APPENDIX A: National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement

This page intentionally left blank.

DRAFT
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
AMONG
THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
THE ALASKA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND
THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING
THE DISPOSITION OF HANGARS 2 AND 3
AT
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA

WHEREAS, the United States Department of the Army, acting through the United States Army Garrison Fort Wainwright (USAG FWA), proposes to demolish Hangar 2 (Building 3008) and Hangar 3 (Building 3005),[1] or maintain the status quo with No Action; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA has determined that this is an Undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), 16 U.S.C. § 470(f), and its implementing regulations, 36 C.F.R. § 800; and

WHEREAS, Hangar 2 and Hangar 3 are contributing resources of the Ladd Field National Historic Landmark (Ladd Field NHL) and the Ladd Air Force Base Cold War Historic District (Cold War Historic District); and

WHEREAS, the Ladd Field NHL was designated in 1985 with twenty-six contributing resources,[2] of which six resources have been demolished or destroyed, and with the expected loss of Hangars 2 and 3, eighteen contributing resources will remain; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA defined the Undertaking's Area of Potential Effect as the Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District (Attachment A); and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA determined that the Undertaking will have an adverse effect on the Ladd Field NHL and Cold War Historic District[3] which are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) and initiated consultation with the Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) on 3 October 2011 pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 800; and

WHEREAS, the National Park Service (NPS) pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 65.1(c) administers the National Historic Landmarks program on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior; and

---

[1] The Alaska Historic Resource Survey (AHRS) identifier for Hangar 2 is FAI-485, and the identifier of Hangar 3 is FAI-482.
[2] Two facilities, Building 2007 and Building 2106 were incorrectly identified as contributing resources in the 1985 nomination. The two facilities are Cold War hangars that were built after Ladd Field NHL's period of significance.
[3] The AHRS identifier for the Ladd Field NHL is FAI-236, and the identifier for the Cold War Historic District is FAI-1288.

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA notified and invited the NPS Alaska Region to consult on this Undertaking on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior on 15 November 2011 pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 800.10(c), and the NPS accepted the invitation to consult and sign this Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) as a concurring party; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA notified and invited the Upper Tanana tribes, the Fairbanks North Star Borough (FNSB) Historic Preservation Commission, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and the Tanana-Yukon Historical Society (TYHS) to consult regarding the Undertaking on 15 November 2011 pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 800.3(f) and all but the Upper Tanana tribes accepted the invitation to consult, and FNSB Historic Preservation Commission and TYHS agreed to sign this MOA as concurring parties; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA consulted with the Fort Wainwright Cultural Resources Working Group, a group of interested parties and individuals who meet with the USAG FWA Cultural Resources staff typically twice a year to discuss and provide input on cultural resources projects at Fort Wainwright; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with 36 C.F.R. § 800.6(a)(1), the USAG FWA notified the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) of its adverse effect determination on 15 November 2011 providing the required documentation, and the ACHP chose to participate in accordance with 36 C.F.R. § 800.6(a)(1)(iii); and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA provided the public with information on the Undertaking and an opportunity to consult through the USAG FWA Environmental Website, at a public meeting on 14 December 2011, and through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA sought partnership with other federal and state agencies including the BLM, NPS Alaska Region, Department of Interior National Business Center, Alaska National Guard, and State of Alaska Division of Forestry to rehabilitate or transfer ownership of the hangars on 06 December 2011 and 23 February 2012, and received no interested replies; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA previously proposed demolition of the hangars and agreed to mitigation measures through the executed *Memorandum of Agreement among the U.S. Department of the Army, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding United States Army Alaska Demolition of Buildings in the Ladd Field National Historic Landmark* signed on 23 May 2001; and

WHEREAS, as a result of this previous mitigation for demolition, the Army determined that a reduced amount of mitigation is appropriate to resolve adverse effects of this Undertaking and consulted with the SHPO concerning this determination; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA reaffirms its responsibility to develop the Historic Buildings Assessment Report and update of Historic American Building Survey Level 1 documentation

which are both projects that USAG FWA previously agreed to produce to mitigate past adverse effects to Hangars 2 and 3[4]; and

WHEREAS, this MOA only addresses the first step in that process of official re-evaluation of the Ladd Field NHL which is the submittal of the re-evaluation to the NPS Alaska Region; and

WHEREAS, outside of the responsibilities detailed in this MOA, it is the USAG FWA's long-term goal to officially submit the findings of the re-evaluation of the Ladd Field NHL to the National Historic Landmarks Program for approval per 36 CFR § 65.8; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA completed in April 2012 the *Reuse Study of FWA's Hangars 2 and 3* which included six options for reuse and rehabilitation with associated cost estimates as part of the mitigation in the *Programmatic Agreement among the U.S. Department of the Army, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding Aviation Stationing* signed on 28 September 2009; and

WHEREAS, during the early stages of the Section 106 consultation, the USAG FWA considered four possible disposition options: rehabilitation of one or both hangars, demolition of one or both hangars, rehabilitation of one hangar and demolition of one, and no action (i.e. maintaining the status quo) concerning both hangars; and

WHEREAS, on 23 May 2012, the USAG FWA Cultural Resources Manager, NPS Alaska Region Historical Architect, SHPO Architectural Historian, and USAG FWA Structural and Electrical Engineers met at Fort Wainwright for a site visit to discuss the NPS Alaska Region and SHPO suggestions on ways to possibly reduce the rehabilitation costs of Hangars 2 and 3; and

WHEREAS, through further analysis, the USAG FWA found that rehabilitation of one or both hangars was not fiscally viable, and the Section 106 consultation and the NEPA EIS were adjusted accordingly; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA reaffirms its desire to be a good steward of the Ladd Field NHL, the Cold War Historic District, and all other historic properties under its care; and

NOW, THEREFORE, the USAG FWA, the SHPO, and the ACHP agree that the Undertaking will be implemented in accordance with the following stipulations in order to take into account the effect of the Undertaking on the historic properties.

[4] The Historic American Building Survey Level 1 documentation is mitigation in the *Programmatic Agreement among the U.S. Department of the Army, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding Aviation Stationing*, and per the agreement, the USAG FWA will complete the project in 2013. The Historic Buildings Assessment Report is mitigation in the *Memorandum of Agreement among the U.S. Department of the Army, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding the Removal of the Overhangs and Stairwells on Hangars 2 and 3*, and per the agreement, the USAG FWA will complete the project in 2016.

STIPULATIONS

USAG FWA shall ensure that the following measures are carried out:

I. MITIGATION FOR THE DEMOLITION OF HANGARS 2 AND 3

A. Public Outreach.

1. In pursuit of more visibility and appreciation for the Ladd Field NHL, the USAG FWA Cultural Resources staff will be available upon request to present lectures to local Fairbanks groups (military and/or non-military) on Fort Wainwright's World War II history. This availability will be noted on the USAG FWA's Environmental website and emails will be sent out to local groups within one month of the execution of this MOA.

2. The USAG FWA will continue to engage the public through the use of previously developed publications by making information and tools available for teachers and other educators, including the Teaching with Historic Places lesson plan on Ladd Field and its role in World War II.

3. In pursuit of more visibility and appreciation for the Ladd Field NHL, the USAG FWA will submit, at minimum, three articles concerning the historic preservation of Fort Wainwright's Ladd Field NHL to local or state publications, possibly including, but not limited to, local, non-profit and statewide newspapers, websites, various social media, and newsletters within one year of executing this MOA and two articles a year, every year, for a subsequent four years.

4. For five years from the execution of this MOA, the USAG FWA will update and seek input twice a year from consulting parties on these public outreach projects detailed in Stipulation I.B starting six months after the execution of this MOA.

B. Re-evaluation of the Ladd Field NHL.

1. The USAG FWA will complete a re-evaluation of the Ladd Field NHL, through preparation of a revised draft NHL nomination, including an analysis of cumulative effects on the Ladd Field NHL from previous demolitions and additions.

2. Within four years of the demolition of Hangars 2 and 3, a draft of the Ladd Field NHL re-evaluation will be submitted to the consulting parties for a 30-day calendar review. The USAG FWA will consider any comments on the draft received from the consulting parties within the 30-day calendar review period.

3. The USAG FWA will submit a final version of the re-evaluation to the consulting parties no less than a year after submitting the first draft.

4. The re-evaluation will include submitting the appropriate documentation to the NPS Alaska Region within five years of the demolition of Hangars 2 and 3.

C. Stewardship of the Ladd Field NHL. With the expected loss of Hangars 2 and 3, the USAG FWA will refocus the efforts of its Directorate of Public Works (DPW) staff on effective stewardship through focused and purposeful management of the remaining contributing resources that comprise the Ladd Field NHL.

1. The USAG FWA will utilize existing and currently planned documentation to further historic preservation objectives and goals including, but not limited to, utilizing the already developed Design Guidelines for the Ladd Field NHL, the educational PowerPoint presentations on historic preservation subjects, and the currently planned but not yet developed Historic Buildings Assessment Report.[5]

2. Within one year of completing the Historic Buildings Assessment Report for the Ladd Field NHL, recommendations from the report will be submitted for consideration in the DPW Annual Work Plan[6].

D. Mitigation for the No Action Option for Hangars 2 and 3. Mitigation for the No Action Option for Hangars 2 and 3 is treated the same as demolition detailed in Stipulations I.A-D except any stipulation's timeframe that is based on demolition will instead be based on the execution of this MOA.

II. MONITORING AND REPORTING

A. Summary Report. Once a year every spring following the execution of this MOA until it expires or is terminated, the USAG FWA shall provide all consulting parties a summary report via email detailing all work undertaken pursuant to this MOA.

1. The summary report shall include progress on the following; demolition progress, public outreach, status of the re-evaluation of the Ladd Field NHL, and stewardship efforts regarding the Ladd Field NHL.

2. In addition, each summary report shall include any scheduling changes proposed, any problems encountered, and any disputes and objections received in the USAG FWA's efforts to carry out the stipulations of this MOA.

3. Upon notification of any summary report, the consulting parties can request, within 30 days, a meeting for further clarification if needed.

[5] The Historic Buildings Assessment Report will detail maintenance and repair needs for the NHL and Cold War Historic District buildings.
[6] The Annual Work Plan is DPW's yearly list of possible repair and maintenance projects for Fort Wainwright buildings.

III. POST REVIEW DISCOVERIES

If potential historic properties are discovered or unanticipated effects on historic properties occur, the USAG FWA will implement the discovery plan included as Attachment B of this MOA.

IV. DISPUTE RESOLUTION

A. Should any signatory party to this MOA object at any time to any actions proposed or the manner in which the terms of this MOA are implemented, the USAG FWA will consult with such party to resolve the objection. If the USAG FWA determines that such objection cannot be resolved:

1. The USAG FWA will forward all documentation relevant to the dispute, including the USAG FWA's proposed resolution, to the ACHP. The ACHP will provide the USAG FWA with its advice on the resolution of the objection within 30 calendar days of receiving adequate documentation. Prior to reaching a final decision on the dispute, the USAG FWA will prepare a written response that takes into account any timely advice or comments regarding the dispute from the ACHP and the signatories, and provide them with a copy of this written response. The USAG FWA will then proceed according to its final decision.

2. If the ACHP does not provide its advice regarding the dispute within the 30-calendar day time period, the USAG FWA may make a final decision on the dispute and proceed accordingly. Prior to reaching such a final decision, the USAG FWA will prepare a written response that takes into account any timely comments regarding the dispute from the signatories to the MOA, and provide the signatories and the ACHP with a copy of such written response.

3. The USAG FWA will be responsible for carrying out all other actions that are not the subject of the dispute.

B. If an objection pertaining to this MOA is raised by a member of the public at any time during implementation of any stipulation in this MOA, the USAG FWA will notify the signatories to this MOA and take into account the objection.

V. AMENDMENT

This MOA may be amended when such an amendment is agreed to in writing by all signatories. The amendment will be effective on the date a copy is signed by all of the signatories and submitted to the ACHP.

VI. TERMINATION

A. If any signatory believes that the terms of this MOA are not being honored or cannot be carried out, or that an amendment to its terms should be made, that signatory will immediately consult with the other signatories to consider and develop amendments to the MOA per Stipulation IV.

B. If this MOA is not amended as provided for in Stipulation IV, the USAG FWA, the SHPO, or the ACHP may propose in writing to terminate this MOA with an explanation of the reasons for termination. If the signatories have found no alternative solution to termination within 30 calendar days after receipt of the written notice, the MOA shall be terminated. If this MOA is terminated and prior to work continuing on the Undertaking, the USAG FWA must either (a) execute a new MOA pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 800.6, or (b) request, take into account, and respond to the comments of the ACHP under 36 C.F.R. § 800.7 and will notify the signatories as to the course of action it will pursue.

VII. ANTI-DEFICIENCY ACT

All requirements set forth in this MOA requiring the expenditure of the USAG FWA funds are expressly subject to the availability of appropriations and the requirements of the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. § 1341). No obligation undertaken by the USAG FWA under the terms of this MOA will require or be interpreted to require a commitment to expend funds not obligated for a particular purpose.

VIII. DURATION

This MOA will become effective upon execution by the signatories and will remain in effect until terminated or twelve years after its execution as long as all stipulations are completed. If all stipulations are not completed prior to such time, USAG FWA may consult with the signatories to reconsider the terms of the MOA and amend it in accordance with Stipulation V. Amendment.

EXECUTION of this MOA by the USAG FWA, the SHPO, and the ACHP and implementation of its terms evidence that the USAG FWA has taken into account the effects of this Undertaking on historic properties and afforded the ACHP an opportunity to comment.

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
AMONG
THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
THE ALASKA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND
THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING
THE DISPOSITION OF HANGARS 2 AND 3
AT
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA

Signatories:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
FORT WAINWRIGHT

By: _____
RONALD M. JOHNSON
COL, SF
Commanding

Date: _____

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
AMONG
THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
THE ALASKA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND
THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING
THE DISPOSITION OF HANGARS 2 AND 3
AT
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA

Signatories:

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

By: _____
JOHN M. FOWLER
Executive Director

Date: _____

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
AMONG
THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
THE ALASKA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND
THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING
THE DISPOSITION OF HANGARS 2 AND 3
AT
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA

Signatories:

ALASKA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER

By: _____
JUDITH E. BITTNER
State Historic Preservation Officer

Date: _____

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
AMONG
THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
THE ALASKA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND
THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING
THE DISPOSITION OF HANGARS 2 AND 3
AT
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA

Concurring Parties:

National Park Service

By: _____
SUE E. MASICA
Alaska Regional Director

Date: _____

Tanana Yukon Historical Society

By: _____
RON INOUYE
President

Date: _____

FNSB Historic Preservation Commission

By: _____
CLAUS-M.NASKE
Chair

Date: _____

Attachment A

Area of Potential Effect for the Undertaking

Attachment B

POST REVIEW AND UNANTICIPATED DISCOVERIES PLAN

A. In the course of conducting approved activities, the USAG FWA and/or their contractors shall not intentionally or knowingly affect (such as remove, disturb, or cause to be removed or disturbed) any historic properties outside the approved scope of work.

B. In the event that a previously unidentified archaeological site is discovered during the execution of this undertaking, all ground disturbing activity shall immediately cease in the area of the discovery until the USAG FWA archaeologist or other USAG FWA personnel who meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Archeologists* can evaluate the archaeological site. Construction work may continue in the project area outside the archaeological resource area. The USAG FWA shall notify the SHPO and appropriate Alaska Native tribes within 3 business days of discovery. The USAG FWA shall ensure that any archaeological work that may be necessary shall be completed in accordance with the NHPA and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act. The SHPO and/or the Alaska Native tribes, if they so request, may immediately inspect the work site to determine the nature and area of the affected archaeological site. Within 10 business days of the original notification of the discovery, the USAG FWA, in consultation with the SHPO and interested Alaska Native tribes, will determine the National Register eligibility of the resource and will propose action to resolve possible adverse effects to any affected National Register-eligible archaeological sites. Work may resume in affected areas after approval by the USAG FWA Cultural Resources Manager and the SHPO.

C. If human remains are inadvertently discovered; the USAG FWA shall notify the SHPO within 24 hours of discovery. The USAG FWA shall cease all work by their contractors and ensure that the remains are secured from further disturbance or vandalism until after the appropriate law enforcement authorities have ensured that the remains are not related to any crime, and until a plan for treatment has been developed. If the USAG FWA determines that the remains are Native American, the Garrison Commander shall immediately undertake any actions necessary under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, as amended. If the USAG FWA determines that the remains are not Native American, and do not warrant criminal investigation, the USAG FWA shall immediately notify the SHPO and consult with the SHPO to identify descendants or other interested parties, if any. The USAG FWA, in consultation with the SHPO and any interested parties, shall develop a plan for the respectful treatment and disposition of the remains. Work may resume in affected areas after approval by the USAG FWA Cultural Resources Manager and the SHPO.

D. If during the course of the undertaking there are any unforeseen or unanticipated effects to historic properties other than the identification of a previously unknown archaeological site, the USAG FWA shall initiate consultation pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 800.13(b)(3) to resolve the unforeseen effects.

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX B: Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement

This page intentionally left blank.

Possessors of classified: 4,623.
Non-Possessors of classified: 8,517.
Responses per respondent: 1.
Average burden hours per respondent:
Possessors of classified: 5.3 hours.
Non-Possessors of classified: 2 hours.
Frequency: Periodic (*e.g.,* Possessors—annually, Non-Possessors—18 months, compliance reviews, or when directed).

Industrial security facility clearance survey data:
Total annual burden hours: 4,902 hours.
Number of respondents: 2,451.
Responses per respondent: 1.
Average burden hours per respondent: 2 hours.
Frequency: On occasion (*e.g.,* initial eligibility determination and when condition significantly changes, such as a change in ownership).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Summary of Information Collection

Executive Order (EO) 12829, ''National Industrial Security Program (NISP),'' January 6, 1993, as amended by EO 12885, December 14, 1993, established the NISP to safeguard federal government classified information released to contractors, licensees, and grantees of the US government. Section 202(a) of EO 12829 stipulates that the Secretary of Defense shall serve as the Executive Agent for inspecting and monitoring the contractors, licensees, and grantees who require or will require access to or who store or will store classified information; and for determining the eligibility for access to classified information of contractors, licensees, grantees, and their respective employees. The specific requirements necessary to protect classified information released to private industry are set forth in DoD 5220.22M, ''National Industrial Security Program Operating Manual (NISPOM),'' February 28, 2006. The Executive Agent has the authority to issue, after consultation with affected agencies, standard forms or other standardization that will promote the implementation of the NISP. Contractors operating under DoD security cognizance are subject to an initial facility clearance survey and periodic government security reviews to determine their eligibility to participate in the NISP and ensure that safeguards employed are adequate for the protection of classified information.

DoD Directive 5105.42, ''Defense Security Service,'' August 30, 2010, incorporating Change 1, March 31, 2011, delineates the mission, functions, and responsibilities of DSS. DSS is an agency of the DoD under authority, direction, and control of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence. DSS functions and responsibilities include the administration and implementation of the Defense portion of the NISP pursuant to EO 12829.

DSS is the office of record for the maintenance of information pertaining to contractor facility clearance records and industrial security information regarding cleared contractors under its cognizance. To the extent possible, information required as part of the survey or security review is obtained as a result of observation by the representative of the Cognizant Security Agency or its designated Cognizant Security Office. Some of the information may be obtained based on conferences with Key Management Personnel and/or other employees of the company. The information is used to respond to all inquires regarding the facility clearance status and classified information storage capability of cleared contractors. It is also used to assess and/or advise Government Contracting Activities regarding any particular contractor's continued ability to protect classified information.

Dated: November 10, 2011.

Aaron Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2011–29532 Filed 11–15–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Environmental Impact Statement for Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, AK

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Army announces its intent to conduct public scoping under the National Environmental Policy Act to gather information to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) related to the disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 at Fort Wainwright, Alaska. Hangars 2 and 3 are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark (NHL). The Department of the Army will use the analysis in the EIS to determine which alternative to implement. There may be significant impacts to historic properties.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be forwarded to Ms. Carrie McEnteer, Directorate of Public Works, Attention: IMPC–FWA–PWE (McEnteer), 1060 Gaffney Road #4500, Fort Wainwright, AK 99703–4500; fax (907) 361–9867; email: *carrie.mcenteer@us.army.mil.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Please contact Ms. Linda Douglass, Public Affairs Office (PAO), IMPC–FWA–PAO (Douglass), 1060 Gaffney Road #5900, Fort Wainwright, AK 99703–5900; telephone (907) 353–6701, email: *linda.douglass@us.army.mil.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The decision to be made by the Army is regarding the disposition of two historic aircraft hangars located at Fort Wainwright. The EIS will assess the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts associated with various proposed facility disposition options to meet safety, funding, facilities management, land use, and cultural resources management objectives. The condition of the facilities warrants a decision on the disposition that meets the aforementioned management objectives.

The implementation of the proposed action would determine the disposition for the historic hangars. Based on the decision, a management strategy would be developed. A range of reasonable alternatives, including a No Action Alternative, will be developed and analyzed in the EIS. Alternatives to be considered include converting both hangars to another use, demolishing both hangars, demolishing one hangar and retaining one hangar, indefinite mothballing of the buildings, and transferring facilities and management responsibility to another agency. Other reasonable alternatives raised during the scoping process and capable of meeting the project purpose and need and criteria will be considered for evaluation in the EIS.

Scoping and public comments: Native Americans, Alaska Natives, federal, state, and local agencies, organizations, and the public are invited to be involved in the scoping process for the preparation of this EIS by participating in scoping meetings and/or submitting written comments. The scoping process will help identify possible alternatives, potential environmental impacts, and key issues of concern to be analyzed in the EIS. Written comments will be accepted within 60 days of publication of the Notice of Intent in the **Federal Register**. Scoping meetings will be held in Fairbanks, AK. Notification of the times and locations for the scoping meetings will be locally published.

Brenda S. Bowen,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2011–29410 Filed 11–15–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–P

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX C: Public Scoping Correspondence

This page intentionally left blank.

Optional Information:(Please print legibly)

Your Name: _____

Mailing Address: _____

_____

Email Address: _____

☐ *Please check here if you would NOT like to be on the mail or email list.*

Comments must be postmarked by 17 January 2012.

