

## 6.0 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS REQUIRED BY THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

### 6.1 CONSISTENCY AND COMPLIANCE WITH OTHER FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS

The F-35A Pacific Operational Beddown Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Proposed Action was assessed to determine its consistency and compliance with applicable environmental regulations and other plans, policies, and controls. The United States (U.S.) Air Force (Air Force) has sought input from the various federal, state, and local agencies, as well as Alaska Native tribes and organizations with management responsibilities in the affected environment. The EIS findings indicate that the Proposed Action and No-Action Alternatives would not conflict with the objectives of applicable plans, policies, and regulations. The alternatives were evaluated adequately and accurately in the EIS based on the most current information available. The EIS process provided federal, state, and local agencies, as well as Alaska Native tribes and organizations, the opportunities to review and comment on this proposal, and requisite coordination and consultation have been undertaken. Table 6.1-1 provides a summary of environmental compliance requirements, and how they were achieved for this proposal.

**Table 6.1-1. Summary of Applicable Environmental Regulations and Regulatory Compliance**

<i>Plans, Policies, and Controls</i>	<i>Regulatory Agency Authority</i>	<i>Status of Compliance</i>	<i>Section of EIS</i>
The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (Public Law 91-190, 42 U.S. Code (USC) 4341 <i>et seq.</i> as amended) 1969, and Air Force 32 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 989 procedures for NEPA implementation	Air Force	This EIS was prepared in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA and Air Force NEPA procedures. Section 2.4 provides a full list of NEPA documents and decisions incorporated by reference. Public participation and review were conducted in compliance with NEPA.	All of document
Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 (43 USC 1601-1624)	Air Force	Alaska Native tribes and organizations indicated that they did not wish to conduct further government-to-government coordination with Eielson Air Force Base (AFB). Construction on the base would not affect any land of interest and the F-35As would operate within the rules, regulations, limitations, seasonal adjustments prescribed by the 11th Air Force Alaska Airspace Handbook for operating in the northern Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex (JPARC) airspace.	Sections 4.2 and 4.8
Noise Control Act of 1972 and Quiet Communities Act of 1978	Air Force	Due consideration to noise impacts consistent with these Acts was undertaken.	Section 4.3

**Table 6.1-1. Summary of Applicable Environmental Regulations and Regulatory Compliance**

<i>Plans, Policies, and Controls</i>	<i>Regulatory Agency Authority</i>	<i>Status of Compliance</i>	<i>Section of EIS</i>
Clean Air Act, 42 USC <i>et al.</i>	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)  Division of Air Quality, Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)	The EIS air quality analysis concludes that proposed emissions under any of the alternatives: (1) would not affect the current attainment status at Eielson AFB; (2) would comply with all applicable state and regional air agency permits, rules, and regulations; (3) would not appreciably increase greenhouse gases or Hazardous Air Pollutants; and (4) would not affect the visibility of Prevention of Significant Deterioration sites in interior Alaska. Title V permits will be updated to include applicable new stationary source emissions such as back-up power diesel generators.	Section 4.4
Executive Order (EO) 13514, Federal Leadership in Environmental, Energy, and Economic Performance	Air Force	The Proposed Action Alternative would increase energy and water consumption; however, the base and Fairbanks North Star Borough have the capacity to provide both energy and water without appreciable changes from baseline conditions.	Sections 4.3 and 4.6
National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended in 1980, 54 USC 100101 <i>et al.</i>	Alaska State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)	Section 106 consultation was conducted with the Alaska SHPO; concurrence was received that there would be no adverse effects at Eielson AFB or to areas underlying northern JPARC airspace. Alaska Native tribes and organizations indicated that they did not wish to conduct further government-to-government consultation.	Section 4.8
Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979, 16 USC 470 <i>et al.</i> ; ARPA) of 1979, Final Uniform Regulations, 32 CFR Part 229 (1997).	Alaska SHPO	The Proposed Action Alternative would not adversely affect archeological resources.	Section 4.8
EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations	Air Force	The Proposed Action Alternative would not result in disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority or low-income populations.	Section 4.9
EO 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks	Air Force	The Proposed Action Alternative could result in adverse learning capabilities to children from classroom interference events.	Section 4.9
Endangered Species Act of 1973, 16 USC 1531 <i>et seq.</i>	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	The Proposed Action Alternative would not affect federally listed species at Eielson AFB. No adverse impacts would occur to the two listed species under JPARC airspace or at any of the impact areas on the ranges.	Section 4.10
The Sikes Act of 1960 (16 USC 670a-670o), as amended	Air Force	Eielson AFB would continue to manage its lands with the goals of maintaining public access and use to the extent possible compatible with the military mission. No adverse impacts.	Section 4.10

