

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 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 region. The EIS findings indicate that the Proposed Action and No-Action Alternative 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 provides a summary of environmental compliance requirements that may apply to the Proposed Action and how they have been achieved.

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 United States (U.S.) Code (USC) 4341 <i>et seq.</i> as amended) 1969, and Air Force 32 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 989 regulations for NEPA implementation	Air Force	This EIS has been prepared in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA and Air Force NEPA procedures. Section 2.3 provides a full list of NEPA documents and decisions incorporated by reference. Public participation and review are being conducted in compliance with NEPA.	All of document
Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 (43 USC 1601-1624)	Air Force	Eielson Air Force Base (AFB) is consulting on a government-to-government basis with Alaska Native tribes and organizations. 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 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

Plans, Policies, and Controls	Regulatory Agency Authority	Status of Compliance	Section of EIS
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 air quality analysis in the EIS 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 rules and regulations, (3) would not appreciably increase Greenhouse Gases or Hazardous Air Pollutants, and (4) would not affect Prevention of Significant Deterioration sites in central Alaska. Title V permits will be updated to include applicable new stationary source emissions.	Section 4.4
Executive Order (EO) 13514, Federal Leadership in Environmental, Energy, and Economic Performance	Air Force	The alternatives would increase energy and water consumption; however, the base has 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 has begun with the Alaska SHPO; however, initially the Air Force concluded that there would be no adverse effects to the Eielson AFB historic district. Coordination with Alaska Native tribes and organizations is ongoing by Eielson AFB's Wing Commander.	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 alternatives would not affect archeological resources.	Section 4.8
EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations	Air Force	The alternatives 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 alternatives would not result in disproportionate risks to children from environmental health risks or safety risks.	Section 4.9
Endangered Species Act of 1973, 16 USC <i>et al.</i>	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	None of the alternatives would affect federally-listed species at Eielson AFB. No adverse impacts would occur to listed species under JPARC airspace or 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 will continue to manage its lands with the goals of maintaining public access and use to the extent possible compatible with the military mission.	Section 4.10
Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, 16 USC 703 <i>et al.</i>	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	The Proposed Action Alternative would not affect migratory birds.	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>
Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, 16 USC 668-668d	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Coordination with the USFWS is ongoing. However, the higher altitudes at which F-35As operate would not introduce any new or adverse effects to the 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. Coordination with United States Army Corps of Engineers Alaska is ongoing. Stormwater runoff during construction and operational phases of the project will be regulated (prior to off-base discharge) under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit and associated Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. Following construction completion, adherence to applicable federal and state stormwater and erosion Best Management Practices would be applied to new operational activities.	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 12 are in wetland areas. Additionally, the number of people exposed to noise levels between 65 and 70 decibels (dB) day-night average sound level (dB DNL) and greater would increase.

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, and wetlands. However, neither of these 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. 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, nontoxic 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. Several types of materials such as paper, toner cartridges, aluminum cans, glass containers, steel and bi-metal cans, and textiles would be recycled from office operations and would not become solid waste. The construction materials and energy required for construction and 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.