Or email comments to carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil

Alternative 2, 4 & 5 must take into account the impact on Ft. Wainwright's mission. If the buildings are still counted as square footage of the post, it will impact any future building needs. To have two old unsafe buildings rather than hangers needed to store & protect current aircraft and troops is unacceptable.

Alternative 4 gives the most flexibility & is a good compromise if the Army has a need for that type of space.

Can the building be transferred to other ownership with the land remaining DOD? Would this impact Post security?

Alt. 5 is unsafe, does not help the military & needlessly increases the maintenance expenses.

Alt. 3 is the most reasonable for our military, it is doubtful any agency or organization could afford to bring it to safe use while remaining compatible w/ military airstrip.

From: Krystin Bogan
To: McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US)
Subject: Hangar Meeting
Date: Wednesday, December 14, 2011 5:30:41 PM

Hi Carrie,
I saw the article about the Ft Wainwright hangar meeting in the News-Miner. Something to think about would be to turn one of them into a Roller Rink. There are 3 Roller Derby teams in the Fairbanks area that would love to see that happen.
Anyway just a thought.

Krystin Bogan

Smith, Spence

From: Accountant [Accountant@tananavalleyfair.org]
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2011 1:53 PM
To: McEnteer, Carrie L CIV (US)
Cc: Randi Carnahan; Accountant
Subject: Army hangars

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Ms. McEnteer,

Good morning, my name is Joyce Whitehorn and I am President of the Tanana Valley State Fair Association. In reading your article on the Army hangars that are being disposed of I would like to ask a few questions.

What size are the hangars?

Are they moveable in pieces?

Where are they located?

Would be allowed to inspect the hangars?

We are a non-profit organization and would be interested in a possible donation of the buildings to the Fair Association, where all the community would be able to have access to them for events throughout the year. It is a shame for building to be destroyed when it could be put to use as an entertainment building, community event building or other needs. I would be interested in any comment or idea you may have on helping us "reenergize" these hangers for the community.

You may reach me at account@tananavalleyfair.org or call 907-451-5549.

Thank you for your consideration,

Joyce Whitehorn, President
Tanana Valley State Fair Association

Dec. 22-2011

To ~~Mr.~~ Ms. Carrie McEntee;

I writing in regards to the disposition of the Hangers 2 and 3 options. My suggestions keeping as much of historical (as possible). One could be taken down (moved) to the fair grounds? Ladd Field Building (name) Purpose- as the past and present of our military presence! The other could be moved to where Captain Bartlett stood! Is these room? Isn't that part of Ladd field? Purpose as a complete "history" of Ladd field, (museum) date built, pictures of Ladd field, etc; could be used for tours, school - UAF (College); history of the presence, etc; When (date) Ladd Field moved to Fort Wainwright and name changed. I've been here in Fairbanks for 30 years have seen many changes and I'm some what a history buff? We have several museums but I feel they are ~~the~~ scattered with several duplicated in the different museums. I have traveled across country and at 79 years old - remembering when world war 1 started - in the Boy Scouts - went around with the air raid wardens at night - during our black outs!! making sure cars stopped - lights out & homes dark; in my state I have heard many uses for them (the biggest use a roller rink) - but I think (my) suggestion would be a plus for Fairbanks and (stay) into something that could or wouldn't go (out of Business)

Thanking you for a consideration!

P.S.

I'm not into the computer age or cell phone & i-pods etc, more or old fashion (some)! Also my suggestions could be (naturally) modified!!

Floyd A. Tolly
P.O. Box 73514
Fairbanks, AK.
99707
phone (907) 455-8038

APPENDIX D: Agency Correspondence

Appendix D contains the formal correspondence that took place between the Army and various federal, state, and local agencies, as well as Native Alaska tribes during the course of the National Environmental Policy Act and National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 processes for the proposed *Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 at Fort Wainwright, Alaska* project. The appendix is composed of the following subsections:

Appendix D-1: Agency Scoping Correspondence

Appendix D-2: Agency Scoping Comments

Appendix D-3: Government to Government Correspondence

Appendix D-4: Cooperating Agency Correspondence

Appendix D-5: Reuse Partnership Correspondence

Appendix D-6: NHPA Section 106 Correspondence

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

Office of the Garrison Commander

NOV 16 2011

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
ATTN: Mr. Ted Swem
Branch Chief, Endangered Species
101 12th Avenue, Room 110
Fairbanks, AK 99701-6237

Dear Mr. Swem:

The U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to assess the potential impacts upon the natural and man-made environment associated with various proposed alternatives for the long-term disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, located on the Main Post of USAG FWA. Alternatives to be considered include converting both hangars to another use, demolishing both hangars, demolishing one hangar and retaining one hangar, and transferring facilities and management responsibility to another agency. This action requires environmental documentation that includes potential affects upon any organisms covered by the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

The numerous biological surveys conducted on Fort Wainwright have never revealed the presence of any federally listed threatened or endangered species. It is therefore our determination that USAG FWA will not be required to have consultations under the ESA with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for the long-term disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 on Fort Wainwright. Please inform us by letter within 30 days of receipt of this letter if you are not in agreement with this determination.

The USAG FWA point of contact for this process is Mr. Gary Larsen, USAG FWA, Directorate of Public Works Environmental Division, Conservation Branch Chief at (907) 361-6104 or gary.w.larsen.civ@mail.mil. Please contact Mr. Larsen for further information.

Thank you very much for your support.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Johnson
Colonel, US Army
Commanding

Smith, Spence

From: Larsen, Gary W USA CIV (US) [gary.w.larsen.civ@mail.mil]
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 4:34 PM
To: McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US)
Subject: FW: ESA consultation number 07CAFB00-2012-SL-0012; EIS for long-term disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, USAG FWA (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

-----Original Message-----
From: Denise_Walther@fws.gov [mailto:Denise_Walther@fws.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 11:27 AM
To: Larsen, Gary W USA CIV (US)
Subject: ESA consultation number 07CAFB00-2012-SL-0012; EIS for long-term disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, USAG FWA

Mr. Larsen:

This communication responds to a letter from the Office of the Garrison Commander, dated November 16, 2011, which transmitted the U.S. Army's determination that no Federally endangered and threatened species occur on U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, AK (USAG FWA). The Service concurs that no listed species or designated critical habitats occur on or near USAG FWA and therefore the proposed action will not affect listed species or critical habitat. Further consultation pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (ESA), is not required. This letter applies only to endangered or threatened species under our jurisdiction. It does not preclude the need to comply with other environmental legislation or regulations such as the Clean Water Act. Thank you for your cooperation in meeting our joint responsibilities under the ESA. If you need further assistance, please contact me at (907) 456-0277.

Best regards,
Denise

Denise A. Walther, Ph.D.
Fish & Wildlife Biologist
Fairbanks Fish and Wildlife Field Office U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
101 12th Ave., Room 110
Fairbanks, AK 99701
907-456-0277
907-456-0208 fax

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

APPENDIX D-1: Agency Scoping Correspondence

During the scoping process for the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) the United States (U.S.) Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) sent scoping invitation letters to the following agency and organization representatives:

Reid Nelson
Director of Federal Agency Programs
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

Deb Caillouet
Environmental Program Specialist
Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation

Alice Edwards
Division of Air Quality, Division Director
Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation

Barbara Trost
Division of Air Quality, Air Monitoring, and Quality Assurance Program
Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation

David James, F&G Regional Supervisor
Wildlife Division
Alaska Department of Fish and Game

Margaret Carpenter, Fairbanks Area Planner
Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities

William Hedman, Archaeologist
Bureau of Land Management

Steve Hartmann, District Manager
Bureau of Land Management

Tammy DeFries, Fire Management Officer
Bureau of Land Management – Alaska Fire Service

Mary Lynch, NEPA Analyst
Bureau of Land Management – Alaska Fire Service

Bud C. Cribley, State Director
Bureau of Land Management, Alaska

The Hon. Jerry Cleworth, Mayor
City of Fairbanks, Alaska

Jacques Gusmano, CERCLA
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Jennifer Curtis, NEPA Reviewer
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Jim Lee, Deputy Director
Fairbanks North Star Borough

The Hon. Luke Hopkins, Mayor
Fairbanks North Star Borough

Allan Renfroe
Fairbanks North Star Borough Historic Preservation Commission

Sarah Conn, Field Supervisor
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Ted Birkedal, Team Manager, CR Team
National Park Service

Brian Turner, Law Fellow
National Trust for Historic Preservation

Sue Masica, Regional Director
National Park Service

Judy Bittner, Alaska Historic Preservation Officer
Alaska Department of Natural Resources
Office of History and Archaeology

Summer L. Rickman, Alaska Historic Preservation Office Member
Alaska Department of Natural Resources
Office of History and Archaeology

Ronald K. Inouye
Tanana Yukon Historical Society

See the attached letter to Mr. Reid Nelson, Director of Federal Agency Programs, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation as an example of the letter sent to each individual.

Johnson, Chloe C USA CTR (US)

From: McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US)
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 10:55 AM
To: rnelson@achp.gov
Cc: kkerr@achp.gov
Subject: EIS for Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, AK: Invite to Agency Scoping Meeting (UNCLASSIFIED)
Attachments: Agency Letter_Invite to Agency Scoping Meeting_Nelson.pdf

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Mr. Nelson,

The U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) addressing the potential impacts associated with several proposed facility disposition options for Hangars 2 and 3 on the Main Post of Fort Wainwright. Hangars 2 and 3 are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark. There may be significant impacts to historic properties associated with this proposed action. Your agency's participation in scoping meetings to be held on Thursday, December 15, 2011 in Fairbanks regarding this proposal is requested. Meeting details are listed in the attached invitation, as well as information on the public scoping meetings.

Please let me know if you would like additional information on the proposed action.

We look forward to working with you,
Carrie

Carrie McEnteer
NEPA Branch Chief
Environmental Division, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
Phone: (907) 361-9507
****PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS: carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

NOV 16 2011

Office of the Garrison Commander

SUBJECT: Invitation to the Agency Scoping Meeting, Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Mr. Reid Nelson
Director of Federal Agency Programs
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Old Post Office, Building 1100
Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 803
Washington, DC 20004

Dear Mr. Nelson:

The US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) invites you to participate in an agency scoping meeting for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) being prepared to assess the potential impacts upon the natural and man-made environment associated with various proposed facility disposition options for Hangars 2 and 3, located on the Main Post of USAG FWA. The two hangars are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark; however, the current condition of the hangars warrants a decision on the disposition of the facilities that meets safety, funding, facilities management, land use and cultural resources management objectives.

The agency scoping meeting will be held Thursday, December 15, 2011 in Fairbanks, Alaska at the Princess Riverside Lodge, 4477 Pikes Landing Road from 10 a.m. to 12 p.m. A public scoping meeting is also scheduled in Fairbanks, Alaska on Wednesday, December 14, 2011 at the Noel Wien Library, 1215 Cowles Street from 5 – 8 p.m. with a presentation given at 6:30 p.m.

In addition to comments received during the scoping meetings, written comments will be accepted until January 17, 2012 for incorporation into the draft EIS. Written comments may be submitted via mail, fax or email to Ms. Carrie McEnteer, Directorate of Public Works, Attn: IMPC-FWA-PWE (McEnteer), 1060 Gaffney Road #4500, Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-4500, fax: (907) 361-9867 or email: carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil

You can access a copy of the EIS Notice of Intent to be published in the Federal Register: http://www.wainwright.army.mil/env/NEPA/Current.html.

USAG FWA looks forward to your participation in the EIS scoping process. If you would like any additional information, please contact Ms. Carrie McEnteer, USAG FWA, Directorate of Public Works Environmental Division, National Environmental Policy Act Branch Chief at (907) 361-9507 or carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Johnson
Colonel, US Army
Commanding

Johnson, Chloe C USA CTR (US)

From: McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US)
Sent: Wednesday, November 23, 2011 10:34 AM
To: Johnson, Chloe C USA CTR (US)
Subject: FW: EIS for Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, AK: Invite to Agency Scoping Meeting (UNCLASSIFIED)
Attachments: Agency Letter_Invite to Agency Scoping Meeting_Lee.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Can you save as a .pdf here:

Scoping/Agency Invite Letters

and upload to Sharepoint?

-----Original Message-----
From: Melissa Kellner [mailto:MKellner@fnsb.us]
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2011 3:17 PM
To: McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US)
Subject: FW: EIS for Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, AK: Invite to Agency Scoping Meeting (UNCLASSIFIED)

Hi Carrie,

Jim asked me to attend this meeting, so I'll be there! Our Historic Preservation Commission meets on Dec 6 and will probably meet again in early January, so if it sounds good to you, I can just bring them the information at their January meeting and get their comments back to you before Jan 17.

I hope you're having a good day!

Melissa

Melissa Kellner
Planner III
Community Planning Department
Fairbanks North Star Borough
(907) 459-1252
mkellner@fnsb.us

-----Original Message-----
From: McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US)
[mailto:carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 10:45 AM
To: Jim Lee
Subject: EIS for Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, AK: Invite to Agency Scoping Meeting (UNCLASSIFIED)

From: Rickman, Summer L (DNR)
To: Graham, Lisa M USA CIV (US)
Subject: RE: Hangar 2 and 3 letter to consult (UNCLASSIFIED)
Date: Thursday, November 17, 2011 10:35:09 AM

Hey Lisa, I have down that I send our response to the first letter out on 10/31/2011 but I'll check around and make sure it made it off Judy's desk. Sorry.

-----Original Message-----
From: Graham, Lisa M USA CIV (US) [mailto:lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 9:09 AM
To: Rickman, Summer L (DNR)
Subject: Hangar 2 and 3 letter to consult (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Hi Summer,

I wanted to send you a copy of the letter we mailed out yesterday. I also included copies of all the other letters.

I know this letter is a bit redundant considering the first letter we sent you. But I spoke with Doug last week and decided to send you this one too being it has more info and is signed by Col. Johnson.

Also, I haven't seen a response to the first letter (date stamped Oct 3), were you waiting to respond or has it just not gotten to me yet?

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Lisa Graham
Cultural Resources Manager
Fort Wainwright AK
907.361.3002

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

APPENDIX D-2: Agency Scoping Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

Preserving America's Heritage

December 1, 2011

Colonel Ronald M. Johnson
Commanding
Department of the Army
Installation Management Command
Headquarters, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
1060 Gaffney Road #6000
ATTN: Office of the Garrison Commander
Fort Wainwright, AK 99703-6000

Ref: ***Agency Scoping Meeting, Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposition of Hangers 2 and 3 (Buildings 3008 and 3005)***
Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark
Fort Wainwright, Fairbanks North Star, Alaska

Dear COL Johnson:

On November 18, 2011, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) received your invitation to participate in an agency scoping meeting for an Environmental Impact Statement in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the disposition of Hangers 2 and 3. Please note, we originally notified Mr. Clifford A. Seibel, Environmental Division Chief, on October 17, 2011 that the ACHP had no plans to become a Cooperating Agency pursuant to NEPA. This decision not to participate in the NEPA process still stands.

Please remove the ACHP from your NEPA distribution list. If you have any questions regarding our decision please contact Ms. Katharine R. Kerr by telephone at (202) 606-8534 or by e-mail at kkerr@achp.gov.

Sincerely,

for

Caroline D. Hall
Assistant Director
Office of Federal Agency Programs
Federal Property Management Section

McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US)

From: Cribley, Bud [bcribley@blm.gov]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 11:22 AM
To: McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US)
Cc: Slaughter, Kent W; Hartmann, Steven C; Murphy, Ted A; Chinn, Ramona; Lowery, June; Pollet, Jolie
Subject: RE: EIS for Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, AK: Invite to Agency Scoping Meeting (UNCLASSIFIED)

Thanks for the heads up and we will be getting back to you on who our point of contact will be.

Bud

-----Original Message-----
From: McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US) [mailto:carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 10:18 AM
To: Cribley, Bud
Subject: EIS for Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, AK: Invite to Agency Scoping Meeting (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Mr. Cribley,

The U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) addressing the potential impacts associated with several proposed facility disposition options for Hangars 2 and 3 on the Main Post of Fort Wainwright. Hangars 2 and 3 are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark. There may be significant impacts to historic properties associated with this proposed action. Your agency's participation in scoping meetings to be held on Thursday, December 15, 2011 in Fairbanks regarding this proposal is requested. Meeting details are listed in the attached invitation, as well as information on the public scoping meetings.

Please let me know if you would like additional information on the proposed action.

We look forward to working with you,
Carrie

Carrie McEnteer
NEPA Branch Chief
Environmental Division, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
Phone: (907) 361-9507
****PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS: carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US)

From: Curtis.Jennifer@epa.gov
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 12:42 PM
To: McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US)
Subject: Re: EIS for Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, AK: Invite to Agency Scoping Meeting (UNCLASSIFIED)

Hi Carrie,

Thanks for the invite. We are interested in the project assuming there are hazardous material or contaminated site issues associated with the project (asbestos, petroleum contamination, etc.). Since I will not be participating in the meeting, I would appreciate receiving any project materials that are distributed that will not be available on the project website.

If I don't talk to you before, I hope you have a great Thanksgiving!
Try to stay warm.

Jennifer Curtis, NEPA Reviewer/Compliance Coordinator US EPA-Alaska Operations Office
222 West 7th Ave., #19
Anchorage, AK 99513
Phone: 907-271-6324
Fax: 907-271-3424
Email: curtis.jennifer@epa.gov

From: "McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US)"
<carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil>
To: Jennifer Curtis/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 11/17/2011 10:42 AM
Subject: EIS for Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, AK: Invite to Agency Scoping Meeting (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Jennifer,

The U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) addressing the potential impacts associated with several proposed facility disposition options for Hangars 2 and 3 on the Main Post of Fort Wainwright. Hangars 2 and 3 are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark. There may be significant impacts to historic properties associated with this proposed action. Your agency's participation in scoping meetings to be held on Thursday, December 15, 2011 in Fairbanks regarding this proposal is requested. Meeting details are listed in the attached invitation, as well as information on the public scoping meetings.

Please let me know if you would like additional information on the proposed action.

We look forward to working with you,
Carrie

Carrie McEnteer
NEPA Branch Chief
Environmental Division, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
Phone: (907) 361-9507
****PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS: carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

[attachment "Agency Letter_Invite to Agency Scoping Meeting_Curtis.pdf" deleted by Jennifer Curtis/R10/USEPA/US]

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 10
ALASKA OPERATIONS OFFICE
Room 537, Federal Building
222 West 7th Avenue, #19
Anchorage, Alaska 99513-7588

January 17, 2012

Carrie McEnteer
Directorate of Public Works
Attention: IMPC-FWA-PWE (McEnteer)
1060 Gaffney Road #4500
Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-4500

Re: EPA scoping comments for Environmental Impact Statement for Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, Alaska, EPA Project # 11-4133-DOD.

Dear Ms. McEnteer:

We have reviewed the November 16, 2011, *Federal Register* Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 at Fort Wainwright in Alaska. Our review of the NOI was conducted in accordance with our responsibilities under National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments at this stage of the EIS development process.

Section 309 specifically directs the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to review and comment in writing on the environmental impacts associated with all major federal actions. Under our Section 309 authority, our review of the draft EIS prepared for the proposed project will consider the expected environmental impacts, and the adequacy of the EIS in meeting procedural and public disclosure requirements of NEPA. A brochure further explaining the EPA's 309 review is enclosed.

By the nature of this project, we recognize that the potential for significant impacts from this project are to historical resources, as Hangars 2 and 3 are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark, as opposed to traditional environmental resources. We also acknowledge that as currently identified in the NOI, the purpose and need for the project, and the range of alternatives for further development in the EIS, seem adequate and appropriate. As such, we have limited our scoping comments below to those environmental concerns regarding issues that may arise in this project depending on the selected alternative. In providing these comments, it is our goal to have these issues addressed in the draft EIS.

Hazardous Material Removal and Disposal
Given the age and type of structures proposed for demolition, it is likely that the structures or their components contain lead-based paint or asbestos. Common renovation activities like sanding, cutting, and demolition can create hazardous lead dust and airborne asbestos fibers, which can be harmful to human health. The EPA is very concerned about such contamination and regulates the management and disposal of certain materials containing these hazardous substances. The regulations covering asbestos can be found in 40 CFR Part 61, Subpart M - National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Asbestos (the asbestos NESHAP).

In general, asbestos workers and/or contractors must be EPA-certified and disposal of asbestos must occur at facilities certified for the disposal of asbestos. In Alaska, landfill permits are issued by the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation. Also, with regard to regulated asbestos, contractors must provide a 10-day notice prior to starting work to the EPA. The EPA Notification of Demolition and Renovation form can be accessed at: http://www.epa.gov/region10/pdf/asbestos/demolition-renovation-notification-form_fillable.pdf.

For materials containing lead-based paint, testing (such as a Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure, or TCLP), may need to be conducted to determine the extent of lead content. Also, a facility approved for the disposal of hazardous waste materials may need to be utilized. Work must be completed in compliance with applicable RCRA regulations under 40 CFR Parts 261-265, in addition to any applicable local and state requirements.

For general questions regarding lead-based paint and asbestos-containing waste material handling and disposal, please contact Maria Tartaglia at (206) 553-1128 or tartaglia.maria@epa.gov. Asbestos notification forms can be submitted to Ms. Tartaglia via email or by U.S. mail at:

Maria Tartaglia
EPA Region 10
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900, AWT-128
Seattle, WA 98101-3140

In addition, questions concerning asbestos in Alaska can be directed to John Pavitt here in the EPA Alaska Operations Office (AOO) at (907) 271-3688. Questions concerning the disposal of RCRA-regulated wastes can be directed to Jon Jones, also here in AOO, at (907) 271-6329.