**Table 6.1-1. Summary of Applicable Environmental Regulations and Regulatory Compliance**

<i>Plans, Policies, and Controls</i>	<i>Regulatory Agency Authority</i>	<i>Status of Compliance</i>	<i>Section of EIS</i>
Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, 16 USC 703 <i>et al.</i>	USFWS	The Proposed Action Alternative would not adversely affect migratory birds at the base or within JPARC airspace.	Section 4.10
Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, 16 USC 668-668d	USFWS	The higher altitudes at which F-35As operate would not introduce any new or adverse effects to eagles.	Section 4.10
Clean Water Act, 33 USC Sections 1251 to 1387 (1986 and Supplement 1997)  Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, 42 USC Sections 300f to 300j-26 (1991 and Supplement 1997)	USEPA  United States Army Corps of Engineers/Alaska  Division of Water, ADEC	A Clean Water Act Section 404 permit is required for potential wetland impacts and will be conducted prior to any ground-disturbing activities. Stormwater runoff during construction and operational phases of the project will be regulated (prior to off-base discharge) under the Alaska Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit and associated Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. Following construction completion, adherence to applicable federal and state stormwater and erosion practices would be applied to new operational activities.	Sections 4.10 and 4.12
EO 11988, Floodplain Management, as amended by EO 13690, Establishing a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard and Process for Further Soliciting and Considering Stakeholder Input	Federal Emergency Management Agency	Fifty-six acres of Eielson AFB would be developed in the 100-year floodplain. There are no other practicable alternatives for locating these facilities in the 100-year floodplain, along and adjacent to the flight line. New construction within the 100-year floodplain would adhere to established floodplain management objectives and structure construction to avoid adverse effects to floodplains.	Section 4.12

## 6.2 UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Avoidance, minimization, or mitigation of adverse effects to natural, cultural, and other environmental resources were integrated into the Proposed Action Alternative to the greatest extent possible and practicable; however, all impacts may not be completely avoided and/or mitigated. Specifically, there would be a loss of approximately 21 acres of undeveloped land, of which about 17 acres are wetlands and 56 acres would be developed in the 100-year floodplain. Additionally, there would be an increase in the number of people exposed to noise levels between 65 and 70 decibels (dB) day-night average sound level (dB DNL).

### **6.3 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES AND LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY**

Analysis of the relationship between a project's short-term impacts on the environment and the effects those impacts may have on the maintenance and enhancement of the long-term productivity of the affected environment is required under NEPA. Impacts that narrow the range of beneficial uses of the environment are of particular concern. This means that choosing one option may reduce future flexibility in pursuing other options, or that committing a resource to a certain use may eliminate the possibility for other uses of that resource.

The Proposed Action Alternative and No-Action Alternative would result in both short- and long-term environmental effects to air quality, soils, wetlands, and floodplains. However, neither of the alternatives is expected to result in impacts that would reduce overall environmental productivity, permanently narrow the range of beneficial uses of the environment, or pose long-term risks to health, safety, or the general welfare of the public.

### **6.4 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES**

Primary irreversible effects result from permanent use of a nonrenewable resource (e.g., minerals or energy). Irretrievable resource commitments involve the loss in value of an affected resource that cannot be restored as a result of the alternatives (e.g., archaeological findings) or consumption of renewable resources that are not permanently lost (e.g., wetlands). Secondary impacts could result from environmental accidents, such as fires or flooding. Natural resources include minerals, energy, land, water, forestry, and biota. Nonrenewable resources are those resources that cannot be replenished by natural means, including oil, natural gas, and iron ore. Renewable natural resources are those resources that can be replenished by natural means, including water, lumber, and soil.

Both alternatives would involve irretrievable commitments of nonrenewable and renewable resources and could involve: (1) general industrial resources such as capital, labor, fuels, and construction materials and (2) project-specific resources such as forests and other land uses within the construction footprint. Under the Proposed Action Alternative, ground disturbance may potentially affect previously unknown cultural resources. However, if unknown cultural resources are discovered during construction or site grading activities, work would be stopped immediately and procedures for inadvertent discovery implemented. This would minimize any irreversible or irretrievable effects to cultural resources.

The resources necessary to implement improvements to existing military lands would not be retrievable if any of the alternatives were implemented. However, the total amount of construction materials under the Proposed Action Alternative (e.g., concrete, insulation, wiring) required is relatively small when compared to the resources available in the region. All new construction, moreover, would comply with EO 13423, *Strengthening Federal Environmental, Energy, and Transportation Management*, and EO 13514, *Federal Leadership in Environmental, Energy, and Economic Performance*. EO 13423 set goals for federal agencies in areas such as energy efficiency, renewable energy, toxic chemical reduction, recycling, sustainable buildings, electronics stewardship, and water conservation. EO 13514 expands on the requirements set forth in EO 13423 and mandates that federal agencies meet numerical and non-numerical targets. For example, EO 13514 requires that 95 percent of all new contracts require the use of water-efficient fixtures, low-flow fixtures, non-toxic or less toxic products, and energy-efficient products. EO 13514 also requires that all new construction comply with the *Guiding Principles for*

*Federal Leadership in High Performance and Sustainable Buildings.* This includes employing design and construction strategies that increase energy efficiency, eliminate solid waste, and reduce stormwater runoff. One strategy for reducing stormwater runoff is the implementation of low impact development technologies. The goal of low impact development technologies is to maintain or restore the natural hydrologic functions of a site and reduce the run-off rate, filter out pollutants, and facilitate the infiltration of water into the ground.

Following construction, military training and office operations would consume nonrenewable resources such as jet fuel and various office supplies. These materials and the energy required for operations are not in short supply; their use would not have an adverse impact on the continued availability of these resources, and the energy resource commitment is not anticipated to be excessive in terms of region-wide usage. Furthermore, compliance with the requirements set forth in EOs 13423 and 13514 would further minimize any irreversible or irretrievable effects to multiple non-renewable and renewable resources.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank.