system has the capacity to meet any demands from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives. Short-term, negligible impacts on the potable water supply system could occur during construction and demolition when existing lines are disconnected from old buildings and new lines are constructed to serve new buildings. There would be a short-term increase in water use for dust control during demolition and construction.

Solid Waste – Under Alternative 1, construction and demolition activities associated with the CATM and SAR, CEW Chapel Building, Honor Guard Building, and CDC would generate solid waste in the form of construction debris. Alternative 1 construction and demolition projects would generate approximately 730,377 pounds (lbs) of construction waste and 18,124,970 lbs of demolition waste. Alternative 2 projects would generate approximately 340,273 lbs of construction waste and 11,561,334 lbs of demolition waste. Alternative 3 projects would result in 575,500 lbs of construction waste and 15,471,834 lbs of demolition waste. No long-term impacts on solid waste management would be expected to occur under the Proposed Action Alternatives because the projects would not appreciably increase the amount of solid waste generated on the Base, and the City of Glendale Municipal Landfill has sufficient capacity to accommodate the waste generated at Luke AFB.

Transportation – Long-term beneficial impacts resulting from the construction (Alternative 1) or relocation (Alternative 2) of the CDC would include reduced commuter congestion and traffic at the Base gates. The CDC is currently at capacity and families are required to seek childcare off-Base, contributing to traffic through the access control points. Construction of the Proposed Action Alternatives would result in minor, beneficial impacts to the transportation environment at Luke AFB. Proposed parking areas associated with the new buildings would provide necessary parking.

Electricity and Natural Gas – The Proposed Action Alternatives would have no long-term impacts to either the electrical or natural gas supply systems. Removing older buildings through demolition and replacing them with larger, more energy-efficient buildings would result in a minor beneficial decrease in either electrical or natural gas demand. Both utility systems have the capacity to meet new demands from increases in building square footage. Any potential short-term disruptions to electrical or natural gas service within project areas during construction and demolition activities would be mitigated during project planning.

Noise

No significant effects to noise would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives. The Proposed Action Alternatives would include construction, demolition, and renovation activities that would occur entirely within the boundaries of Luke AFB. Noise associated with the proposed projects would not cause any significant direct or indirect impacts on noise-sensitive receptors. Operational noise at Luke AFB would not increase from implementation of the Project Action Alternatives.

Hazardous Materials and Wastes

No significant effects to hazardous materials (HAZMAT) and wastes would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Hazardous Materials and Wastes – Under the Proposed Action Alternatives, a limited use of certain HAZMAT would be required during construction and demolition. Associated HAZMAT could include paints, welding gases, solvents, preservatives, sealants, and pesticides. Additionally, hydraulic fluids and petroleum products, such as diesel and gasoline, would be used in construction, demolition, and renovation equipment and vehicles. As such, the Proposed Action Alternatives would create the potential for the accidental discharge or spill of HAZMAT and wastes that could contaminate the environment or result in exposure of persons to such contaminants. With the applicable requirements and management plans in

place for construction of the Proposed Action Alternatives and no contaminants at concentrations that would pose a risk to construction workers, potential HAZMAT effects would be minor and short term.

Asbestos, Lead-Based Paint, and Polychlorinated Biphenyls – Buildings B909, B918, B325, B799, B156, and B1118 associated with the Proposed Action have the potential for containing lead-based paint (LBP) and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB) materials. Buildings B918, B325, B799, and B156 have the potential to contain asbestos-containing materials (ACMs). Procedures for managing ACMs, LBP, and PCBs would be followed as necessary. Asbestos surveys would be conducted, as required, for any permitting with the Maricopa County Air Quality Department.

Perfluoroalkyl Substances and Aqueous Film Forming Foam – Perfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) may be present in soil and/or groundwater at aqueous film forming foam (AFFF) release sites FT-07E, FT-07W, and SS-42 because of past firefighting training activities. No soil disturbance would occur within 150 meters of these sites; therefore, significant impacts to PFAS and AFFF sites would not be anticipated under the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Environmental Restoration Program Sites – There currently are no active Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) sites at Luke AFB, but there are several former sites that require further monitoring. Construction for Proposed Action Alternatives projects and buildings would take place within 150 meters of several ERP sites, including FT-07E, SD-38, and SS-42. However, due to the inactive status of these ERP sites, impacts to the project sites would not be anticipated. The CEW and Honor Guard projects under the Proposed Action Alternatives would be implemented within 150 meters (0.1 mile) of existing aboveground storage tanks (ASTs). Although these projects would be located within proximity of an existing AST, work under the Proposed Action would not be expected to result in impacts to ASTs.

Safety

Moderate, long-term, beneficial impacts to safety would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives. Beneficial impacts would include construction of a new Chapel Building to address capacity issues, construction of a new Honor Guard Building to address the currently condemned and unusable building, and construction of a new CDC to address existing safety issues, such as an insufficient line of sight, outdated intercom and mass notification systems, unsafe outdoor spaces and playground areas, and capacity concerns.

Short-term, negligible-to-minor impacts on contractor health and safety could occur with implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives. To minimize health and safety risks, contractors would be required to use appropriate personal protective equipment and establish and maintain site-specific health and safety programs for their employees and follow all applicable Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations.

Socioeconomics

No significant effects to socioeconomics would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives. The proposed projects would not involve the addition of permanent military, contract, or civilian personnel or their families. Therefore, no impacts to the local or regional population would occur. The construction of new facilities and demolition of existing facilities would result in a temporary increase of 20–50 construction personnel, depending on the number of projects occurring simultaneously; any temporary increase would have a negligible beneficial impact on the socioeconomic condition on the region. Because there would be no permanent increase in military, contract, or civilian personnel, there would be no need for additional housing. Therefore, no adverse impacts on employment, housing, or educational resources would occur under the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Environmental Justice and Protection of Children

Long-term, beneficial impacts to the protection of children would result from construction of the new CDC facility (Alternatives 1 and 3) or renovation of the Youth Center (Alternative 2) to house the CDC. The new CDC would provide safer childcare facilities and improve existing capacity, increasing protection to children of the community. All proposed projects would be located within the Installation and no disproportionate and adverse impacts to communities with environmental justice concerns or youth populations would be anticipated.

Cumulative Impacts

The EA considered cumulative impacts that could result from the incremental impact of Proposed Action Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 when added to other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions on Luke AFB. No potentially significant cumulative impacts were identified.

Mitigation

The EA analysis concluded that neither Alternatives 1, 2, nor 3 of the Proposed Action would result in significant environmental impacts; therefore, no mitigation measures are required. BMPs are described and recommended in the EA where applicable.

Conclusion

Finding of No Significant Impact*.* After review of the EA prepared in accordance with the requirements of NEPA, CEQ regulations, and 32 CFR Part 989*,* and which is hereby incorporated by reference, I have determined that the proposed activities would not have a significant impact on the quality of the human or natural environment. Accordingly, an Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared. This decision was made after considering all submitted information, including a review of agency comments submitted during the 30-day public comment period, and considering a full range of practical alternatives that meet project requirements and are within the legal authority of the US Air Force.

_____ _____

JASON M. RUESCHHOFF DATE
Brigadier General, USAF
Commander, 56th Fighter Wing