Finally, although not identified in the NOI, if any ground disturbing activities will be conducted, the DOD should ensure that adequate sampling and analysis is undertaken to identify any current or historic contamination and required cleanup activities.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to participate early in the planning process for this project and are available to discuss issues or answer questions that arise while you develop the draft EIS. Should you have any questions regarding our comments please contact me at (907) 271-6324 or by electronic mail at curtis.jennifer@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

Jennifer J. Curtis
Environmental Review and Sediments Management Unit

Enclosure

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance

July, 1999

EPA's Section 309 Review:
The Clean Air Act and NEPA

Office of Federal Activities (2251A)

Quick Reference Brochure

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND THE CLEAN AIR ACT

The Clean Air Act, a law to prevent pollution of a single environmental medium, contains an unusual provision. That provision is Section 309, which authorizes the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to review certain proposed actions of other federal agencies in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and to make those reviews public. If the proposing agency (the "lead" agency) does not make sufficient revisions and the project remains environmentally unsatisfactory, EPA may refer the matter to the President's Council on Environmental Quality for mediation. (See **Highlight A.**)

HIGHLIGHT A: Section 309 of the Clean Air Act

(a) The Administrator shall review and comment in writing on the environmental impact of any matter relating to duties and responsibilities granted pursuant to this Act or other provisions of the authority of the Administrator, contained in any (1) legislation proposed by any Federal department or agency, (2) newly authorized Federal projects for construction and any major Federal agency action (other than a project for construction) to which Section 102(2)(C) of Public Law 91-190 [*] applies, and (3) proposed regulations published by any department or agency of the Federal government. Such written comment shall be made public at the conclusion of any such review.

(b) In the event the Administrator determines that any such legislation, action, or regulation is unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality, he shall publish his determination and the matter shall be referred to the Council on Environmental Quality.

[*] NEPA (42 *USC* 4332(2)(C) et seq.)

Section 309 originated in 1970, the year in which landmark national legislation created new agencies and new requirements for restoring and protecting the environment. Besides NEPA and its creation of CEQ, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and EPA were established, and, at the end of 1970, the Clean Air Act was passed. At that time, many issues of environmental consequence were brewing (see **Highlight** B), one of which--the proposed supersonic transport aircraft (SST)--became a crucial test of NEPA. (See **The National Environmental Policy Act** section, below.)

The lead agency for the SST project, the Department of Transportation (DOT), chose not to disclose EPA's comments on the NEPA-required environmental impact statement (EIS) before having issued its final decision, construing NEPA to contain no explicit public disclosure requirements. Although later CEQ regulations under the Act would clarify this ambiguity, the Congress had a vehicle at hand in which to make its point: the draft Clean Air Act. Senator Edmund Muskie, sponsor of Section 309, said to the Senate when submitting the conference report, that as soon as EPA has completed its review of a proposed action, it must make its written comments public, and "not when the environmental impact agency decides the public should be informed." (116 *Cong. Rec.* S-20602, Dec. 18, 1970)

HIGHLIGHT B: When NEPA Was New: 1970-1971 Issues

- o Trans-Alaska oil pipeline and the North Slope-Valdez route
- o Supersonic transport aircraft
- o Cross-Florida Barge Canal
- o Clearcutting "areas of scenic beauty" in national forests
- o Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway
- o Dredging and filling in wetlands
- o Calvert Cliffs (MD) nuclear power plant

To correct another ambiguity of NEPA, Section 309 places the requirement to review EISs upon EPA because NEPA "does not assure that Federal environmental agencies will effectively participate in the decision-making process. It is essential that mission-oriented Federal agencies have access to environmental expertise in order to give adequate consideration to environmental factors." (*Sen. Rept.* No. 91-1196, 91st Cong., 2d Sess. 43, 1970) Consequently, EPA has reviewed most of the approximately 25,000 draft and final EISs produced since the passage of NEPA.

Section 309 confers upon EPA broad review responsibilities for proposed federal actions. (See **Highlight C.**) The EPA Administrator has delegated responsibility of national program manager to the Office of Federal Activities (OFA), and to the ten EPA Regional Administrators for review of regional specific actions. OFA has developed a set of criteria for rating draft EISs. The rating system provides a basis upon which EPA makes recommendations to the lead agency for improving the draft. If improvements are not made in the final EIS, EPA may refer the final EIS to CEQ. (See sections on **The National Environmental Policy Act** and **Referrals**, below.)

HIGHLIGHT C: Materials Which EPA Reviews Under Section 309 Authority

- o Proposed legislation
- o Proposed regulation
- o Environmental assessment (EA)
- o Environmental impact statement (EIS), draft and final
- o Any proposal that the lead agency maintains does not require an EIS but that EPA believes constitutes a major federal action significantly affecting the environment so as to require an EIS.

Figure 1: EPA's Criteria for Sec. 309 Review of Impact Statements

Rating Environmental Impacts:

LO--Lack of Objections

EC--Environmental Concerns--Impacts identified that should be avoided. Mitigation measures may be required.

EO--Environmental Objections--Significant impacts identified. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the proposed action or consideration of another alternative, including any that was either previously unaddressed or eliminated from the study, or the no-action alternative). Reasons can include:

- o violation of a federal environmental standard;
- o violation of the federal agency's own environmental standard;
- o violation of an EPA policy declaration;
- o potential for significant environmental degradation; or,
- o precedent-setting for future actions that collectively could result in significant environmental impacts.

EU--Environmentally Unsatisfactory--Impacts identified are so severe that the action must not proceed as proposed. If these deficiencies are not corrected in the final EIS, EPA may refer the EIS to CEQ Reasons, in addition to impacts identified, can include:

- o substantial violation of a federal environmental standard;
- o severity, duration, or geographical extent of impacts that warrants special attention; or,
- o national importance, due to threat to national environmental resources or policies.

Rating Adequacy of the Impact Statement:

1 (Adequate)--No further information is required for review.

2 (Insufficient Information)--Either more information is needed for review, or other alternatives should be evaluated. The identified additional information or analysis should be included in the final EIS.

3 (Inadequate)--Seriously lacking in information or analysis to address potentially significant environmental impacts. The draft EIS does not meet NEPA and/or Section 309 requirements. If not revised or supplemented and provided again as a draft EIS for public comment, EPA may refer the EIS to CEQ.

(See **Selected Publications**, below: EPA's ***Policy and Procedures for the Review of Federal Actions Impacting the Environment.***)

Annually, OFA and its regional counterparts review about 500 EISs and some 2000 other actions (see **Figures 1** and **2**). Among the variety of proposed actions that may be reviewed, besides that for which an agency provides an impact statement, are: legislation proposed by a federal agency; a proposed agency regulation; the renewal of an action originally approved before the enactment of NEPA; a proposal for which an agency has determined that no impact statement is needed, whether or not the agency has published a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI); and, an action that is actually a segment of either a program or a reasonably expected succession of actions that could result in a cumulative negative impact on human health or welfare or the environment.

In addition to conducting environmental reviews, OFA develops guidance materials and provides training courses on NEPA and Section 309 requirements for EPA regional staff, and promotes coordination between EPA offices and other federal agencies.

THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT AND CEQ

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA, 42 *USC* 4321 et seq.) was enacted on January 1, 1970 in recognition of the widening influence on the human and natural environment that individual federal agency actions can exert. With its stated purpose (see **Highlight D**) and with heightened public awareness of environmental quality questions, NEPA makes its goals and policies "supplemental to those set forth in existing authorities of Federal agencies" (NEPA, Section 105). In this way, the agencies' authorizing statutes were amended to include NEPA requirements.

Title I of NEPA requires the federal government to use all practicable means to preserve and maintain conditions under which human beings can coexist with the natural world in productive harmony. Section 102 directs federal agencies to lend appropriate support to initiatives and programs meant to anticipate and prevent degradation of world environmental quality. Further, this section requires federal agencies to incorporate environmental considerations in their decision-making, using a systematic, interdisciplinary approach.

HIGHLIGHT D: The Purposes of NEPA

The purposes of this Act are: To declare a national policy which will encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment; to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man; to enrich the understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to the Nation; and to establish a Council on Environmental Quality.

(PL 91-190, 42 *USC* 4321 et seq.)

Title II of NEPA establishes the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ, or the Council). Two months after enactment of NEPA, the President issued Executive Order 11514 authorizing CEQ to guide the Sec. 102 process. Under this order, the Council immediately published guidelines, followed in 1978 by regulations (40 *CFR* Parts 1500-1508) requiring all Federal agencies to issue NEPA regulations consistent with CEQ's. Advisory to the President, CEQ conducts studies, prepares the annual Environmental Quality Report to Congress, and reviews EISs. Moreover, CEQ mediates interagency disputes concerning environmental analyses of matters of national importance. (See **Referrals** section, below.)

As evidence of compliance with the NEPA Section 102 provisions for a proposed major action that could significantly affect the environment, CEQ requires the lead agency to prepare a detailed written statement addressing NEPA concerns, i.e., an EIS (40 *CFR* Part 1501). The lead agency may first prepare an environmental assessment (EA), which is a concise public document (40 *CFR* Part 1501.3) that determines whether an EIS or a FONSI (40 *CFR* Part 1501.4(e)) should be prepared. An EA is not necessary, however, if the agency has decided at the outset to prepare an EIS.

For review, the lead agency provides the EIS to those federal agencies having statutory jurisdiction or special expertise, as well as to appropriate other federal, state, and local agencies; Indian tribes, when the proposed action might impact tribal lands; and, the interested or affected public (40 *CFR* Part 1503.1). Once the EIS is final, the lead agency must file it formally, simultaneously making it available to the public, together with the reviewers' comments and the lead agency's responses to those comments (40 *CFR* Part 1506.9). The CEQ regulations designate EPA the official recipient of all final EISs, which responsibility the EPA Administrator delegates to OFA.

REFERRALS TO THE COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

The "predecision referrals" provision (40 *CFR* Part 1504) enables any federal agency under NEPA to refer another agency's final EIS to CEQ during the 30-day waiting period before a lead agency can proceed with the action. On the other hand, Section 309 authorizes EPA to refer to CEQ a broader range of federal activities, not only actions for which EISs are prepared. The CEQ regulations (40 *CFR* 1504.1(b)) implement Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, acknowledging that EPA has been assigned more extensive review and referral authority than the other agencies (see **Highlight C**).

Within 25 days after the lead agency has made the final EIS available to the public, the referring agency must provide early notification to that agency about its intention, and make its referral in writing to CEQ. The lead agency, once it has received written notification from CEQ, is to respond in writing within 25 days. During that same period, other agencies and the public may submit written comments to CEQ. Then CEQ may publish Findings and Recommendations; mediate between the disputing agencies; hold public meetings or hearings; refer irreconcilable disputes to the Executive Office of the President for action; or, conclude either that the issue is not of national importance or that insufficient information has been submitted upon which to base a decision.

In the time since the referral process was formally established in 1973, agencies have referred a total of 24 proposed federal actions to CEQ. Of these, EPA was responsible for 15, of which one was referred jointly with the Department of the Interior (DOI). (See **Figure 2** for EPA regional environmental review offices.) So far, in no case has CEQ made a formal referral to the Office of the President. Most often, CEQ has issued Findings and Recommendations. In a few cases the lead agency has withdrawn the proposal, and in three cases CEQ determined that the issue was not a matter of national importance.

In 1989, CEQ upheld EPA's Section 309 referral authority. At issue was a DOI Bureau of Reclamation proposal to renew longterm water contracts for irrigation operations of the Friant Unit in the Central Valley Project of California. The reason for referral was that no EIS had been prepared on the contract renewals, which individually and in the aggregate were likely to result in unsatisfactory environmental effects. In response, DOI questioned EPA's right to challenge the agency's decision that no EIS was needed. In rejecting that argument, CEQ established a precedent, that is, affirmed that EPA may identify a major federal action significantly affecting the environment, even though the lead agency disagrees.

Figure 2: EPA'S REGIONAL SECTION 309 REVIEWERS

REGION 1 : (617) 918-1051
Office of Environmental Review
JFK Federal Bldg.
Boston, MA 02203-0001

REGION 2 : (212) 637-3504
Envir. Planning & Protection
290 Broadway
New York, NY 10007-1866

REGION 3 : (215) 814-2705
Envir. Programs Branch
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106

REGION 4 : (404) 562-9611
Office of Envir. Assessment
61 Forsyth Street
Atlanta, GA 30303

REGION 5 : (312) 886-9750
Federal Activities program
77 West Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, IL 60604-3507

REGION 6 : (214) 665-7451
Office - Planning & Coordination
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200
Dallas, TX 75270-2733

REGION 7 : (913) 551-7148
Environmental Review
726 Minnesota Avenue
Kansas City, KS 66101

REGION 8 : (303) 312-6228
Ecosystem Protection Program
999 18th Street, Suite 500
Denver, CO 80202-2466

REGION 9 : (415) 744-1584
Office of Federal Activities
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

REGION 10 : (206) 553-8574
Ecosystems & Communities
1200 Sixth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS

Caldwell, Lynton K., *Science and the National Environmental Policy Act; Redirecting Policy Through Procedural Reform. University of Alabama Fress, c1982.*

Congressional Record, vol. 166, p. S-20602 (Dec. 18, 1970).

Healy, Martin, "The Environmental Protection Agency's Duty to Oversee NEPA's Implementation: Section 309 of the Clean Air Act," *Environmental Law Reporter*, 3 ELR 50071 (1973).

Liroff, Richard, "The Council on Environmental Quality," *Environmental Law Reporter*, 3 ELR 50051 (1973).

Policies and Procedures for the Review of Federal Actions Impacting the Environment. U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Enforcement, Office of Federal Activities, Pub. No. 1640 (rev. 1984).

Procedures for Implementing the Requirements of the Council on Environmental Quality on the National Environmental Policy Act. U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, 40 *CFR* Part 6.

Rand, Sally and Tawater, Mark Steven, *Environmental Referrals and the Council on Environmental Quality*. Washington, D. C., Environmental Law Institute, 1986.

Regulations For Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act. U. S. Executive Office of the President, Council on Environmental Quality, 40 *CFR* Parts 1500-1508 (reprint, as of July 1, 1986). Contents include: the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended in 1975; the Clean Air Act, Section 309; and, Executive Order 11514, as amended by Executive Order 11991.

Senate Report No. 91-1196, 91st Congress, 2nd Session, p. 43 (1970).

Fairbanks North Star Borough

809 Pioneer Road P.O. Box 71267 Fairbanks, Alaska 99707-1267 907/459-1000
www.co.fairbanks.ak.us

January 12, 2012

Ms. Carrie McEnteer, Directorate of Public Works
Attn: IMPC-FWA-PWE (McEnteer)
1060 Gaffney Road #4500
Fort Wainwright, AK 99703-4500

Re: Disposition of Hangars 2 & 3

Dear Ms. McEnteer:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the plans for the future of Hangars 2 & 3. The Fairbanks North Star Borough Historic Preservation Commission supports Alternative 2, converting both hangars to another use. The Commission feels that these hangars are essential elements of the Ladd Field historic district.

Thank you for your superlative work on this project. Please don't hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Melissa Kellner

Melissa Kellner
Comprehensive Planner

McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US)

From: Sarah_Conn@fws.gov
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 11:48 AM
To: McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US)
Cc: Jewel_Bennett@fws.gov
Subject: Re: EIS for Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, AK: Invite to Agency Scoping Meeting (UNCLASSIFIED)

Ms. McEnteer,

Thank you for your invitation to an agency meeting to discuss your proposed hanger removal project on Fort Wainwright. Because these are existing facilities, within the developed area of Fort Wainwright the projects is unlikely to have major impacts to Fish and Wildlife Service's trust resources. Therefore, we won't be attending the meeting but we do appreciate you offering us the opportunity to be involved.

Sarah

"McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US)" <carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil>

11/17/2011 10:33 AM To
"sarah_conn@fws.gov" <sarah_conn@fws.gov> cc Subject EIS for Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, AK: Invite to Agency Scoping Meeting (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Ms. Conn,

The U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) addressing the potential impacts associated with several proposed facility disposition options for Hangars 2 and 3 on the Main Post of Fort Wainwright. Hangars 2 and 3 are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark. There may be significant impacts to historic properties associated with this proposed action. Your agency's participation in scoping meetings to be held on Thursday, December 15, 2011 in Fairbanks regarding this proposal is requested. Meeting details are listed in the attached invitation, as well as information on the public scoping meetings.

Please let me know if you would like additional information on the proposed action.

We look forward to working with you,
Carrie

Carrie McEnteer
NEPA Branch Chief

Environmental Division, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
Phone: (907) 361-9507
****PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS: carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

[attachment "Agency Letter_Invite to Agency Scoping Meeting_Conn.pdf" deleted by Sarah Conn/R7/FWS/DOI]

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPT. OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

DIVISION OF AIR QUALITY
AIR NON-POINT & MOBILE SOURCES

SEAN PARNELL, GOVERNOR

619 E. Ship Creek Ave., Suite 249
Anchorage, AK 99501
PHONE: (907) 269-7579
FAX: (907) 269-7508
http://www.state.ak.us/dec/

November 23, 2011

Ms. Carrie McEnteer
Directorate of Public Works
National Environmental Policy Act Branch Chief
US Army Garrison Alaska, Fort Wainwright
Attn: IMPC-FWA-PWE (McEnteer)
1060 Gaffney Road #4500
Fort Wainwright, AK 99703-4500

Subject: Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposition of Hangers 2 and 3 at US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Dear Ms. McEnteer:

This letter is in regards to your proposed facility disposition options for Hangers 2 and 3, located on the Main Post of USAG FWA. This proposed project is located in a nonattainment area for particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) and carbon monoxide for air quality control under the Clean Air Act. Therefore, the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) has concerns regarding the following:

1. A project receiving federal funds or approvals do require an applicability analysis under General Conformity regulations for $PM_{2.5}$ and carbon monoxide emissions. Factors such as the type of project, either it is exempt or one that falls under *de minimis* needs to be considered prior to determining if a demonstration of conformity is required.

   An interagency consultation though not required is recommended to avoid potential pitfalls before an applicability analysis is prepared to determine if your project exceeds the *de minimis* thresholds; contact Cindy Heil at ADEC (907) 269-7579 to determine which procedures and factors need to be addressed in the analysis, if desired.

   Here is the link to Division of Air Quality's web page that provides additional information on conformity issues: http://www.dec.state.ak.us/air/anpms/conf/confhome.htm.

2. Should the preferred method be demolition; particular attention should be given during the demolition/disposition activities to take reasonable precaution per 18 AAC 50.0475(d) to prevent fugitive dust.

3. If the preferred method for disposal of debris is by open burning, the USAG or their contractor must use "reasonable procedures to minimize adverse environmental effects and limit the amount of smoke generated" as well as get any applicable permits. A complete description of the open burn guidance policy can be found at http://www.dec.state.ak.us/air/Open%20Burn/Docs/obrguide.pdf. Also, note that Fairbanks North Star Borough (FNSB) has their own ordinance regarding Air Quality and should be consulted prior to any open burning activities within their jurisdiction. FNSB can be contacted at 907-459-1005 or by e-mail at airquality@co.fairbanks.ak.us.

   A general requirement of the Air Quality Control Regulations is that wastes should be burned in a manner that does not cause a public health, safety or welfare threat, an environmental problem or a nuisance.

4. In addition, federal regulations require the removal of all asbestos-containing materials and hazardous or toxic materials prior to beginning a building demolition or renovation. Certified building inspectors will be required to assess the project for presence of asbestos. The U.S Environmental protection Agency (EPA) regulates the abatement and disposal of asbestos containing material and needs to be notified before any asbestos removal or building demolition begins. You can contact EPA at the Alaska office at 907-271-3688 or 800-781-0983 for additional clarification and assistance.

Thank you for contacting us about your project and for the opportunity to comment on the EIS. If you have further questions or concerns about air quality issues, you may contact me at (907) 269-7579 or by e-mail at cindy.heil@alaska.gov.

Sincerely,

Cindy Heil
Program Manager
Air Non-point & Mobile Sources

Printed on Recycled Paper

Phone call, December 2

Laura Jacobs ADF&G via David James

- Temporary water use permit application
  -Is this for a nearby waterway for activities related to the demolition of the hangars?
- Will water be withdrawn and inserted into the Chena?
  -Or is the TWUP to support another project?
- Issues: fish habitat related to water discharges
  -No wildlife issues according to David James
- It is not likely that they will attend agency meetings
- Wanted more detail on the proposed action and on the alternatives
- May send a written response

Johnson, Chloe C USA CTR (US)

From: McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US)
Sent: Wednesday, November 23, 2011 10:28 AM
To: Johnson, Chloe C USA CTR (US)
Subject: FW: EIS for Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, AK: Invite to Agency Scoping Meeting (UNCLASSIFIED)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Please save as a .pdf and save to:

Scoping/Agency Invite Letters

And upload to the SharePoint

-----Original Message-----
From: Tanana Yukon Historical Society [mailto:tyhs@alaska.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 22, 2011 3:45 PM
To: McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US)
Cc: Ron Inouye
Subject: Re: EIS for Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, AK: Invite to Agency Scoping Meeting (UNCLASSIFIED)

Carrie:

Thanks for the heads up.

Elizabeth

At 7:42 PM +0000 11/17/11, McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US) wrote:
>Mr. Inouye,
>
>The U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska is preparing an
>Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) addressing the potential impacts
>associated with several proposed facility disposition options for
>Hangars 2 and 3 on the Main Post of Fort Wainwright.
>Hangars 2 and 3 are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War
>II National Historic Landmark. There may be significant impacts to
>historic properties associated with this proposed action. Your agency's
>participation in scoping meetings to be held on Thursday, December 15,
>2011 in Fairbanks regarding this proposal is requested.
>Meeting details are listed in the attached invitation, as well as
>information on the public scoping meetings.
>
>Please let me know if you would like additional information on the
>proposed action.
>
>We look forward to working with you,
>Carrie
>
>

>Carrie McEnteer
>NEPA Branch Chief
>Environmental Division, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
>Phone: (907) 361-9507
>****PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS: carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil
Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

APPENDIX D-3: Government to Government Correspondence

The USAG FWA sent six federally recognized Alaska Native tribes letters notifying them of the Army's intent to prepare an EIS and informing them about the public scoping meeting times and locations. The tribes were offered the opportunity to enter into government-to-government consultation and to become consulting parties to the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 process. Letters were sent to the following six tribes:

William Miller, President
Village of Dot Lake

Donald Adams, President
Native Village of Tetlin

JoAnn Polston, First Chief
Heely Lake Village

William D. Lord, First Chief
Nenana Native Association

Roy Denny, President
Native Village of Tanacross

Belinda Thomas, President
Northway Village

See the attached letter to William Miller, President of the Village of Dot Lake as an example of the letter sent to each individual.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF:

Office of the Garrison Commander

NOV 16 2011

SUBJECT: Offer of Government-to-Government Consultation on the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska

William Miller, President
Village of Dot Lake
P.O. Box 2279
Dot Lake, AK 99737

Dear President Miller:

The U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to assess the potential impacts upon the natural and man-made environment associated with various proposed facility disposition options for Hangars 2 and 3, located on the Main Post of Fort Wainwright and contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark. Options currently being considered include converting use of both hangars to another purpose, demolishing both hangars, demolishing one hangar and retaining one hangar, indefinite "mothballing" of the buildings, and transferring facilities and management responsibilities to another agency. The condition of the facilities and the relocation of their maintenance functions warrant a decision on their future disposition that meets safety, funding, facilities management, land use, and cultural resources management objectives.

A public scoping meeting will be held on Wednesday, December 14, 2011 at the Noel Wien Library, 1215 Cowles Street, Fairbanks from 5 – 8 p.m. with a presentation given at 6:30 p.m. If tribal representatives believe that a tribe-specific scoping meeting is warranted for this National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) action, one will be scheduled. Written comments for inclusion into the draft EIS will also be accepted until January 17, 2012.

If you wish to enter into government-to-government consultation because you feel this proposed activity may significantly affect tribal rights or protected resources, please advise Ms. Elizabeth A. Cook in writing by December 7, 2011. Please consider this letter our notification in accordance with the Department of Defense (DoD) Instruction Number 4710.02: *DoD Interactions with Federally Recognized Tribes* and the Department of Defense (DoD) American Indian and Alaska Native Policy.

USAG FWA is concurrently conducting National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 consultation on the disposition of the hangars. If you feel that this undertaking is of interest to your tribal government interests, you are invited to become

a consulting party in the Section 106 process and your response to this offer is requested by December 7, 2011. The initial Section 106 meeting will be held on December 15, 2011 at Fort Wainwright.

Requests for government-to-government consultation or responses for inclusion in the NEPA or Section 106 processes should be directed to Ms. Elizabeth Cook, USAG FWA Native Liaison, at ATTN: IMPC-FWA-PWE (Cook), 1060 Gaffney Rd #4500, Fort Wainwright, AK 99703-4500. If you need additional information to make this determination, please contact Ms. Cook at *elizabeth.a.cook80.ctr@mail.mil* or (907) 361-6323. I am also forwarding a copy of this letter to Charles Miller, Tribal Administrator.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Johnson
Colonel, US Army
Commanding

Smith, Spence

From: Cook, Elizabeth A USA CTR (US) [elizabeth.a.cook80.ctr@mail.mil]
Sent: Thursday, December 15, 2011 5:16 PM
To: Graham, Lisa M USA CIV (US); McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US)
Subject: Hanger 2 and 3 G2G consultation (UNCLASSIFIED)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Lisa and Carrie--

I have confirmation from Village of Dot Lake (verbal), Native Village of Tanacross (verbal), Native Village of Tetlin (verbal), and Healy Lake Village (written) that consultation will not be requested.

I have received no response from Northway Village and consider that non-interest. So far our contact with Northway has included a mailed letter, an email, two messages left with office staff, and three unanswered phone calls. Based on the feelings from others in the region, I say the assumption is safe that consultation will not be requested by Northway.

Elizabeth A. Cook, M.A.
USAG FWA Native Liaison
(907) 361-6323 office
(907) 952-0115 cell

** please note the new email address : elizabeth.a.cook80.ctr@mail.mil
**

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

MENDAS CHA~AG TRIBE
Healy Lake Traditional Council
P.O. Box 74090
Fairbanks, Alaska 99707
Phone: (907) 479-0638 Fax: (907) 479-0639

DPW Environmental

December 15, 2011

Department Of The Army
Installation Management Command
Headquarters, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
1060 Gaffney Road #6000
Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-6000

Office of the Garrison Commander

RE: Offer of Government to Government Consultation on the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Dear Colonel Johnson,

Thank you for the information and request for consultation in the aforementioned subject. The Mendas Cha~Ag Tribe of Healy Lake and the Healy Lake Traditional Council now waives the consultation as it finds the disposition of the property to have no impact upon the Tribe or its lands.

Sincerely,

JoAnn Polston
First Chief
Mendas Cha~Ag Tribe
Healy Lake Traditional Council

APPENDIX D-4: Cooperating Agency Correspondence

The USAG FWA invited the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), the National Park Service (NPS), and the Alaska State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to become cooperating agencies for this EIS. See the attached letter to Mr. Reid Nelson of the ACHP as an example of the letter sent to each of the individuals listed below.

Reid Nelson
Director of Federal Agency Programs
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

Sue Masica, Regional Director
National Park Service

Judy Bittner, Alaska Historic Preservation Officer
Alaska Department of Natural Resources
Office of History and Archaeology

McEnteer, Carrie L Ms US USA IMCOM

From: McEnteer, Carrie L Ms US USA IMCOM
Sent: Tuesday, October 04, 2011 2:44 PM
To: 'rnelson@achp.gov'; 'kkerr@achp.gov'
Cc: Graham, Lisa M Ms CTR US USA IMCOM; Sprau, Matthew H Mr CTR US USA IMCOM; Seibel, Clifford CIV US USA IMCOM
Subject: Cooperating Agency Status Request - EIS for Future Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, Alaska (UNCLASSIFIED)
Attachments: Cooperating Agency Status_ACHP_USAG FWA Request Letter.pdf

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Mr. Nelson,

Please see attached letter requesting your agency's assistance in preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) analyzing the future disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 (Buildings 3008 and 3005) at Fort Wainwright, Alaska. A hardcopy will follow via Fed Ex.

Very respectfully,

Carrie McEnteer
NEPA Branch Chief
Environmental Division, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
Phone: (907) 361-9507
Email: carrie.mcenteer@us.army.mil

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

Directorate of Public Works

Mr. Reid Nelson
Director of Federal Agency Programs
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Old Post Office Building 1100
Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 803
Washington, DC 20004

Dear Mr. Nelson:

The US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) is initiating efforts to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) related to the future disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 (Buildings 3008 and 3005), located at USAG FWA.

Hangars 2 and 3 are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark. An internal review of environmental issues related to this undertaking has determined that possible adverse impacts to cultural resources will be an important consideration for this EIS. Inasmuch as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) has both special expertise and regulatory authority with respect to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark, it is believed that your cooperation in our National Environmental Policy Act analysis would be helpful in ensuring a thorough review of potential impacts to cultural resources and development of reasonable mitigation measures.

We are writing to ask for your participation as a Cooperating Agency in the EIS process. A range of reasonable alternatives have been identified, including demolition, reuse, and transferring of the property and all management responsibilities, to include funding, repair, management, operations (to include utilities) and maintenance, from the US Army to another agency. Based on the decision, a future management strategy would be developed. USAG FWA hopes that the ACHP is able to provide support for our EIS efforts as a formal Cooperating Agency and looks forward to discussing the possibility.

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Clifford Seibel, Environmental Division Chief, Directorate of Public Works, USAG FWA at (907) 361-6220.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Johnson
Colonel, US Army
Commanding

McEnteer, Carrie L Ms US USA IMCOM

From: Graham, Lisa M Ms CTR US USA IMCOM
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2011 8:01 AM
To: Sprau, Matthew H Mr CTR US USA IMCOM; McEnteer, Carrie L Ms US USA IMCOM
Subject: FW: Hangar 2 and 3 Disposition and Cooperating Agency Status for NEPA Process (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

FYI

Lisa Graham
Cultural Resources Manager
Fort Wainwright AK
907.361.3002

-----Original Message-----
From: Ted_Birkedal@nps.gov [mailto:Ted_Birkedal@nps.gov]
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2011 6:39 PM
To: Graham, Lisa M Ms CTR US USA IMCOM
Cc: Janet_Clemens@nps.gov; Darrell_Lewis@nps.gov; Grant_Crosby@nps.gov
Subject: RE: Hangar 2 and 3 Disposition and Cooperating Agency Status for NEPA Process

Lisa:

I have been able to talk to staff about Army's offer about serving as a Cooperation Agency in the Hanger Disposition NEPA process and as I said over the phone we would not have the necessary staff and travel resources to fulfill that role at the expected level. I had meetings with Grant, Janet, and Darrell and all agree. Grant whose time would most be drawn upon was particularly wary of us signing up as a "Cooperator".

We hope to be heavily involved to the in the Section 106 consultation process and we will be available to offer what technical advice we can into the NEPA process. We are very interested in the future preservation of Hangars 2 and 3 for they were closely associated to the lend-lease effort and they serve as important structural touchstone's to WWII in Alaska.

If I remember correctly, we will be getting a formal written invitation to serve as a Cooperator, to which we must reply in turn in writing. The purpose of this email is to let you know informally what our position must be.

Thanks,

Ted Birkedal
Team Manager
Cultural Resources Team
Alaska Regional Office
National Park Service
240 West 5th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
Phone: (907) 644-3456
Email: ted_birkedal@nps.gov

Preserving America's Heritage

October 17, 2011

Mr. Clifford A. Seibel
Environmental Division Chief
Department of the Army
Installation Management Command
Headquarters, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
1060 Gaffney Road #6000
ATTN: Directorate of Public Works
Fort Wainwright, AK 99703-6000

Ref: Future Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 (Buildings 3008 and 3005)
Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark
Fort Wainwright, Fairbanks North Star, Alaska

Dear Mr. Seibel:

On October 4, 2011, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) received your notification for the development of an Environmental Impact Statement for the referenced project. This notification also included a request for the ACHP to become a Cooperating Agency in Fort Wainwright's compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act. We have no comments or plans to become a Cooperating Agency pursuant to NEPA, at this time.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act instructs the federal agency to take into account the effect of an undertaking on any property that is eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places "prior to the approval of the expenditure of any Federal funds on the undertaking or prior to the issuance of any license." 16 U.S.C. § 470f (emphasis added). This statutory language makes it clear that a federal agency must complete its Section 106 responsibilities before ("prior to") reaching its final decision ("approval," "issuance") on an undertaking.

According to the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations, a Record of Decision (ROD) "shall state … what the decision was … [and] … whether all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the alternative selected have been adopted, and if not, why they were not." 40 C.F.R. § 1502.2 (emphasis added). Accordingly, the issuance of a ROD conveys the agency's final decision on an undertaking and details the nature of that decision.

In order to meet the statutory and regulatory requirements of the Section 106 process, the ROD should be issued concurrent with or after the completion of the Section 106 process. As you know, the execution of a Section 106 program alternative, such as a Programmatic Agreement, in accordance with the Section 106 regulations indicates that an agency has completed this process.

In order to ensure compliance with Section 106, the ACHP encourages Fort Wainwright to initiate the Section 106 process by notifying, at your earliest convenience, the Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the Secretary of the Interior (per 36 CFR § 800.10(c)), Indian tribes, and other consulting parties pursuant to our regulations, "Protection of Historic Properties" (36 CFR Part 800). Through early consultation your agency will be able to determine the appropriate strategy to ensure Section 106 compliance for this undertaking.

Fort Wainwright should continue consultation with the SHPO, the Secretary of the Interior, Indian tribes, and other consulting parties to identify and evaluate historic properties and to assess any potential adverse effects on those historic properties. If you determine, through consultation with the consulting parties, that the undertaking will adversely affect historic properties, or that the development of a Programmatic Agreement is necessary, Fort Wainwright must notify the ACHP and provide the documentation detailed at 36 CFR § 800.11(e).

Should you have any questions as to how your agency should comply with the requirements of Section 106, please contact Ms. Katharine R. Kerr by telephone at (202) 606-8534 or by e-mail at kkerr@achp.gov.

Sincerely,

Caroline D. Hall
Assistant Director
Office of Federal Agency Programs
Federal Property Management Section

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX D-5: Reuse Partnership Correspondence

This page intentionally left blank.

Johnson, Chloe C USA CTR (US)

From: McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US)
Sent: Thursday, December 08, 2011 10:44 AM
To: sue_masica@nps.gov
Cc: Seibel, Clifford A USA CIV (US); Ted_Birkedal@nps.gov; Graham, Lisa M USA CIV (US)
Subject: Inquiry Letter Regarding Feasibility of Funding Partnership Between BLM and USAG FWA - Hangars 2 and 3 (UNCLASSIFIED)
Attachments: Sue Masica, Regional Director Nat. Park Service, 240 W. 5th Ave.Room 114, Anchorage, AK 99501-1365.pdf

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Ms. Masica,

Please see attached letter inquiring about the feasibility of a funding partnership between the National Park Service and U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska in support of future rehabilitation of Hangars 2 and 3 located on Fort Wainwright. A hardcopy will follow via mail service.

Very respectfully,
Carrie

Carrie McEnteer
NEPA Branch Chief
Environmental Division, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
Phone: (907) 361-9507
****PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS: carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

DEC 0 6 2011

Office of the Garrison Commander

Sue Masica
Regional Director
National Park Service
240 West 5th Avenue, Room 114
Anchorage, AK 99501-1365

Dear Ms. Masica:

The US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) is initiating efforts to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) related to the future disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, located on USAG FWA. The two hangars are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark; however, the current condition of the hangars warrants a decision on the disposition of the facilities that meets safety, funding, facilities management, land use and cultural resources management objectives.

As part of the scoping process, USAG FWA is considering a range of reasonable alternatives including converting both hangars to another use, demolishing both hangars, demolishing one hangar and retaining one hangar, indefinite "mothballing" of the buildings, and transferring facilities and management responsibility to another agency. Other reasonable alternatives that were raised during the EIS scoping process and capable of meeting the project purpose, need and criteria will be considered for evaluation in the EIS.

As a federal entity that has both special expertise and regulatory authority with respect to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark, your agency may have an increased interest in developing a funding partnership with USAG FWA in rehabilitation of Hangars 2 and 3 in exchange for shared facility use. A recent study was completed that investigated possible reuse scenarios for Hangars 2 and 3. The study outlined the basic stabilization and repair efforts required to support a new use. Cost estimates ranging from $32 to $38 million per hangar were identified.

The opportunity may exist for USAG FWA and the National Park Service (NPS) to develop a unique partnership that will further the cultural resource preservation goals of both organizations while offering NPS an opportunity to utilize the hangars to further their own historic preservation and outreach goals for the Ladd Field National Historic Landmark. We look forward to discussing the feasibility of this partnership.

The USAG FWA has also contacted the Bureau of Land Management with a similar inquiry.

If you have questions, please contact Mr. Clifford Seibel, USAG FWA, Directorate of Public Works, Environmental Division Chief at (907) 361-6220 or clifford.a.seibel.civ@mail.mil

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Johnson
Colonel, US Army
Commanding

Johnson, Chloe C USA CTR (US)

From: McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US)
Sent: Thursday, December 08, 2011 10:37 AM
To: Cribley, Bud
Cc: Seibel, Clifford A USA CIV (US)
Subject: Inquiry Letter Regarding Feasibility of Funding Partnership Between BLM and USAG FWA - Hangars 2 and 3 (UNCLASSIFIED)
Attachments: Bud C. Cribley, State Director,BLM Alaska 222 W. 7th Ave.,#13 Anchorage, AK 99513.pdf

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Mr. Cribley,

Please see attached letter inquiring about the feasibility of a funding partnership between the Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska in support of future rehabilitation of Hangars 2 and 3 located on Fort Wainwright. A hardcopy will follow via mail service.

Very respectfully,
Carrie

Carrie McEnteer
NEPA Branch Chief
Environmental Division, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
Phone: (907) 361-9507
****PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS: carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

Office of the Garrison Commander

DEC 0 6 2011

Bud C. Cribley
State Director, BLM Alaska
222 W. 7th Avenue, #13
Anchorage, AK 99513

Dear Mr. Cribley:

The US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) is initiating efforts to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) related to the future disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, located on USAG FWA. The two hangars are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark; however, the current condition of the hangars warrants a decision on the disposition of the facilities that meets safety, funding, facilities management, land use and cultural resources management objectives.

As part of the scoping process, USAG FWA is considering a range of reasonable alternatives including converting both hangars to another use, demolishing both hangars, demolishing one hangar and retaining one hangar, indefinite "mothballing" of the buildings, and transferring facilities and management responsibility to another agency. Other reasonable alternatives that were raised during the scoping process and capable of meeting the project purpose, need and criteria will be considered for evaluation in the EIS.

As one of the primary users of Fort Wainwright Ladd Army Airfield, your agency may have an increased interest in developing a funding partnership with USAG FWA in rehabilitation of Hangars 2 and 3 in exchange for shared facility use. A recent study was completed that investigated possible reuse scenarios for Hangars 2 and 3. The study outlined the basic stabilization and repair efforts required to support a new use. Cost estimates ranging from $32 to $38 million per hangar were identified.

The opportunity may exist for USAG FWA and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to develop a unique partnership that will further the cultural resource preservation goals of the Army while offering BLM additional space to conduct airfield operations on Fort Wainwright Ladd Army Airfield. We look forward to discussing the feasibility of this partnership.

The USAG FWA has also contacted the National Park Service with a similar inquiry.

If you have questions, please contact Mr. Clifford Seibel, USAG FWA, Directorate of Public Works, Environmental Division Chief at (907) 361-6220 or clifford.a.seibel.civ@mail.mil

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Johnson
Colonel, US Army
Commanding

Smith, Spence

From: McEnteer, Carrie L CIV (US) [carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil]
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2012 3:30 PM
To: Harry_Kieling@nbc.gov
Cc: Seibel, Clifford A CIV (US)
Subject: Inquiry Letter Regarding Feasibility of Funding Partnership Between DOI and US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright - Hangars 2 and 3 (UNCLASSIFIED)
Attachments: Partnership Inquiry_Kieling.pdf

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Mr. Kieling,

Please see attached letter inquiring about the feasibility of a funding partnership between the Department of the Interior - Aviation Management and U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska in support of future rehabilitation of Hangars 2 and 3 located on Fort Wainwright. A hardcopy will follow via mail service.

Very respectfully,
Carrie

Carrie McEnteer
NEPA Branch Chief
Environmental Division, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
Phone: (907) 361-9507
****PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS: carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

Office of the Garrison Commander

Harry Kieling,
Regional Director
Department of the Interior, National Business Center
Aviation Management, Alaska Regional Office
Division of Aircraft Maintenance
4405 Lear Court
Anchorage, AK 99502-1032

FEB 2 3 2012

Dear Mr. Kieling:

The US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) is initiating efforts to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) related to the future disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, located at USAG FWA. The two hangars are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark; however, the current condition of the hangars warrants a decision on the disposition of the facilities that meets safety, funding, facilities management, land use and cultural resources management objectives.

As part of the scoping process, USAG FWA is considering a range of reasonable alternatives including converting both hangars to another use, demolishing both hangars, demolishing one hangar and retaining one hangar, indefinite "mothballing" of the buildings, and transferring facilities and management responsibility to another agency. Other reasonable alternatives were raised during the scoping process and capable of meeting the project purpose and need and criteria will be considered for evaluation in the EIS.

As an agency with aviation management responsibilities, your organization may have an increased interest in developing a funding partnership with USAG FWA in rehabilitation of Hangars 2 and 3, located on the Fort Wainwright Ladd Army Airfield, in exchange for shared facility use. A recent study was completed that investigated possible reuse scenarios for Hangars 2 and 3. The study outlined the basic stabilization and repair efforts required to support a new use. Cost estimates ranging from $32 to $38 million per hangar were identified.

The opportunity may exist for USAG FWA and the Department of the Interior to develop a unique partnership that will further the cultural resource preservation goals of the Army while offering space to the Aviation Management division to conduct airfield operations out of Ladd Army Airfield. We look forward to discussing the feasibility of this partnership.

USAG FWA has also contacted the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, Alaska State Division of Forestry, and the Alaska Army National Guard with a similar inquiry.

If you have questions, please contact Mr. Clifford Seibel, USAG FWA, Directorate of Public Works Environmental Division at (907) 361-6220 or at clifford.a.seibel.civ@mail.mil

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Johnson
Colonel, US Army
Commanding

Smith, Spence

From: McEnteer, Carrie L CIV (US) [carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil]
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2012 3:46 PM
To: Gilbert, Joel T LTC USARMY (US)
Cc: Seibel, Clifford A CIV (US); Siftar, Kathleen D CIV (US)
Subject: Inquiry Letter Regarding Feasibility of Funding Partnership Between AK Army National Guard and US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright - Hangars 2 and 3 (UNCLASSIFIED)
Attachments: Partnership Inquiry_Gilbert.pdf

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

LTC Gilbert,

Please see attached letter inquiring about the feasibility of a funding partnership between the Alaska Army National Guard and U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska in support of future rehabilitation of Hangars 2 and 3 located on Fort Wainwright. A hardcopy will follow via mail service.

Very respectfully,
Carrie

Carrie McEnteer
NEPA Branch Chief
Environmental Division, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
Phone: (907) 361-9507
****PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS: carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

Office of the Garrison Commander

Lieutenant Colonel Joel Gilbert
Construction and Facility Management Office
PO Box 5800
Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska 99050

FEB 2 3 2012

Dear Lieutenant Colonel Gilbert:

The US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) is initiating efforts to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) related to the future disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, located at USAG FWA. The two hangars are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark; however, the current condition of the hangars warrants a decision on the disposition of the facilities that meets safety, funding, facilities management, land use and cultural resources management objectives.

As part of the scoping process, USAG FWA is considering a range of reasonable alternatives including converting both hangars to another use, demolishing both hangars, demolishing one hangar and retaining one hangar, indefinite "mothballing" of the buildings, and transferring facilities and management responsibility to another agency. Other reasonable alternatives were raised during the scoping process and capable of meeting the project purpose and need and criteria will be considered for evaluation in the EIS.

As one of the users of the Fort Wainwright Ladd Army Airfield, your agency may have an increased interest in developing a funding partnership with USAG FWA in rehabilitation of Hangars 2 and 3 in exchange for shared facility use. A recent study was completed that investigated possible reuse scenarios for Hangars 2 and 3. The study outlined the basic stabilization and repair efforts required to support a new use. Cost estimates ranging from $32 to $38 million per hangar were identified.

The opportunity may exist for USAG FWA and the Alaska Army National Guard to develop a unique partnership that will further the cultural resource preservation goals of the Army while offering the Alaska Army National Guard additional space to conduct airfield operations on Fort Wainwright. We look forward to discussing the feasibility of this partnership.

USAG FWA has also contacted the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, and Alaska State Division of Forestry with a similar inquiry.

If you have questions, please contact Mr. Clifford Seibel, USAG FWA, Directorate of Public Works Environmental Division at (907) 361-6220 or at clifford.a.seibel.civ@mail.mil

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Johnson
Colonel, US Army
Commanding

Smith, Spence

From: McEnteer, Carrie L CIV (US) [carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil]
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2012 3:22 PM
To: chris.maisch@alaska.gov
Cc: Seibel, Clifford A CIV (US)
Subject: Inquiry Letter Regarding Feasibility of Funding Partnership Between DOF and US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright - Hangars 2 and 3 (UNCLASSIFIED)
Attachments: Partnership Inquiry_Maisch.pdf

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Mr. Maisch,

Please see attached letter inquiring about the feasibility of a funding partnership between the State of Alaska - Division of Forestry and U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska in support of future rehabilitation of Hangars 2 and 3 located on Fort Wainwright. A hardcopy will follow via mail service.

Very respectfully,
Carrie

Carrie McEnteer
NEPA Branch Chief
Environmental Division, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
Phone: (907) 361-9507
****PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS: carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

Office of the Garrison Commander

Chris Maisch
State Forester and Director
Division of Forestry
550 W. 7th Ave. Suite 1450
Anchorage, AK 99501-3566

FEB 2 3 2012

Dear Mr. Maisch:

The US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) is initiating efforts to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) related to the future disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, located at USAG FWA. The two hangars are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark; however, the current condition of the hangars warrants a decision on the disposition of the facilities that meets safety, funding, facilities management, land use and cultural resources management objectives.

As part of the scoping process, USAG FWA is considering a range of reasonable alternatives including converting both hangars to another use, demolishing both hangars, demolishing one hangar and retaining one hangar, indefinite "mothballing" of the buildings, and transferring facilities and management responsibility to another agency. Other reasonable alternatives were raised during the scoping process and capable of meeting the project purpose and need and criteria will be considered for evaluation in the EIS.

As an agency with aviation management responsibilities, your organization may have an increased interest in developing a funding partnership with USAG FWA in rehabilitation of Hangars 2 and 3, located on the Fort Wainwright Ladd Army Airfield, in exchange for shared facility use. A recent study was completed that investigated possible reuse scenarios for Hangars 2 and 3. The study outlined the basic stabilization and repair efforts required to support a new use. Cost estimates ranging from $32 to $38 million per hangar were identified.

The opportunity may exist for USAG FWA and the State of Alaska Division of Forestry to develop a unique partnership that will further the cultural resource preservation goals of the Army while offering the Division of Forestry space to conduct airfield operations out of Ladd Army Airfield. We look forward to discussing the feasibility of this partnership.

USAG FWA has also contacted the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, Department of Interior, and the Alaska Army National Guard with a similar inquiry.

If you have questions, please contact Mr. Clifford Seibel, USAG FWA, Directorate of Public Works Environmental Division at (907) 361-6220 or at clifford.a.seibel.civ@mail.mil

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Johnson
Colonel, US Army
Commanding

United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Alaska Region
240 West 5th Avenue, Room 114
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

IN REPLY REFER TO:

H34 (AKRO-RCR)

JAN 04 2012

Colonel Ronald M. Johnson, U.S. Army
Installation Management Command
Headquarters, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
1060 Gaffney Road #6000
Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-6000

Dear Colonel Johnson:

This letter is in response to your December 6, 2011, inquiry regarding the possibility of a funding partnership with U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright (USAG FWA) to rehabilitate Hangars 2 and 3 at Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark (NHL).

The Alaska Region of the National Park Service does not have a need for a storage facility to support our operations in Fairbanks, but we are encouraged by the breadth of reuse options being considered by the U.S. Army to preserve the two historic hangars, both of which are integral to the significance of the Ladd Field NHL. Partnering with other Federal agencies to rehabilitate the two hangars is a sound approach which illustrates the Army's interest in preserving our nation's cultural heritage.

Although the National Park Service does not have a programmatic need to partner with the Army to rehabilitate the hangars, we are available to provide your agency with technical assistance with matters related to historic preservation.

Our cultural resources team has carefully reviewed the November 2011 *Reuse Study of FWA's Hangars 2 and 3* at Fort Wainwright, Alaska, and they are encouraged by the six alternatives for adaptive reuse. Our team is surprised at the $32 million cost estimate associated with stabilizing each building prior to a final build-out for a new use. We believe there may be options that have a much more reasonable price tag that will successfully stabilize the structures while maintaining the functionality of the reuse options and the exterior character of each hangar. For instance, thoughtfully designed alternatives, including, but not limited to, installation of additional interior supports or a steel superstructure to support the existing structure, may be acceptable to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and align with the rehabilitation treatment defined by *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

As contributing elements to the Ladd Field NHL, Hangars 2 & 3 are important features of the historic airfield. We applaud the Army's interest in attempting to preserve the unique clear span configuration of each hangar in addition to the historic fabric. This approach, however, likely contributes to the high stabilization costs. The hangars' overall exterior appearance, including form, scale and view shed characteristics, are more critical than the interior spaces. Considering options that do not include maintaining the clear span may result in designs that are considerably less costly.

Our National Register Team Historical Architect is available to consult on-site with your cultural resource and design team to discuss alternatives which may reduce the stabilization and operational costs. In order to effectively assist the Army in exploring alternate approaches to rehabilitation for contemporary use, we will need to review the structural engineer's analysis and supporting calculations that document the lack of structural integrity of the hangars. At the present time, we do not have access to the detailed information that would enable us to understand the extent of the structural threats to the buildings. It seems there are more efficient options than to completely deconstruct both buildings in order to perform a detailed condition assessment for the stabilization effort and we are willing and able to partner with the Army to explore those options.

Please contact Debora Cooper, Associate Regional Director for Resources, Alaska Regional Office, at (907) 644-3505 or via email [debora_cooper@nps.gov] if you are interested in our technical assistance in historical architecture.

Sincerely,

Sue E. Masica

Sue E. Masica
Regional Director

cc:
Judy Bittner, State Historic Preservation Officer

United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Alaska State Office
222 West Seventh Avenue, #13
Anchorage, Alaska 99513-7504
http://www.blm.gov/ak

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

In Reply Refer To:
1324(AK-9100)

JAN 2 1 2012

Colonel Ronald M. Johnson
United States Army
1060 Gaffney Road # 6000
Fort Wainright, Alaska 99703-6000

Dear Colonel Johnson:

Thank you for your December 6, 2011, letter inviting BLM-Alaska to partner with the United States Army Garrison Fort Wainright in the rehabilitation of Hangars 2 and 3 in exchange for shared facility use.

We appreciate the offer, but due to our current and projected operational requirements we do not wish to commit to this project at this time. Please do not hesitate to contact me with future partnership opportunities as they arise.

Sincerely,

Bud C. Cribley Jr.
State Director

Smith, Spence

From: Harry_Kieling@nbc.gov
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2012 4:59 PM
To: Geoff_Haskett@fws.gov; Sue_Masica@nps.gov; bcribley@blm.gov
Cc: Kevin_Fox@fws.gov; Ken_Barnes@nps.gov; kslaught@blm.gov; McEnteer, Carrie L CIV (US); Mark_Bathrick@nbc.gov; Stewart_Walker@nbc.gov; Ralph_Getchell@nbc.gov
Subject: Fw: Inquiry Letter Regarding Feasibility of Funding Partnership Between DOI and US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright - Hangars 2 and 3 (UNCLASSIFIED)
Attachments: Partnership Inquiry_Kieling.pdf

Geoff,

If you have any interest you may want to pass to one of your staff for evaluation.

Sue/Bud looks like you may have already seen this but wanted to make sure

If interested and I can help let me know.

Harry Kieling
Alaska Regional Director
US Department of the Interior
National Business Center
Aviation Management Directorate
Alaska Regional Office
Phone: 907 271-5626
harry_kieling@nbc.gov

An ISO 9001:2008 CERTIFIED Shared Services Provider

Click on the graphic above to take our Customer Satisfaction Survey

----- Forwarded by Harry Kieling/NBC/OS/DOI on 02/22/2012 12:47 PM -----

From: "McEnteer, Carrie L CIV (US)" <carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil>
To: "Harry_Kieling@nbc.gov" <Harry_Kieling@nbc.gov>
Cc: "Seibel, Clifford A CIV (US)" <clifford.a.seibel.civ@mail.mil>
Date: 02/22/2012 11:30 AM
Subject: Inquiry Letter Regarding Feasibility of Funding Partnership Between DOI and US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright - Hangars 2 and 3 (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Mr. Kieling,

Please see attached letter inquiring about the feasibility of a funding partnership between the Department of the Interior - Aviation Management and U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska in support of future rehabilitation of Hangars 2 and 3 located on Fort Wainwright. A hardcopy will follow via mail service.

Very respectfully,
Carrie

Carrie McEnteer
NEPA Branch Chief
Environmental Division, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
Phone: (907) 361-9507
****PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS: carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Smith, Spence

From: McEnteer, Carrie L CIV (US) <carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil>
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2012 5:04 PM
To: Gilbert, Joel T LTC USARMY (US)
Cc: Seibel, Clifford A CIV (US); Siftar, Kathleen D CIV (US); Negri, Frank A CPT USARMY (US)
Subject: RE: Inquiry Letter Regarding Feasibility of Funding Partnership Between AK Army National Guard and US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright - Hangars 2 and 3 (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

LTC Gilbert,

Thank you for your time and consideration.

V/r,
Carrie

-----Original Message-----
From: Gilbert, Joel T LTC MIL NG AK ARNG [mailto:joel.gilbert@us.army.mil]
Sent: Friday, February 24, 2012 10:50 AM
To: McEnteer, Carrie L CIV (US)
Cc: Seibel, Clifford A CIV (US); Siftar, Kathleen D CIV (US); Negri, Frank A CPT USARMY (US)
Subject: RE: Inquiry Letter Regarding Feasibility of Funding Partnership Between AK Army National Guard and US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright - Hangars 2 and 3 (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Ma'am,

We appreciate the offer to participate in a partnership with U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright to occupy/utilize the hangars. We unfortunately at this time are unable to enter into the partnership based upon manning/force structure that is positioned at that location compared to the costs involved.

Please keep us in mind when planning future opportunities.

Sincerely,

LTC Gilbert

-----Original Message-----
From: McEnteer, Carrie L CIV (US) [mailto:carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil]
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2012 11:46 AM
To: Gilbert, Joel T LTC MIL NG AK ARNG
Cc: Seibel, Clifford A CIV (US); Siftar, Kathleen D CIV (US)
Subject: Inquiry Letter Regarding Feasibility of Funding Partnership Between AK Army National Guard and US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright - Hangars 2 and 3
(UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

LTC Gilbert,

Please see attached letter inquiring about the feasibility of a funding partnership between the Alaska Army National Guard and U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska in support of future rehabilitation of Hangars 2 and

3 located on Fort Wainwright. A hardcopy will follow via mail service.

Very respectfully,
Carrie

Carrie McEnteer
NEPA Branch Chief
Environmental Division, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
Phone: (907) 361-9507
****PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS: carrie.l.mcenteer.civ@mail.mil

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX D-6: NHPA Section 106 Correspondence

This page intentionally left blank.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

OCT 0 3 2011

Directorate of Public Works

SUBJECT: Notification of an Undertaking Affecting Hangars 2 and 3

Judith E. Bittner
State Historic Preservation Officer
Office of History and Archaeology
550 West Seventh Ave., Suite 1310
Anchorage, Alaska 99501-1365

Dear Ms. Bittner:

In accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3c, the US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) is notifying you of an undertaking potentially affecting Hangars 2 and 3 (Buildings 3008 and 3005), both of which are contributing properties to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark.

Both facilities are in a deteriorated state, which in the case of Hangar 2 is exacerbated by the effects of the February 2011 fire at the facility. The condition of the facilities is at a point where a decision on their future disposition is needed that meets safety, funding, facilities management, land use, and cultural resource management objectives. USAG FWA will be conducting consultation with you and other interested parties on the effects of this undertaking pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act's Section 106.

In accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3f, USAG FWA would like consult with you on potential consulting parties. Please see the enclosed draft list of consulting parties.

Point of contact for this letter is Lisa Graham, Directorate of Public Works, Environmental Division, Cultural Resources Manager, (907) 361-3002.

Sincerely,

Michael T. Meeks
Director, Directorate of Public Works

Enclosure

Consulting Parties List

Alaska Association of Historic Preservation
645 West 3rd Ave
Anchorage, AK 99501

Alaska Aviation Heritage Museum
4721 Aircraft Drive
Anchorage, AK 99502

Tanana-Yukon Historical Society
PO Box 71336
Fairbanks, AK 99707-1336

Bureau of Land Management
1150 University Avenue
Fairbanks, AK 99709-3899

Fairbanks North Star Borough
Historic Preservation Commission
PO Box 71267
Fairbanks, AK 99707-1267

National Park Service
240 West 5th Avenue
Anchorage, AK 99501

Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc.
Cultural Resources Department
122 First Avenue, Suite 600
Fairbanks, AK 99701-4897

National Trust for Historic Preservation
5 Third Street, Suite 707
San Francisco, CA 94103

Federally Recognized Tribes

Nenana Native Association
PO Box 356
Nenana, AK 99760-0356

Native Village of Tetlin
PO Box 797
Tok, AK 99780

Native Village of Tanacross
PO Box 76009
Tanacross, AK 99776

Northway Village
PO Box 516
Northway, AK 99764

Native Village of Eagle
PO Box 19
Eagle, AK 99738

Healy Lake Village
PO Box 73158
Fairbanks, AK 99707

Village of Dot Lake
PO Box 2279
Dot Lake, AK 99737

STATE OF ALASKA

SEAN PARNELL, GOVERNOR

550 WEST 7TH AVENUE, SUITE 1310
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501-3565
PHONE: (907) 269-8721
FAX: (907) 269-8908

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

DIVISION OF PARKS & OUTDOOR RECREATION
OFFICE OF HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY

October 31, 2011

File No.: 3130-1R Army Ft. Wainwright

SUBJECT: Undertaking affecting Hangers 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright

Michael T. Meeks
Director, Directorate of Public Works
Department of the Army
Installation Management Command
Headquarters, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
1060 Gaffney Road #6000
Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-6000

Dear Mr. Meeks,

The Alaska State Historic Preservation Office received your initiation letter on October 6, 2011 regarding the potential undertakings affecting Hangers 2 and 3. We look forward to the upcoming consultation with you and other interested parties in December. Through this early consultation the Army will be able to determine the appropriate strategy to ensure Section 106 compliance for this undertaking as well as best possible outcome for the hangers.

Please contact Summer Rickman at 269-8717 or summer.rickman@alaska.gov if you have any questions or if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Judith E. Bittner
State Historic Preservation Officer

JEB:slr

Printed on Recycled Paper

From:	Graham, Lisa M USA CIV (US)
To:	Summer L Rickman (DNR) (summer.rickman@alaska.gov)
Subject:	Hangar 2 and 3 letter to consult (UNCLASSIFIED)
Date:	Thursday, November 17, 2011 9:09:00 AM
Attachments:	Sec106lt_Hangars2&3_Invitation to Consult_SHPO.pdf Sec106 lt_Hangars 2&3_invitation to consult_all parties.pdf Enclosure to 15Nov lt_Hangar 2 Bldg Survey.pdf Enclosure to 15Nov lt_Hangar 3 Bldg Survey.pdf

---

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Hi Summer,

I wanted to send you a copy of the letter we mailed out yesterday. I also included copies of all the other letters.

I know this letter is a bit redundant considering the first letter we sent you. But I spoke with Doug last week and decided to send you this one too being it has more info and is signed by Col. Johnson.

Also, I haven't seen a response to the first letter (date stamped Oct 3), were you waiting to respond or has it just not gotten to me yet?

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Lisa Graham
Cultural Resources Manager
Fort Wainwright AK
907.361.3002

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

NOV 15 2011

Office of the Garrison Commander

SUBJECT: Invitation to Consult on the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Ms. Judy Bittner
Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer
Alaska DNR, Office of History and Archaeology
550 W 7th Avenue, Suite 1310
Anchorage, AK 99501-3565

Dear Ms. Bittner:

The US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) invites you to consult on the future disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 which are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark (NHL). The condition of the facilities and the relocation of their maintenance functions warrant a decision on their future disposition that meets safety, funding, facilities management, land use, and cultural resources management objectives. Options currently being considered include converting use of both hangars to another purpose, demolishing both hangars, demolishing one and retaining one, indefinite "mothballing" of the hangars, and transferring facilities and management responsibilities to another agency.

This letter invites your organization to participate in the National Historic Preservation Act's (NHPA) Section 106 consultation process pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2(d). If your organization is interested in participating in this consultation process, a more detailed package of information will be forthcoming based on your response. A building inventory report for each hangar containing both an architectural description and a significance summary is enclosed. The initial Section 106 consultation meeting will be held at Fort Wainwright, building 1555 on Thursday, December 15, 2011 from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m.

As this undertaking is complex with multiple options and timeframes, the USAG FWA will be pursuing a Programmatic Agreement with the consulting parties pursuant to 36 CFR 800.14(b)3. The USAG FWA is also concurrently preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to assess the potential impacts upon the natural and man-made environment associated with the proposed facility disposition options. The Section 106 consultation process will inform the EIS analysis, and through the EIS, an option will be chosen and a management strategy will be developed.

Please send your response to this invitation to consult via mail, fax or email to Ms. Lisa Graham, Directorate of Public Works, Attn: IMPC-FWA-PWE (Graham), 1060 Gaffney Road #4500, Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-4500, fax: (907) 361-9867 or email: lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil.

USAG FWA looks forward to your participation in the NHPA's Section 106 consultation process. If you would like any additional information, please contact Ms. Lisa Graham, USAG FWA, Directorate of Public Works Environmental Division, Cultural Resources Manager at (907) 361-3002 or email at lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Johnson
Colonel, US Army
Commanding

Enclosures

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

NOV 15 2011

Office of the Garrison Commander

SUBJECT: Invitation to Consult on the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Mr. William Hedman
Archaeologist
Bureau of Land Management
1150 University Avenue
Fairbanks, AK 99709

Dear Mr. Hedman:

The US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) invites you to consult on the future disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 which are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark (NHL). The condition of the facilities and the relocation of their maintenance functions warrant a decision on their future disposition that meets safety, funding, facilities management, land use, and cultural resources management objectives. Options currently being considered include converting use of both hangars to another purpose, demolishing both hangars, demolishing one and retaining one, indefinite "mothballing" of the hangars, and transferring facilities and management responsibilities to another agency.

This letter invites your organization to participate in the National Historic Preservation Act's (NHPA) Section 106 consultation process pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2(d). If your organization is interested in participating in this consultation process, a more detailed package of information will be forthcoming based on your response. A building inventory report for each hangar containing both an architectural description and a significance summary is enclosed. The initial Section 106 consultation meeting will be held at Fort Wainwright, building 1555 on Thursday, December 15, 2011 from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m.

As this undertaking is complex with multiple options and timeframes, the USAG FWA will be pursuing a Programmatic Agreement with the consulting parties pursuant to 36 CFR 800.14(b)3. The USAG FWA is also concurrently preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to assess the potential impacts upon the natural and man-made environment associated with the proposed facility disposition options. The Section 106 consultation process will inform the EIS analysis, and through the EIS, an option will be chosen and a management strategy will be developed.

Please send your response to this invitation to consult via mail, fax or email to Ms. Lisa Graham, Directorate of Public Works, Attn: IMPC-FWA-PWE (Graham), 1060 Gaffney Road #4500, Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-4500, fax: (907) 361-9867 or email: lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil.

USAG FWA looks forward to your participation in the NHPA's Section 106 consultation process. If you would like any additional information, please contact Ms. Lisa Graham, USAG FWA, Directorate of Public Works Environmental Division, Cultural Resources Manager at (907) 361-3002 or email at lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Johnson
Colonel, US Army
Commanding

Enclosures

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

NOV 15 2011

Office of the Garrison Commander

SUBJECT: Invitation to Consult on the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Mr. Ronald K. Inouye
Tanana Yukon Historical Society
P.O. Box 71336
Fairbanks, AK 99707-1336

Dear Mr. Inouye:

The US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) invites you to consult on the future disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 which are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark (NHL). The condition of the facilities and the relocation of their maintenance functions warrant a decision on their future disposition that meets safety, funding, facilities management, land use, and cultural resources management objectives. Options currently being considered include converting use of both hangars to another purpose, demolishing both hangars, demolishing one and retaining one, indefinite "mothballing" of the hangars, and transferring facilities and management responsibilities to another agency.

This letter invites your organization to participate in the National Historic Preservation Act's (NHPA) Section 106 consultation process pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2(d). If your organization is interested in participating in this consultation process, a more detailed package of information will be forthcoming based on your response. A building inventory report for each hangar containing both an architectural description and a significance summary is enclosed. The initial Section 106 consultation meeting will be held at Fort Wainwright, building 1555 on Thursday, December 15, 2011 from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m.

As this undertaking is complex with multiple options and timeframes, the USAG FWA will be pursuing a Programmatic Agreement with the consulting parties pursuant to 36 CFR 800.14(b)3. The USAG FWA is also concurrently preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to assess the potential impacts upon the natural and man-made environment associated with the proposed facility disposition options. The Section 106 consultation process will inform the EIS analysis, and through the EIS, an option will be chosen and a management strategy will be developed.

Please send your response to this invitation to consult via mail, fax or email to Ms. Lisa Graham, Directorate of Public Works, Attn: IMPC-FWA-PWE (Graham), 1060 Gaffney Road #4500, Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-4500, fax: (907) 361-9867 or email: lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil.

USAG FWA looks forward to your participation in the NHPA's Section 106 consultation process. If you would like any additional information, please contact Ms. Lisa Graham, USAG FWA, Directorate of Public Works Environmental Division, Cultural Resources Manager at (907) 361-3002 or email at lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Johnson
Colonel, US Army
Commanding

Enclosures

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

NOV 15 2011

Office of the Garrison Commander

SUBJECT: Invitation to Consult on the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Mr. Brian R. Turner
National Trust for Historic Preservation
The Hearst Building
5 Third Street, Suite 707
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Turner:

The US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) invites you to consult on the future disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 which are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark (NHL). The condition of the facilities and the relocation of their maintenance functions warrant a decision on their future disposition that meets safety, funding, facilities management, land use, and cultural resources management objectives. Options currently being considered include converting use of both hangars to another purpose, demolishing both hangars, demolishing one and retaining one, indefinite "mothballing" of the hangars, and transferring facilities and management responsibilities to another agency.

This letter invites your organization to participate in the National Historic Preservation Act's (NHPA) Section 106 consultation process pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2(d). If your organization is interested in participating in this consultation process, a more detailed package of information will be forthcoming based on your response. A building inventory report for each hangar containing both an architectural description and a significance summary is enclosed. The initial Section 106 consultation meeting will be held at Fort Wainwright, building 1555 on Thursday, December 15, 2011 from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m.

As this undertaking is complex with multiple options and timeframes, the USAG FWA will be pursuing a Programmatic Agreement with the consulting parties pursuant to 36 CFR 800.14(b)3. The USAG FWA is also concurrently preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to assess the potential impacts upon the natural and man-made environment associated with the proposed facility disposition options. The Section 106 consultation process will inform the EIS analysis, and through the EIS, an option will be chosen and a management strategy will be developed.

Please send your response to this invitation to consult via mail, fax or email to Ms. Lisa Graham, Directorate of Public Works, Attn: IMPC-FWA-PWE (Graham), 1060 Gaffney Road #4500, Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-4500, fax: (907) 361-9867 or email: lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil.

USAG FWA looks forward to your participation in the NHPA's Section 106 consultation process. If you would like any additional information, please contact Ms. Lisa Graham, USAG FWA, Directorate of Public Works Environmental Division, Cultural Resources Manager at (907) 361-3002 or email at lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Johnson
Colonel, US Army
Commanding

Enclosures

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

Office of the Garrison Commander

NOV 15 2011

SUBJECT: Invitation to Consult on the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Mr. Allan Renfroe
Fairbanks North Star Borough Historic Preservation Commission
P.O. Box 71267-1267 (809 Pioneer Rd)
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Dear Mr. Renfroe:

The US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) invites you to consult on the future disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 which are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark (NHL). The condition of the facilities and the relocation of their maintenance functions warrant a decision on their future disposition that meets safety, funding, facilities management, land use, and cultural resources management objectives. Options currently being considered include converting use of both hangars to another purpose, demolishing both hangars, demolishing one and retaining one, indefinite "mothballing" of the hangars, and transferring facilities and management responsibilities to another agency.

This letter invites your organization to participate in the National Historic Preservation Act's (NHPA) Section 106 consultation process pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2(d). If your organization is interested in participating in this consultation process, a more detailed package of information will be forthcoming based on your response. A building inventory report for each hangar containing both an architectural description and a significance summary is enclosed. The initial Section 106 consultation meeting will be held at Fort Wainwright, building 1555 on Thursday, December 15, 2011 from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m.

As this undertaking is complex with multiple options and timeframes, the USAG FWA will be pursuing a Programmatic Agreement with the consulting parties pursuant to 36 CFR 800.14(b)3. The USAG FWA is also concurrently preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to assess the potential impacts upon the natural and man-made environment associated with the proposed facility disposition options. The Section 106 consultation process will inform the EIS analysis, and through the EIS, an option will be chosen and a management strategy will be developed.

Please send your response to this invitation to consult via mail, fax or email to Ms. Lisa Graham, Directorate of Public Works, Attn: IMPC-FWA-PWE (Graham), 1060 Gaffney Road #4500, Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-4500, fax: (907) 361-9867 or email: lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil.

USAG FWA looks forward to your participation in the NHPA's Section 106 consultation process. If you would like any additional information, please contact Ms. Lisa Graham, USAG FWA, Directorate of Public Works Environmental Division, Cultural Resources Manager at (907) 361-3002 or email at lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Johnson
Colonel, US Army
Commanding

Enclosures

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF:

NOV 15 2011

Office of the Garrison Commander

SUBJECT: Invitation to Consult on the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Ms. Sue Masica
Regional Director
National Park Service
240 West 5th Avenue, Room 114
Anchorage, AK 99501-1365

Dear Ms. Masica:

The US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) invites you to consult on the future disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 which are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark (NHL). The condition of the facilities and the relocation of their maintenance functions warrant a decision on their future disposition that meets safety, funding, facilities management, land use, and cultural resources management objectives. Options currently being considered include converting use of both hangars to another purpose, demolishing both hangars, demolishing one and retaining one, indefinite "mothballing" of the hangars, and transferring facilities and management responsibilities to another agency.

This letter invites your organization to participate in the National Historic Preservation Act's (NHPA) Section 106 consultation process pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2(d). If your organization is interested in participating in this consultation process, a more detailed package of information will be forthcoming based on your response. A building inventory report for each hangar containing both an architectural description and a significance summary is enclosed. The initial Section 106 consultation meeting will be held at Fort Wainwright, building 1555 on Thursday, December 15, 2011 from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m.

As this undertaking is complex with multiple options and timeframes, the USAG FWA will be pursuing a Programmatic Agreement with the consulting parties pursuant to 36 CFR 800.14(b)3. The USAG FWA is also concurrently preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to assess the potential impacts upon the natural and man-made environment associated with the proposed facility disposition options. The Section 106 consultation process will inform the EIS analysis, and through the EIS, an option will be chosen and a management strategy will be developed.

Please send your response to this invitation to consult via mail, fax or email to Ms. Lisa Graham, Directorate of Public Works, Attn: IMPC-FWA-PWE (Graham), 1060 Gaffney Road #4500, Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-4500, fax: (907) 361-9867 or email: lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil.

USAG FWA looks forward to your participation in the NHPA's Section 106 consultation process. If you would like any additional information, please contact Ms. Lisa Graham, USAG FWA, Directorate of Public Works Environmental Division, Cultural Resources Manager at (907) 361-3002 or email at lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Johnson
Colonel, US Army
Commanding

Enclosures

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

Office of the Garrison Commander

NOV 15 2011

SUBJECT: Inv Invitation to Consult on the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Mr. Reid Nelson
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Old Post Office, Building 1100
Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 803
Washington, DC 20004

Dear Mr. Nelson:

The US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) invites you to consult on the future disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 which are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark (NHL). The condition of the facilities and the relocation of their maintenance functions warrant a decision on their future disposition that meets safety, funding, facilities management, land use, and cultural resources management objectives. Options currently being considered include converting use of both hangars to another purpose, demolishing both hangars, demolishing one and retaining one, indefinite "mothballing" of the hangars, and transferring facilities and management responsibilities to another agency.

This letter invites your organization to participate in the National Historic Preservation Act's (NHPA) Section 106 consultation process pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2(d). If your organization is interested in participating in this consultation process, a more detailed package of information will be forthcoming based on your response. A building inventory report for each hangar containing both an architectural description and a significance summary is enclosed. The initial Section 106 consultation meeting will be held at Fort Wainwright, building 1555 on Thursday, December 15, 2011 from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m.

As this undertaking is complex with multiple options and timeframes, the USAG FWA will be pursuing a Programmatic Agreement with the consulting parties pursuant to 36 CFR 800.14(b)3. The USAG FWA is also concurrently preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to assess the potential impacts upon the natural and man-made environment associated with the proposed facility disposition options. The Section 106 consultation process will inform the EIS analysis, and through the EIS, an option will be chosen and a management strategy will be developed.

Please send your response to this invitation to consult via mail, fax or email to Ms. Lisa Graham, Directorate of Public Works, Attn: IMPC-FWA-PWE (Graham), 1060 Gaffney Road #4500, Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-4500, fax: (907) 361-9867 or email: lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil.

USAG FWA looks forward to your participation in the NHPA's Section 106 consultation process. If you would like any additional information, please contact Ms. Lisa Graham, USAG FWA, Directorate of Public Works Environmental Division, Cultural Resources Manager at (907) 361-3002 or email at lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Johnson
Colonel, US Army
Commanding

Enclosures

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

NOV 15 2011

Office of the Garrison Commander

SUBJECT: Invitation to Consult on the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Mr. Norm Lagasse
Alaska Aviation Heritage Museum
4721 Aircraft Drive
Anchroage, AK 99502

Dear Mr. Lagasse:

The US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) invites you to consult on the future disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 which are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark (NHL). The condition of the facilities and the relocation of their maintenance functions warrant a decision on their future disposition that meets safety, funding, facilities management, land use, and cultural resources management objectives. Options currently being considered include converting use of both hangars to another purpose, demolishing both hangars, demolishing one and retaining one, indefinite "mothballing" of the hangars, and transferring facilities and management responsibilities to another agency.

This letter invites your organization to participate in the National Historic Preservation Act's (NHPA) Section 106 consultation process pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2(d). If your organization is interested in participating in this consultation process, a more detailed package of information will be forthcoming based on your response. A building inventory report for each hangar containing both an architectural description and a significance summary is enclosed. The initial Section 106 consultation meeting will be held at Fort Wainwright, building 1555 on Thursday, December 15, 2011 from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m.

As this undertaking is complex with multiple options and timeframes, the USAG FWA will be pursuing a Programmatic Agreement with the consulting parties pursuant to 36 CFR 800.14(b)3. The USAG FWA is also concurrently preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to assess the potential impacts upon the natural and man-made environment associated with the proposed facility disposition options. The Section 106 consultation process will inform the EIS analysis, and through the EIS, an option will be chosen and a management strategy will be developed.

Please send your response to this invitation to consult via mail, fax or email to Ms. Lisa Graham, Directorate of Public Works, Attn: IMPC-FWA-PWE (Graham), 1060 Gaffney Road #4500, Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-4500, fax: (907) 361-9867 or email: lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil.

USAG FWA looks forward to your participation in the NHPA's Section 106 consultation process. If you would like any additional information, please contact Ms. Lisa Graham, USAG FWA, Directorate of Public Works Environmental Division, Cultural Resources Manager at (907) 361-3002 or email at lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Johnson
Colonel, US Army
Commanding

Enclosures

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

Office of the Garrison Commander

NOV 15 2011

SUBJECT: Invitation to Consult on the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Ms. Jessica Verges
Alaska Association for Historic Preservation
345 West 3rd Ave
Anchorage, AK 99501

Dear Ms. Verges:

The US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) invites you to consult on the future disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 which are contributing elements to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark (NHL). The condition of the facilities and the relocation of their maintenance functions warrant a decision on their future disposition that meets safety, funding, facilities management, land use, and cultural resources management objectives. Options currently being considered include converting use of both hangars to another purpose, demolishing both hangars, demolishing one and retaining one, indefinite "mothballing" of the hangars, and transferring facilities and management responsibilities to another agency.

This letter invites your organization to participate in the National Historic Preservation Act's (NHPA) Section 106 consultation process pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2(d). If your organization is interested in participating in this consultation process, a more detailed package of information will be forthcoming based on your response. A building inventory report for each hangar containing both an architectural description and a significance summary is enclosed. The initial Section 106 consultation meeting will be held at Fort Wainwright, building 1555 on Thursday, December 15, 2011 from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m.

As this undertaking is complex with multiple options and timeframes, the USAG FWA will be pursuing a Programmatic Agreement with the consulting parties pursuant to 36 CFR 800.14(b)3. The USAG FWA is also concurrently preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to assess the potential impacts upon the natural and man-made environment associated with the proposed facility disposition options. The Section 106 consultation process will inform the EIS analysis, and through the EIS, an option will be chosen and a management strategy will be developed.

Please send your response to this invitation to consult via mail, fax or email to Ms. Lisa Graham, Directorate of Public Works, Attn: IMPC-FWA-PWE (Graham), 1060 Gaffney Road #4500, Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-4500, fax: (907) 361-9867 or email: lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil.

USAG FWA looks forward to your participation in the NHPA's Section 106 consultation process. If you would like any additional information, please contact Ms. Lisa Graham, USAG FWA, Directorate of Public Works Environmental Division, Cultural Resources Manager at (907) 361-3002 or email at lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Johnson
Colonel, US Army
Commanding

Enclosures

Building Inventory: Fort Wainwright, Alaska

AHRS NUMBER:	**FAI-00485**	**SITE NAME:**	**Building 3008: Hangar 2**
Army Building No.:	**3008**		

General Property Information

Address:	On the south side of the runway towards the runway's eastern end	**City:**	Fort Wainwright
Historic Name:	Hangar 2		
Owner:	US Army Alaska, Fort Wainwright	**Owner Address:**	Fort Wainwright, Alaska
GPS Coordinate:	WGS84	**USGS Quad:**	Fairbanks D2
Section:	18	**Township:**	1S
Range:	1E		
Zoning:	UTM 6N	**Northing:**	7189715.59766
Easting:	469665.531054		

Historic Associations

Resource Type:	Building
Original Owner:	US Army Air Corps, Ladd Field
Builder:	Unknown
Significant Person:	No Known
Significant Event:	World War II; Cold War
Construction Date:	1942
Date Moved:	N/A
Destruction Date:	N/A
Reconstruction Date:	N/A
Historic Function:	Air Facility
Current Function:	Air Facility
Cultural Affiliation:	Euro-American

NRHP STATUS

Original Evaluation Date: 1984

Re-evaluation Date: 2010

NHL District

Contributing

Cold War Historic District

Contributing

NRHP Individually Eligible

No

HABS Documentation

Level: 2

Recordation Date: 1986

Building Inventory: Fort Wainwright, Alaska

AHRS NUMBER:	**FAI-00485**	**SITE NAME:**	**Building 3008: Hangar 2**
Army Building No.:	**3008**		

Architectural Information

Architectural Style: Military Vernacular

Stories: 2

Ancillary Structure:

Plan: Open Floor

Structural System:
Wood Frame

Roof Shape:
Barreled Truss

Other Materials:
Fabric

Exterior Wall Materials:
Metal

Roof Features:
Other

Special Features:
Large Hangar Doors
Portico

Foundation Materials:
Concrete

Roof Materials:
Metal
Corrugated

Setting Description:

Cantonment, southwest corner of airfield. Hangars 2 and 3 (Buildings 3008 and 3005) are a pair of Birchwood hangars placed in close proximity, with Building 3008 on the west and Building 3005 on the east. With their massing, height and appearance, they dominate the setting at this end of the airfield. An aircraft apron and the western end of the airfield are both located to the north of the hangars. Two small warehouses are located to the west (Buildings 3033 and 3031). Beyond Meridian Road is the western Montgomery Road engineering/industrial support area. The hangars are bordered by parking areas on the south. Across Montgomery Road, there are 2 Cold War-era support buildings, and farther to the south, Cold War-era barracks on Neely Road. To the east is a Cold War-era fire station (Building 3004), a 1988 flight simulatorbuilding (Building 3000) and beyond, a blend of small Cold War-era buildings and the recent Stryker complex.

Architectural Description:

Building 3008 is a two-story, wood-frame, Birchwood hangar on a concrete foundation, oriented east/west. The barreled truss roof is finished in polyurethane, and the exterior is clad in corrugated metal. The hanger is square and measures 200 feet long by 200 feet wide, with the hangar bay situated between a pair of two-story administrative areas. The east and west elevation are virtually identical. Both elevations feature two hanger door openings covered by fabric curtain doors, a pair of steel slab personnel doors with vision lights, and a pair of steel slab personnel doors that allow access to the office areas. The roof features two, rectangular roof access elements; a gable-roofed structure with single fixed-sash windows on its east and west elevations, and a shed-roofed structure with a single metal personnel door. The south elevation has a single steel slab personnel door with a gable-roofed portico on the east end of the elevation. Fenestration on the north and south elevations consists of evenly spaced awning- vinyl windows on the first and second stories. On the north elevation is a gable-roofed portico covering a centrally located, steel double personnel door with vision light.

Alterations

Year	*Description*	*Comment*
1949	8x8’ storm entrance installed on south side of hangar.	Exterior
1950	Corrugated aluminum roofing installed.	Exterior
1960	Hangar doors repaired with wheels and weather stripping replaced.	Exterior
1962	2 electrical overhead doors installed.	Exterior
1963	18x14’ overhead door installed.	Exterior
1970	New roof installed.	Exterior
1971	Existing side windows replaced, 8 door panel windows replaced at each end of hangar and remainder covered in cement asbestos board, vapor barrier, insulation and finish to match existing finish.	Exterior
1973	Repair of broken and cracked hangar trusses.	Interior

Building Inventory: Fort Wainwright, Alaska

AHRS NUMBER:	FAI-00485	SITE NAME: Building 3008: Hangar 2
Army Building No.:	3008	

1977	Insulation replaced under roof deck.	Interior
1977	Existing hangar lights replaced.	Interior
1979	Administrative section: Selected partitions removed; finish and insulation removed from exterior walls; second floor ceiling, doors and door frames removed; treads, risers, landings and handrails removed from stairs. Insulation, vapor barrier and finish installed on exterior walls and second floor ceiling. Doors and door frames installed. Rubber tread and riser covering and handrails replaced on stairs.	Exterior
1980	Storm entrance installed.	Exterior
1984	Reinforcement and repair of roof trusses.	Interior
1986	The hangar doors were reduced in size and fitted with fabric curtain doors.	Exterior
1986	The roof was replaced.	Exterior
2001	The windows were replaced.	Exterior
2010	Removed overhangs and exterior stairs.	Exterior

Building Inventory: Fort Wainwright, Alaska

AHRS NUMBER:	**FAI-00485**	**SITE NAME:**	**Building 3008: Hangar 2**
Army Building No.:	**3008**		

Building Evaluation

Criteria Evaluations

Individual NRHP Listing Criteria Evaluation:

Building 3008 does not have any individual associations with significant events or trends in US or Alaska history. It is not associated with significant persons and it does not exemplify a type, period, or method of construction. Therefore, this building is ineligible for individual listing on the NRHP under any criterion.

NHL Criteria Evaluation:

The Ladd Field National Historic Landmark is listed on the NRHP under Criterion A for its role as an aircraft supply and repair depot and as a cargo and passenger flight hub for the Air Transport Command missions of WWII. Ladd Field is significant on the national level for its association with aviation and the changing role of the US in the world community during WWII. Building 3008 is a contributing structure to the Ladd Field National Historic Landmark.

NRHP Cold War Historic District Criteria Evaluation:

Cold War Historic District is eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A for its association with the strategic aerial reconnaissance, air defense, and Arctic research missions of the Cold War. Building 3008 is a contributing element of the Ladd AFB Cold War Historic District due to its association with the air defense mission of the Cold War because of its use by the Fighter Intercept Squadrons.

Description of Integrity:

Building 3008 maintains integrity of location, feeling, association, and setting.

Statement of Significance:

Ladd Field NHL is nationally significant for its association with the themes of Expanding Science and Technology and the Changing Role of the US in the World. Construction began on the military post in 1938. Located near Fairbanks, Ladd Field was the first US Army airfield in Alaska and was a part of the defense build-up for WWII in the territory. The military post is associated with the development of cold weather aviation technology and played a supporting role in the Aleutian Campaign of WWII in the Pacific. Ladd Field was also the Alaskan headquarters for the Alaska-Siberia (ALSIB) Lend-Lease route over which the US sent thousands of military aircraft to the Soviet Union for use in the Eastern Front of the war in Europe. The period of significance begins in 1940 when the airfield became operational and extends to late 1945 when WWII ended. Ladd Field, originally established as an Army Air Corps cold weather testing station, began operations in 1940. From 1942 to 1945, in a unique high priority mission, the airfield was the transfer point for over 7,900 Lend-Lease aircraft bound for the USSR on the ALSIB route. After WWII, the alliance between the US and the USSR rapidly ended. The Cold War standoff took its place, re-shaping the mission and infrastructure of Ladd Field. The Ladd Field National Historic Landmark is listed on the NRHP under Criterion A for its role as an aircraft supply and repair depot and as a cargo and passenger flight hub for the Air Transport Command missions of WWII. Ladd Field is significant on the national level for its association with aviation and the changing role of the US in the world community during WWII. Building 3008 was considered a contributing element of the Ladd Field NHL as a part of the NHL listing.

From 1946 to 1949, during the earliest years of the Cold War, Ladd Air Force Base (Ladd AFB) hosted some of the United States Air Force's (USAF) first long-range strategic aerial reconnaissance units. From 1950 until 1960, Ladd AFB hosted Fighter Interceptor Squadrons as part of the Aircraft Control and Warning System. Throughout this period (1946 to 1960), the USAF constructed over 300 new facilities on the installation to support its Cold War missions and personnel. The majority of these facilities were family housing, barracks, support facilities, and utility infrastructure, which were largely built to replace the many temporary World War II buildings on the installation. Mission related construction included hangars, ammo storage facilities, maintenance shops, communications facilities, and airfield improvements. During the period of significance, 1945 to 1960, Ladd AFB was a vital part of the US Cold War mission. The Ladd AFB Cold War Historic District is eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A for its association with the strategic aerial reconnaissance, air defense, and Arctic research missions of the Cold War. Building 3008 is a contributing element of the Ladd AFB Cold War Historic District due to its association with the air defense mission of the Cold War because of its use by the Fighter Intercept Squadrons.

Building 3008 does not have any individual associations with significant events or trends in US or Alaska history. It is not associated with significant persons and it does not exemplify a type, period, or method of construction. This resource does not appear to be eligible for individual listing in the NRHP under any criterion.

Building Inventory: Fort Wainwright, Alaska

AHRS NUMBER:	**FAI-00485**	**SITE NAME:**	**Building 3008: Hangar 2**
Army Building No.:	**3008**		

PHOTOGRAPHS

Photo Year: 2011 **Description:** Hangar 2 - west elevation

Photo File: BLDG 3008 - W ELEVATION.JPG

Building Inventory: Fort Wainwright, Alaska

AHRS NUMBER:	**FAI-00485**	**SITE NAME:**	**Building 3008: Hangar 2**
Army Building No.:	**3008**		

Photo Year: 2011 **Description:** Hangar 2 - north elevation

Photo File: HANGAR 2 NORTH ELEVATION.JPG

Building Inventory: Fort Wainwright, Alaska

AHRS NUMBER:	**FAI-00485**	**SITE NAME:**	**Building 3008: Hangar 2**
Army Building No.:	**3008**		

Photo Year: 2007 **Description:** Roofline detail

Photo File: 3008 C.jpg

Building Inventory: Fort Wainwright, Alaska

AHRS NUMBER:	**FAI-00485**	**SITE NAME:**	**Building 3008: Hangar 2**
Army Building No.:	**3008**		

Photo Year: 2007 **Description:** Oblique-front façade

Photo File: 3008 B.jpg

Building Inventory: Fort Wainwright, Alaska

AHRS NUMBER:	**FAI-00485**	**SITE NAME:**	**Building 3008: Hangar 2**
Army Building No.:	**3008**		

Photo Year: 2007 **Description:** Roofline detail

Photo File: 3008 A.jpg

Building Inventory: Fort Wainwright, Alaska

AHRS NUMBER:	**FAI-00485**	**SITE NAME:**	**Building 3008: Hangar 2**
Army Building No.:	**3008**		

Photo Year: 2006 **Description:** East elevation

Photo File: 3008 - e elev.jpg

Building Inventory: Fort Wainwright, Alaska

AHRS NUMBER:	**FAI-00482**	**SITE NAME:**	**Building 3005: Hangar 3**
Army Building No.:	**3005**		

General Property Information

Address:	South side of runway, near the intersection of Montgomery and Meridian roads	**City:**	Fort Wainwright
Historic Name:	Hangar 3		
Owner:	US Army Alaska, Fort Wainwright	**Owner Address:**	Fort Wainwright, Alaska
GPS Coordinate:	WGS84	**USGS Quad:**	Fairbanks D2
Section:	18	**Township:**	1S **Range:** 1E
Zoning:	UTM 6N	**Northing:**	7189717.68120 **Easting:** 469850.706491

Historic Associations

Resource Type:	Building
Original Owner:	US Army Air Corps, Ladd Field
Builder:	Unknown
Significant Person:	No Known
Significant Event:	World War II; Cold War
Construction Date:	1942
Date Moved:	N/A
Destruction Date:	N/A
Reconstruction Date:	N/A
Historic Function:	Air Facility
Current Function:	Air Facility
Cultural Affiliation:	Euro-American

NRHP STATUS

Original Evaluation Date: 1984

Re-evaluation Date: 2010

NHL District

Contributing

Cold War Historic District

Contributing

NRHP Individually Eligible

No

HABS Documentation

Level: 2

Recordation Date: 1986

Building Inventory: Fort Wainwright, Alaska

AHRS NUMBER:	**FAI-00482**	**SITE NAME:**	**Building 3005: Hangar 3**
Army Building No.:	**3005**		

Architectural Information

Architectural Style: Military Vernacular

Stories: 2

Ancillary Structure:

Plan: Open Floor

Structural System:
Wood Frame

Roof Shape:
Barreled Truss

Other Materials:
Fabric

Exterior Wall Materials:
Metal

Roof Features:
Other

Special Features:
Large Hangar Doors
Portico

Foundation Materials:
Concrete

Roof Materials:
Metal
Corrugated

Setting Description:

Cantonment, southwest corner of airfield. Hangars 2 and 3 (Buildings 3008 and 3005) are a pair of Birchwood hangars placed in close proximity, with Building 3008 on the west and Building 3005 on the east. With their massing, height and appearance, they dominate the setting at this end of the airfield. An aircraft apron and the western end of the airfield are both north of the hangars. Two small warehouses are located to the west (Buildings 3033 and 3031). Beyond Meridian Road is the western Montgomery Road engineering/industrial support area. The hangars are bordered by parking areas on the south. Across Montgomery Road, there are two Cold War-era support buildings and farther to the south, Cold War-era barracks on Neely Road. To the east is a Cold War-era fire station (Building 3004), a 1988 flight simulator building (Building 3000) and beyond, a blend of small Cold War-era buildings and the recent Stryker complex.

Architectural Description:

Building 3005 is a two-story, wood-frame, Birchwood hangar on a concrete foundation, oriented east/west. The barreled truss roof is finished in polyurethane, and the exterior is clad in corrugated metal. The hanger is square and measures 200 feet long by 200 feet wide, with the hangar bay situated between a pair of two-story administrative areas. The east and west elevation are virtually identical. Both elevations feature: two hanger door openings covered by fabric curtain doors, a pair of steel slab personnel doors with vision lights, and a pair of steel slab personnel doors allow access to the office area on the north and south ends of both elevations. The roof features two, rectangular roof access elements; a gable-roofed structure with single fixed-sash windows on its east and west elevations and a shed-roofed structure with a single metal personnel door. The south elevation has two steel slab personnel doors with gable-roofed porticos on the east end of the elevation. Fenestration on the north and south elevations consists of evenly spaced awning vinyl windows on the first and second stories. On the north elevation is a gable-roofed portico covering a centrally located, steel double personnel door with a vision light.

Alterations

Year	*Description*	*Comment*
1960	Hangar doors repaired with new hardware, wheels and weather stripping.	Exterior
1962	New overhead pilot doors installed.	Exterior
1970	New roof installed.	Exterior
1971	Existing side windows replaced, 8 door panel windows replaced at each end of hangar and remainder covered in cement asbestos board, vapor barrier, insulation and finish to match existing finish.	Exterior
1973	Repair of broken and cracked hangar trusses.	Interior
1974	Existing siding removed (and reused in Bldg 2085) and new siding (synthetic rosin coated) installed. Existing sills and mullions replaced with metal components. All painted exterior surfaces repainted.	Exterior

Building Inventory: Fort Wainwright, Alaska

AHRS NUMBER:	FAI-00482	SITE NAME: Building 3005: Hangar 3
Army Building No.:	3005	

1979	Administrative portion: Selected partitions removed; finish and insulation removed from exterior walls; and second floor and ceiling, doors and door frames removed; treads, risers, landings and handrails removed from stairs. Insulation, vapor barrier and finish installed on exterior walls and second floor ceiling. Doors and door frames installed. Rubber tread and riser covering and handrails replaced on stairs. Hangar portion: four pilot doors with frames were installed.	Exterior
1979	Deluge system installed.	Interior
1980	Storm entrance installed.	
1984	Reinforcement and repair of roof trusses.	Interior
1986	The building received a new roof.	Exterior
1989	The hangar doors were reduced in size and fitted with fabric curtain doors.	Exterior
1989	Security screens installed on 11 windows of south side of building, ground level.	Exterior
1993	Heating unit replaced by two separate units.	
2001	The windows were replaced.	Exterior
2010	Overhangs removed and exterior stairwells replaced	Exterior

Building Inventory: Fort Wainwright, Alaska

AHRS NUMBER:	**FAI-00482**	**SITE NAME:**	**Building 3005: Hangar 3**
Army Building No.:	**3005**		

Building Evaluation

Criteria Evaluations

Individual NRHP Listing Criteria Evaluation:

Building 3005 does not have any individual associations with significant events or trends in US or Alaska history. It is not associated with significant persons and it does not exemplify a type, period, or method of construction. Therefore, this building is ineligible for individual listing on the NRHP under any criterion.

NHL Criteria Evaluation:

The Ladd Field National Historic Landmark is listed on the NRHP under Criterion A for its role as an aircraft supply and repair depot and as a cargo and passenger flight hub for the Air Transport Command missions of WWII. Ladd Field is significant on the national level for its association with aviation and the changing role of the US in the world community during WWII. Building 3005 is a contributing structure in the Ladd Field National Historic Landmark.

NRHP Cold War Historic District Criteria Evaluation:

Cold War Historic District is eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A for its association with the strategic aerial reconnaissance, air defense, and Arctic research missions of the Cold War. Building 3005 is a contributing element of the Ladd AFB Cold War Historic District due to its association with the air defense mission of the Cold War because of its use by the Fighter Intercept Squadrons.

Description of Integrity:

Building 3005 maintains integrity of location, feeling, association, and setting.

Statement of Significance:

Ladd Field NHL is nationally significant for its association with the themes of Expanding Science and Technology and the Changing Role of the US in the World. Construction began on the military post in 1938. Located near Fairbanks, Ladd Field was the first US Army airfield in Alaska and was a part of the defense build-up for WWII in the territory. The military post is associated with the development of cold weather aviation technology and played a supporting role in the Aleutian Campaign of WWII in the Pacific. Ladd Field was also the Alaskan headquarters for the Alaska-Siberia (ALSIB) Lend-Lease route over which the US sent thousands of military aircraft to the Soviet Union for use in the Eastern Front of the war in Europe. The period of significance begins in 1940 when the airfield became operational and extends to late 1945 when WWII ended. Ladd Field, originally established as an Army Air Corps cold weather testing station, began operations in 1940. From 1942 to 1945, in a unique high priority mission, the airfield was the transfer point for over 7,900 Lend-Lease aircraft bound for the USSR on the ALSIB route. After WWII, the alliance between the US and the USSR rapidly ended. The Cold War standoff took its place, re-shaping the mission and infrastructure of Ladd Field. The Ladd Field National Historic Landmark is listed on the NRHP under Criterion A for its role as an aircraft supply and repair depot and as a cargo and passenger flight hub for the Air Transport Command missions of WWII. Ladd Field is significant on the national level for its association with aviation and the changing role of the US in the world community during WWII. Building 3005 was considered a contributing element of the Ladd Field NHL as a part of the NHL listing.

From 1946 to 1949, during the earliest years of the Cold War, Ladd Air Force Base (Ladd AFB) hosted some of the United States Air Force's (USAF) first long-range strategic aerial reconnaissance units. From 1950 to 1960 Ladd AFB hosted Fighter Interceptor Squadrons as part of the Aircraft Control and Warning System. Throughout this period (1946 to 1960), the USAF constructed over 300 new facilities on the installation to support its Cold War missions and personnel. The majority of these facilities were family housing, barracks, support facilities, and utility infrastructure, which were largely built to replace the many temporary World War II buildings on the installation. Mission related construction included hangars, ammo storage facilities, maintenance shops, communications facilities, and airfield improvements. During the period of significance, 1945 to 1960, Ladd AFB was a vital part of the US Cold War mission. The Ladd AFB Cold War Historic District is eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A for its association with the strategic aerial reconnaissance, air defense, and Arctic research missions of the Cold War. Building 3005 is a contributing element of the Ladd AFB Cold War Historic District due to its association with the (air defense mission of the Cold War because of its use by the Fighter Intercept Squadrons.

Building 3005 does not have any individual associations with significant events or trends in US or Alaska history. It is not associated with significant persons and it does not exemplify a type, period, or method of construction. This resource does not appear to be eligible for individual listing in the NRHP under any criterion.

Building Inventory: Fort Wainwright, Alaska

AHRS NUMBER:	**FAI-00482**	**SITE NAME:**	**Building 3005: Hangar 3**
Army Building No.:	**3005**		

PHOTOGRAPHS

Photo Year: 2011 **Description:** Northwest oblique

Photo File: HANGAR 3 NW OBLIQUE.JPG

Building Inventory: Fort Wainwright, Alaska

AHRS NUMBER:	**FAI-00482**	**SITE NAME:**	**Building 3005: Hangar 3**
Army Building No.:	**3005**		

Photo Year: 2010 **Description:** Northeast oblique

Photo File: 3005 - ne obliq.jpg

Building Inventory: Fort Wainwright, Alaska

AHRS NUMBER:	**FAI-00482**	**SITE NAME:**	**Building 3005: Hangar 3**
Army Building No.:	**3005**		

Photo Year: 2006 **Description:** North elevation-façade detail

Photo File: 3005 - n elev - facade detail.jpg

Building Inventory: Fort Wainwright, Alaska

AHRS NUMBER:	**FAI-00482**	**SITE NAME:**	**Building 3005: Hangar 3**
Army Building No.:	**3005**		

Photo Year: 2007 **Description:** Front elevation

Photo File: 3005 B.jpg

Building Inventory: Fort Wainwright, Alaska

AHRS NUMBER:	**FAI-00482**	**SITE NAME:**	**Building 3005: Hangar 3**
Army Building No.:	**3005**		

Photo Year: 2007 **Description:** Doorway detail

Photo File: 3005 C.jpg

STATE OF ALASKA

SEAN PARNELL, GOVERNOR

550 WEST 7TH AVENUE, SUITE 1310
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501-3565
PHONE: (907) 269-8721
FAX: (907) 269-8908

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

DIVISION OF PARKS & OUTDOOR RECREATION
OFFICE OF HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY

October 31, 2011

File No.: 3130-1R Army Ft. Wainwright

SUBJECT: Undertaking affecting Hangers 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright

Michael T. Meeks
Director, Directorate of Public Works
Department of the Army
Installation Management Command
Headquarters, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
1060 Gaffney Road #6000
Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-6000

Dear Mr. Meeks,

The Alaska State Historic Preservation Office received your initiation letter on October 6, 2011 regarding the potential undertakings affecting Hangers 2 and 3. We look forward to the upcoming consultation with you and other interested parties in December. Through this early consultation the Army will be able to determine the appropriate strategy to ensure Section 106 compliance for this undertaking as well as best possible outcome for the hangers.

Please contact Summer Rickman at 269-8717 or summer.rickman@alaska.gov if you have any questions or if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Judith E. Bittner
State Historic Preservation Officer

JEB:slr

Printed on Recycled Paper

From:	Graham, Lisa M USA CIV (US)
To:	"Ted_Birkedal@nps.gov"
Subject:	FW: Invitation to the Agency Scoping Meeting on Hangars 2 and 3, Ladd Field National Historic Landmark and Invitation to Consult on the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Ladd Field National Historic Landmark (UNCLASSIFIED)
Date:	Monday, November 28, 2011 3:11:00 PM

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Hi Ted,

Thank you for your response and we look forward to working with you all, in particular working with Grant at our agency NEPA and Section 106 meetings on Dec 15th.

Note - I did not receive your original response, Carrie forwarded it to me. It looks like the email that you have for me is incorrect; there is no underscore at the beginning of the email address. That being said, we are having some trouble with our overall system, so if I do not respond to email, please give me a call or try again. I apologize for any inconvenience.

V/r,

Lisa Graham
Cultural Resources Manager
Fort Wainwright AK
907.361.3002
****PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS: lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil

-----Original Message-----
From: Ted_Birkedal@nps.gov [mailto:Ted_Birkedal@nps.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 23, 2011 5:14 PM
To: McEnteer, Carrie L USA CIV (US); "Graham, Lisa M USA CIV (US)" _lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil
Cc: Sue_Masica@nps.gov; Debora_Cooper@nps.gov; Grant_Crosby@nps.gov; Darrell_Lewis@nps.gov; Janet_Clemens@nps.gov
Subject: Invitation to the Agency Scoping Meeting on Hangars 2 and 3, Ladd Field National Historic Landmark and Invitation to Consult on the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Ladd Field National Historic Landmark

Carrie and Lisa:

We are in receipt of Colonel Ronald M. Johnson's letter of November 15, 2011 which invites the National Park Service to the "Agency Scoping Meeting, Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, US Army Garrison Fort Wainright, Alaska" as well as the letter from the Colonel dated November 16, 2011 which invites the National Park Service to enter into the broader Section 106 consultation process on the disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 at Fort Wainwright. As per the instructions in the letters, we are contacting you by email to confirm the National Park Service's interest in both attending the scoping meeting and participating in the consultations over the disposition of the two historic hangars.

We will be sending Historical Architect Grant Crosby as our official representative to the scoping meeting on December 15, 2011. My entire National Historic Landmark staff will be participating in the broader Section 106 consultation process on the disposition of the hangars.

We thank you for the invitations to the National Park Service to provide

its views on the preservation of Hangars 2 and 3.

Ted Birkedal
Team Manager
Cultural Resources Team
Alaska Regional Office
National Park Service
240 West 5th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
Phone: (907) 644-3456
Email: ted_birkedal@nps.gov

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Milford Wayne Donaldson, FAIA
Chairman

Clement A. Price Ph.D.
Vice Chairman

John M. Fowler
Executive Director

Preserving America's Heritage

December 1, 2011

Honorable John McHugh
Secretary of the Army
1400 Defense Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301-1400

Ref: ***Disposition of Hangers 2 and 3 (Buildings 3008 and 3005)***
Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark
Fort Wainwright, Fairbanks North Star, Alaska

Dear Secretary McHugh:

In response to a notification by United States Army Garrison, Fort Wainwright, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) will participate in consultation to develop an agreement document for the proposed disposition of Hangers 2 and 3, contributing resources to the Ladd Field World War II National Historic Landmark. Our decision to participate in this consultation is based on the *Criteria for Council Involvement in Reviewing Individual Section 106 Cases*, contained within our regulations. The criteria are met for this proposed undertaking because it has substantial impacts on important historic properties and has the potential for presenting procedural problems.

Section 800.6(a)(1)(iii) of our regulations requires that we notify you, as the head of the agency, of our decision to participate in consultation. By copy of this letter, we are also notifying COL Ronald M. Johnson, Garrison Commander, United States Army Garrison, Fort Wainwright, of this decision.

Our participation in this consultation will be handled by Ms. Katharine R. Kerr who can be reached at (202) 606-8534 or via e-mail at kkerr@achp.gov. We look forward to working with your agency and other consulting parties to consider alternatives to this undertaking that could avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential adverse effects on historic properties and to reach an agreement document.

Sincerely,

John M. Fowler
Executive Director

111253847

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

1100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 803 • Washington, DC 20004
Phone: 202-606-8503 • Fax: 202-606-8647 • achp@achp.gov • www.achp.gov

From: Graham, Lisa M USA CIV (US)
To: "Brian Turner"
Subject: RE: Hangars2&3 - Invitation to Consult (UNCLASSIFIED)
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2011 2:04:00 PM

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Great, thanks for the response.

Lisa Graham
Cultural Resources Manager
Fort Wainwright AK
907.361.3002
****PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS: lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil

-----Original Message-----
From: Brian Turner [mailto:Brian_Turner@nthp.org]
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2011 2:01 PM
To: Graham, Lisa M USA CIV (US)
Subject: RE: Hangars2&3 - Invitation to Consult (UNCLASSIFIED)

Thanks, Lisa. Great to hear from you. I'll let you know whether we will be engaging in this one.

Brian

Brian R. Turner| Regional Attorney, Western Office National Trust for Historic Preservation | 5 Third Street, Suite 707, San Francisco, CA 94103 | Phone: 415.947.0692 ext. 38225 | Email: brian_turner@nthp.org | www.PreservationNation.org

The National Trust for Historic Preservation helps people protect, enhance, and enjoy the places that matter to them. Become our newest member today! Learn more at www.PreservationNation.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Graham, Lisa M USA CIV (US) [mailto:lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 10:47 AM
To: Brian Turner
Subject: FW: Hangars2&3 - Invitation to Consult (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Hi Brian,

Attached is a copy of the letter sent out yesterday to the National Trust. Please let me know if you have any questions.

I hope you're doing well!

Lisa Graham
Cultural Resources Manager

Fort Wainwright AK
907.361.3002

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

MAR 27 2012

Directorate of Public Works

SUBJECT: Determination of Effect - Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright

Judith E. Bittner
State Historic Preservation Officer
Office of History and Archaeology
550 West Seventh Ave., Suite 1310
Anchorage, Alaska 99501-1365

Dear Ms. Bittner:

The US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright (USAG FWA) requests your concurrence with the determination of **Historic Properties Adversely Affected** for the future disposition plans of Hangars 2 and 3. The hangars are contributing elements to the Ladd Field National Historic Landmark (NHL). The condition of the facilities and the relocation of their maintenance functions warrant a decision on their future disposition that meets safety, funding, facilities management, land use, and cultural resources management objectives. Options currently being considered include converting use of both hangars to another purpose, demolishing both hangars, demolishing one and retaining one, no action, and transferring facilities and management responsibilities to another agency.

A number of documents have been supplied to your office and other consulting parties to give background information and context for this current undertaking. The documentation includes:

- Citizens Guide to Section 106 (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation);
- Booklet of Interior and Exterior Photographs of Hangars 2 and 3
- Ladd Field World War II Historic Context Report
- 1984 NHL Nomination of Ladd Field
- Condition Assessment and Rehabilitation Plan
- Building Survey for Hangar 2
- Building Survey for Hangar 3
- Draft Reuse Study
- Official Fire Report
- Hangar 2 Structural Assessment Report
- Hangar 3 Structural Assessment Report
- Hangar 2 After Fire Structural Inspection Report
- Hangar 2 Inspection Report (Design Alaska)
- Letter Requesting Consultation

Also, in previous correspondence and/or during the December 15, 2011 meeting, USAG FWA has:

- Determined that the proposed Army action is an undertaking as defined in 36 CFR Part 800.16 (y) and that it has the potential to cause effects on historic properties
- Notified the appropriate State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and consulted with the SHPO on plans to involve the public and establish the process by which USAG FWA plans to identify additional consulting parties
- Invited local governments, tribes, interested parties, and the public to consult
- Held public meetings and met with interested consulting parties (SHPO, National Park Service, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Tanana Yukon Historical Society, Fairbanks North Star Borough Historic Preservation Commission and Bureau of Land Management)
- Notified the consulting parties that USAG FWA will be pursuing a Programmatic Agreement pursuant to 36 CFR 800.14(b)3
- Defined the Area of Potential Effect (Hangar 2 and 3, surrounding viewshed, and the NHL and historic district)
- Indentified and evaluated the historic significance of the affected historic properties (Hangars 2 and 3, NHL, and the historic district)

The results of the identification process and evaluation of the potential effects is that USAG FWA finds that future disposition plans of Hangars 2 and 3 will **Adversely Affect Historic Properties**. All options for the future disposition could adversely affect the hangars and, in so doing, the whole NHL and historic district. The most severe potential adverse affects are associated with demolition of the facilities and the no-action option. The no-action option would effectively lead to demolition being no rehabilitation of the facilities would take place. Demolition of the facilities would not only destroy the individual properties but would also affect the NHL, possibly causing the boundary of the district to be reduced as these facilities are the only contributing elements of the NHL south of the airfield.

Copies of this letter will be sent to the National Park Service, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Tanana Yukon Historical Society, Fairbanks North Star Borough Historic Preservation Commission and Bureau of Land Management.

USAG FWA requests your concurrence with this finding and looks forward to developing a Programmatic Agreement with your office and other consulting parties. Thank you for your participation thus far in this consultation process. If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Lisa Graham, USAG FWA Cultural Resources Manager, at (907) 361-3002 or lisa.m.graham52.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Michael T. Meeks
Director, Directorate of Public Works

STATE OF ALASKA

SEAN PARNELL, GOVERNOR

550 WEST 7TH AVENUE, SUITE 1310
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501-3565
PHONE: (907) 269-8721
FAX: (907) 269-8908

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

DIVISION OF PARKS & OUTDOOR RECREATION
OFFICE OF HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY

April 16, 2012

JUN 1 1 2012

File No.: 3130-1R Army Ft. Wainwright

SUBJECT: Determination of Effect – Disposition of Hangers 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright

Michael T. Meeks
Director, Directorate of Public Works
Department of the Army
Installation Management Command
Headquarters, U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright
1060 Gaffney Road # 6000
Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-6000

Dear Mr. Meeks,

The Alaska State Historic Preservation Office received your determination of effect letter on April 3, 2012 regarding the potential undertakings affecting Hangers 2 and 3. We concur with your determination of **Historic Properties Adversely Affected** for the future disposition plans of Hanger 2 and 3. The hangers are contributing elements to the Ladd Field National Historic Landmark (NHL). Our office looks forward to continued consultation with you and other interested parties and the development of a Programmatic Agreement to address the multiple disposition options for the hangers and potential mitigation options for the adverse affect.

Please contact Summer Rickman at 269-8717 or summer.rickman@alaska.gov if you have any questions or if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Judith E. Bittner
State Historic Preservation Officer

JEB:slr

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX E: Draft EIS Comments

[Note: Comments received on the Draft EIS will be included in this Appendix for the Final EIS]

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX F: Economic Impact Forecast System Analysis

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX F: ECONONIC IMPACT FORECAST MODEL

1.0 Socioeconomic Impact Assessment

Socioeconomic impacts are linked through cause-and-effect relationships. Military payrolls and local procurement contribute to the economic base for the region of influence (ROI). In this regard, the proposed demolition of Hangars 2 and 3 under Alternative 1would have a multiplier effect on the local and regional economy. With Alternative 1, direct jobs would be created, generating new income and increasing personal spending. This spending generally creates secondary jobs, increases business volume, and increases revenues for schools and other social services.

Under Alternative 2, the No Action Alternative, no planned demolition, construction, or renovation would occur. Given that no large-scale rehabilitation efforts would be undertaken for the hangars and as systems fail they would not be repaired or replaced, their structural integrity would continue to deteriorate, most likely resulting in structural failure (an uncontrolled collapse) or total loss of one or both hangars by fire. When this occurs, the No Action Alternative also would have the same multiplier effect on the local and regional economy from debris removal activities as Alternative 1. Therefore, impacts under the No Action Alternative are not analyzed separately from Alternative 1.

2.0 Economic Impact Forecast System

The Army, with the assistance of many academic and professional economists and regional scientists, developed the Economic Impact Forecast System (EIFS) to address the economic impacts of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)-requiring actions and to measure their significance. As a result of its designed applicability, and in the interest of uniformity, EIFS should be used in NEPA assessments for the proposed action. The entire system is designed for the scrutiny of a populace affected by the actions being studied. The algorithms in the EIFS model are simple and easy to understand, but still have firm, defensible bases in regional economic theory.

EIFS was developed under a joint project of the U.S Army Corps of Engineers (USACE); the Army Environmental Policy Institute; and the Computer and Information Science Department of Clark Atlanta University, Georgia. EIFS is an on-line system, and the EIFS Web application is hosted by USACE, Mobile District. The system is available to anyone with an approved user-id and password. University staff and the staff of USACE, Mobile District, are available to assist with the use of EIFS.

The databases in EIFS are national in scope and cover the approximately 3,700 counties, parishes, and independent cities that are recognized as reporting units by federal agencies. EIFS allows the user to define an economic ROI by identifying the counties, parishes, or cities to be analyzed. Once the ROI is defined, the system aggregates the data, calculates multipliers and other variables used in the various models in EIFS, and prompts the user for forecast input data.

3.0 Economic Impact Forecast System Model

The basis of the EIFS analytical capabilities is the calculation of multipliers that are used to estimate the impacts resulting from military-related changes in local expenditures or employment. In calculating the multipliers, EIFS uses the economic base model approach, which relies on the ratio of total economic activity to basic economic activity. Basic, in this context, is defined as the production or employment engaged to supply goods and services outside the ROI or by federal activities (such as military installations and their employees). According to economic base theory, the ratio of total income to basic income is measurable (as the multiplier) and sufficiently stable so that future changes in economic activity can be forecast. This technique is especially appropriate for estimating aggregate impacts and makes the economic base model ideal for the environmental assessment and environmental impact statement (EIS) process.

The multiplier is interpreted as the total impact on the economy of the region resulting from a unit change in its base sector; for example, a dollar increase in local expenditures due to an expansion of its military installation. EIFS estimates its multipliers using a location quotient approach based on the concentration of industries within the region relative to the industrial concentrations for the nation.

The user inputs into the model the data elements that describe the Army action: the change in expenditures, or dollar volume of the construction project(s); change in civilian or military employment; average annual income of affected civilian or military employees; the percent of civilians expected to relocate due to the Army's action; and the percent of military living on-post. Once these are entered into the EIFS model, a projection of changes in the local economy is provided. These are projected changes in sales volume, income, employment, and population. These four indicator variables are used to measure and evaluate socioeconomic impacts. Sales volume is the direct and indirect change in local business activity and sales (total retail and wholesale trade sales, total selected service receipts, and value-added by manufacturing). Employment is the total change in local employment due to the proposed action, including not only the direct and secondary changes in local employment, but also those personnel who are initially affected by the military action. Income is the total change in local wages and salaries due to the proposed action, which includes the sum of the direct and indirect wages

and salaries, plus the income of the civilian and military personnel affected by the proposed action. Population is the increase or decrease in the local population as a result of the proposed action.

4.0 The Significance of Socioeconomic Impacts

Once model projections are obtained, the rational threshold value (RTV) profile allows the user to evaluate the significance of the impacts. This analytical tool reviews the historical trends for the defined region and develops measures of local historical fluctuations in sales volume, income, employment, and population. These evaluations identify the positive and negative changes within which a project can affect the local economy without creating a significant impact. The greatest historical changes define the boundaries that provide a basis for comparing an action's impact on the historical fluctuation in a particular area. Specifically, EIFS sets the boundaries by multiplying the maximum historical deviation of the following variables: the sales volume, income, employment, and population (Table 4-1).

Table 4-1: Historical Deviation Variables

		Increase	Decrease
Sales volume	X	100%	75%
Income	X	100%	67%
Employment	X	100%	67%
Population	X	100%	50%

Source: USACE (2013)

These boundaries determine the amount of change that will affect an area. The percentage allowances are arbitrary, but sensible. The maximum positive historical fluctuation is allowed with expansion because economic growth is beneficial. While cases of damaging economic growth have been cited, and although the zero-growth concept is being accepted by many local planning groups, military base reductions and closures generally are more injurious to local economics than are expansion actions.

The major strengths of the RTV are its specificity to the region under analysis and its basis on actual historical data for the region. The EIFS impact model, in combination with the RTV, has proven successful in addressing perceived socioeconomic impacts. The EIFS model and the RTV technique for measuring the intensity of impacts have been reviewed by economic experts and have been deemed theoretically sound.

The following are the EIFS inputs and output data and the RTVs for the ROI.

4.1 Summary of Assumptions

For this analysis, it was assumed that no civilian personnel would permanently relocate to the ROI as a result of the Proposed Action. Therefore, only demolition costs were used to determine the impact of the Proposed Action on the ROI and only demolition cost, not civilian or military employment, estimates were inserted into Table 4-2 below. The total project cost for the demolition of Hangars 2 and 3 is estimated to be $6,376,300 (USACE, 2012).

Demolition spending associated with Alternative 1 would generate sales of approximately $6,822,640 in 2014, which represents a less than one percent deviation of sales volume change over time in the ROI. Direct and induced income is estimated to be $1,302,319, which represents a negligible deviation from the average rate of income change over time in the ROI. Based on demolition spending, during the six-month period this project would be underway, approximately 32 persons would be directly employed and would support an additional 36 jobs indirectly through demolition-related spending for a total of 68 jobs, which represents a negligible deviation from the average rate of employment change over time in the ROI. This is because employment numbers output by the model are full-time equivalent (FTE) numbers and, as this project is only expected to take 6 months, the employment numbers shown in this paragraph are twice those shown below. None of the forecasted sales, income, or employment estimates has a deviation from the average rate of change greater than their respective historic extreme deviations; therefore, the anticipated economic changes in these indicators are expected to have less than a significant effect on the ROI's economy (USACE, 2013).

4.2 Alternative 1: Demolition of Hangars 2 and 3

Table 4-2 shows inputs to the model. Table 4-3 shows the impact from Alternative 1 spending as result of sales, income, and employment generated for the economy and the percent annual fluctuation it represents. Table 4-4 shows the annual fluctuations in RTV for the ROI above or below which the action would be considered significant.

Table 4-2: Forecast Input for the EIFS Model

EIFS Report Fairbanks North Star Borough, Alaska – Forecast Input	
Change in local expenditures	$6,376,300
Change in civilian employment	0
Average income of affected civilian	$0
Percent expected to relocate	0
Change in military employment	0
Average income of affected military	$0
Percent of military living on-base	0

Source: USACE (2013)

Table 4-3 shows the EIFS model outputs that would result from demolition-related spending if Hangars 2 and 3 are demolished.

Table 4-3: EIFS Report for Fairbanks North Star Borough, Alaska – Forecast Output

Forecast Output		
Employment multiplier	2.07	
Income multiplier	2.07	
Sales volume – direct	$3,295,962	
Sales volume – induced	$3,526,679	
Sales volume – total	$6,822,640	0.31%
Income – direct	$629,139	
Income – induced	$673,179	
Income – total (place of work)	$1,302,319	0.06%
Employment – direct	16	
Employment – induced	18	
Employment – total	34	0.07%

Source: USACE (2013)
Note: Employment numbers output by the model are full-time equivalent numbers and, as this project is only expected to take 6 months, the employment numbers for the Proposed Action are double those shown by the model output.

Table 4-4 shows the annual fluctuations in RTV for the ROI above or below which the proposed action would have a significant socioeconomic impact.

Table 4-4: EIFS Report for Fairbanks North Star Borough, Alaska – RTV Summary

RTV Summary				
	Sales Volume	**Income**	**Employment**	**Population**
Positive RTV	40.50%	40.42%	23.35%	7.01%
Negative RTV	-19.03%	-15.15%	-6.65%	-1.68%

Source: USACE (2013)

5.0 References

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2012. FTW373D FY 14 Demo Bldg 3005 & 3008 Final CWE. Prepared by Binh Nguyen, US Army Corps of Engineers. Prepared on 11/26/2012 for Fort Wainwright.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2013. Mobile District. Economic Impact Forecast System (EIFS). Project Name: "Wainwright - Alt 1". Model run by Chris Dixon. Retrieved on 2/6/2013. Retrieved from: http://ww3.sam.usace.army.mil/eifs/.

APPENDIX G: Air Quality General Conformity Applicability Analysis

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX G: AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS

1.0 Introduction

This air quality applicability analysis was conducted to identify potential increases or decreases in criteria air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed demolition of Hangars 2 and 3 at Fort Wainwright, Fairbanks, Alaska. The project site is designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) as in nonattainment for particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to nominal 2.5 micrometers ($PM_{2.5}$) and maintenance for carbon monoxide (CO) and is subject to the federal conformity requirements. The purpose of the analysis is to apply the Federal General Conformity Rule established in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §93, *Determining Conformity of Federal Actions to State or Federal Implementation Plans*, to the Proposed Action to determine any effect on air quality.

The federal conformity rules were established to ensure that federal activities do not hamper local efforts to control air pollution. In particular, Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act (CAA) prohibits federal agencies, departments, or instrumentalities from engaging in, supporting, licensing, or approving any action, in an area that is in nonattainment or maintenance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), which does not conform to an approved state or federal implementation plan.

2.0 Project Description

Under Alternative 1, the United States (U.S.) Department of the Army (Army) would demolish two 52,000-square-foot hangars and supporting infrastructure beginning in the spring of 2014. Demolition would involve removal of the hangars, totaling 24,016 cubic yards of non-hazardous debris; demolition of existing and abandoned utilities not belonging to Doyon Utilities (the current utility provider for the installation), totaling approximately 2,680 linear feet; demolition of existing privately owned vehicle parking areas, lighting, head bolt outlets and power source, encompassing an area of approximately 3.3 acres; and demolition of the concrete building slabs and foundations within 5 feet of the building, to a depth of eight inches, totaling approximately 2,075 cubic yards of debris. In addition, a small (200-square-foot), open, flammable liquids storage facility located between Hangars 2 and 3, which is currently empty, would be demolished, totaling approximately 91 cubic yards of debris.

Prior to demolition, the Army would conduct hazardous material surveys of the buildings and their supporting infrastructure, including surveys for soil contamination. The Army would properly remove and dispose of any hazardous materials found. Any asbestos containing building materials would be

disposed of in the Fort Wainwright landfill, while all other hazardous materials would be disposed of properly in accordance with applicable federal and state regulations off-post in the Fairbanks North Star Borough (FNSB) landfill. Non-hazardous demolition debris would be disposed of in the FNSB landfill; however, the Army would divert (i.e., salvage, recycle, or reuse) non-hazardous materials from being placed in the landfill to the maximum extent practicable. Once demolition of the hangars is complete, approximately 13,625 square yards of concrete would be added to the building and infrastructure footprints to maintain consistency with the adjacent airfield, which is designated as an aircraft parking apron. The Army would construct two asphalt access roads to the new apron to facilitate potential future access by emergency and maintenance vehicles. Infiltration areas, swales, and culverts for stormwater would be installed as needed, to include the addition of topsoil and seeding. Security fencing, compatible with existing design, would also be installed. The total area encompassed by this project is approximately 10 acres.

Under Alternative 2, the No Action Alternative, no demolition of Hangars 2 and 3 would occur. Because there would be no large-scale rehabilitation efforts and the likelihood that future system failure would not result in replacement or repair, the structural integrity of the hangars would continue to deteriorate over time. The eventual uncontrolled collapse of the buildings or perhaps the total loss of one or both hangars by fire is most likely. At such time the buildings do collapse, all debris would be treated as waste and disposed of in the FNSB landfill. Any follow-on actions associated with the location would be subject to funding, but the current preference would be that concrete is added to the building footprints to maintain consistency with the adjacent airfield as an aircraft parking apron. When collapse of the buildings occurs, there would be temporary emissions similar to those described under Alternative 1 within this conformity applicability analysis. Therefore, demolition and construction impacts under the No Action Alternative are not analyzed separately from Alternative 1.

3.0 Meteorology/Climate

Temperature is a parameter used in calculating emissions for air quality applicability. The climate in Fairbanks, Alaska, ranges from 72 degrees Fahrenheit in July to an average of –20 degrees Fahrenheit in January. Fairbanks receives an average of 11.3 inches of precipitation annually. April is the driest month (The Weather Channel, 2012). During the winter months, low temperatures and calm winds combined with high emissions in Fairbanks create surface based inversions. Surface-based inversions result in poor dispersion of air pollutants, namely $PM_{2.5}$ and create unhealthy air quality conditions.

4.0 Current Ambient Air Quality Conditions

The USEPA has classified the area of the Proposed Action, FNSB, Alaska, as in nonattainment for $PM_{2.5}$. Only a portion of the FNSB is classified as nonattainment; however, the nonattainment portion includes Fort Wainwright. The region is also in maintenance for CO.

5.0 Air Quality Regulatory Requirements

5.1 General Conformity Applicability Analysis

The USEPA defines ambient air in 40 CFR §50 as "that portion of the atmosphere, external to buildings, to which the general public has access." In compliance with the 1970 CAA and the 1977 and 1990 CAA Amendments, the USEPA has promulgated the NAAQS. The NAAQS were enacted for the protection of the public health and welfare, allowing for an adequate margin of safety. To date, the USEPA has issued NAAQS for six criteria pollutants: CO, sulfur dioxide (SO_2), particulate matter (particles with a diameter less than or equal to a nominal 10 micrometers (PM_{10}) and particles with a diameter less than or equal to nominal 2.5 micrometers ($PM_{2.5}$), ozone (O_3), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), and lead (Pb). Federal regulations designate Air Quality Control Regions in violation of the NAAQS as nonattainment areas. According to the severity of the pollution problem, nonattainment areas can be categorized as marginal, moderate, serious, severe, or extreme.

The NAAQS for $PM_{2.5}$ and CO are listed in Table G-1.

Table G-1: Ambient Air Quality Standards

Pollutant	Federal Standard[a]	Alaska Standard
$PM_{2.5}$		
24-hour average	35 µg/m^3	35 µg/m^3
Annual geometric mean	15 µg/m^3	15 µg/m^3
CO		
8-hour	9 ppm	10 mg/m^3
1-hour	35 ppm	40 mg/m^3

Sources: USEPA (2012); AKDEC (2012)

Notes: CO – carbon monoxide, $PM_{2.5}$ – particulate matter, ppm – parts per million, µg /m^3 – micrograms per cubic meter, mg/m^3 – milligrams per cubic meter

[a] Federal primary and secondary standards for this pollutant are identical.

To regulate the emission levels resulting from a project, federal actions located in nonattainment or maintenance areas are required to demonstrate compliance with the general conformity rule established in 40 CFR §93 *Determining Conformity of Federal Actions to State or Federal Implementation Plans*

(the Rule). The project area is located within a nonattainment area and maintenance area; therefore, a General Conformity Rule applicability analysis is warranted.

Section 93.153 of the Rule sets applicability requirements for projects subject to the Rule through establishment of *de minimis* levels for annual criteria pollutant emissions. These *de minimis* levels are set according to criteria pollutant nonattainment area designations. For projects below the *de minimis* levels, a conformity determination is not required. Those at or above the levels are required to perform a conformity analysis as established in the Rule. The *de minimis* levels apply to emissions that can occur during the construction and operation phases of the action.

On July 11, 2006, the USEPA established *de minimis* levels for $PM_{2.5}$. The final rule established 100 tons per year (TPY) as the *de minimis* emission level under nonattainment for directly emitted $PM_{2.5}$ and each of the precursors that form it (SO_2, NO_x, volatile organic compounds [VOCs], and ammonia). This 100 TPY threshold applies separately to each precursor. This means that if an action's direct or indirect emissions of $PM_{2.5}$, SO_2, NO_x, VOC, or ammonia exceed 100 TPY, a General Conformity determination would be required. Under the current USEPA policy for addressing $PM_{2.5}$ precursors, only $PM_{2.5}$ and SO_2 must be evaluated in all regions. States are not required to evaluate VOC, NO_x, or ammonia unless the state or the USEPA makes a technical demonstration that those particular emissions from sources within the state significantly contribute to $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations in a given nonattainment area (USEPA, 2007). Neither USEPA nor Alaska has found $PM_{2.5}$ problems in Fairbanks to be caused by NO_x, VOC, or ammonia; therefore, these pollutants are not examined further in this analysis.

The U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright (USAG FWA) has completed a General Conformity Rule applicability analysis in order to analyze any impact to air quality. Emissions have been estimated for $PM_{2.5}$ with its precursor SO_2, and CO. Annual emissions for these compounds were estimated for the demolition of Hangars 2 and 3 to determine if they would be below or above the *de minimis* levels established in the Rule. The *de minimis* for $PM_{2.5}$ nonattainment areas is 100 TPY for $PM_{2.5}$ and SO_2. The maintenance *de minimis* level for CO is 100 TPY.

Sources of $PM_{2.5}$, SO_2, and CO associated with the Proposed Action would include emissions from demolition equipment, fugitive dust ($PM_{2.5}$), and the change in emissions from the reduced demand on the central heating and power plant.

6.0 Conformity Applicability Analysis

This project construction- and operations-related General Conformity analysis was performed for the Proposed Action at Fort Wainwright. This conformity analysis and air emissions evaluation will follow

the criteria regulated in 40 CFR §93, *Determining Conformity of General Federal Actions to State or Federal Implementation Plans; Final Rule* (November 30, 1993), as revised 5 April 2010. The emissions evaluation will also follow all National Environmental Policy Act-related criteria regulated in 40 CFR §6.

6.1 Construction Phase Emissions

The Proposed Action would require the operation of heavy equipment and dump trucks for demolition activities.

6.1.1 Emissions from Heavy Equipment

Annual emissions were calculated for various types of diesel construction vehicles using model emission rate input for the year 2014 in USEPA's *Nonroad2008a Emission Inventory Model: Diesel Construction Equipment, Fairbanks, Alaska* (USEPA, 2008). Truck emission levels were calculated using USEPA's *MOVES* model for conditions in summer 2014 (USEPA, 2010). The total annual emissions in TPY were determined for each vehicle based on the number of vehicles used and the number of operating hours per year. As noted above, if demolition of the buildings occurs, it would begin in the spring of 2014. So for the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that any demolition and construction activities would be completed in a one year timeframe (i.e., during 2014). If demolition occurs later than 2014, it would be expected that newer, cleaner heavy equipment would be used, resulting in fewer emissions.

It was assumed that dump trucks would travel 14 miles per trip to the local landfill, with the exception of the asbestos-containing material, which would have a round trip haul of 5 miles to the Fort Wainwright landfill.

6.1.2 Calculations for Construction Emissions

Using the emissions factors in Table G-2, construction emissions were calculated for the proposed demolition of both Hangars 2 and 3 at Fort Wainwright. Using the assumptions described above, the emissions in tons of $PM_{2.5}$, SO_2, and CO for construction equipment emissions were calculated for each vehicle type using the appropriate equations shown in Table G-3.

Emissions factors used for construction vehicles are shown in Table G-2.

Table G-2: Emissions Factors for Construction Vehicles

Construction Vehicle Type	Emissions Factors (pounds/hour-vehicle		
	$PM_{2.5}$	SO_2	CO
Front end loader	0.184	0.050	0.945
Backhoe	0.203	0.031	1.351
Crane	0.089	0.056	0.308
Dump truck[a]	0.429	0.0089	2.480
Excavator	0.077	0.039	0.273
Dozer	0.093	0.047	0.348
Vibratory roller	0.120	0.034	0.833
Grader	0.100	0.037	0.356
Asphalt paver	0.145	0.041	1.032
Steel wheel roller	0.037	0.013	0.294
Pneumatic wheel roller	0.063	0.022	0.500
Water tanker*	0.262	0.0307	2.163

Notes: CO – carbon monoxide, $PM_{2.5}$ – particulate matter, SO_2 – sulfur dioxide

[a] Units are in grams/mile/vehicle.

Table G-3: Equations for Construction Emissions Calculations

Emission Source	Equation	Sample Calculation
Heavy equipment emissions, hourly on-site activities	(# of vehicle type) (emission factor) (total # of days in operation) (hours/day) (1 ton/2,000 pounds) = tons of air emissions	(1 grader) (0.100 pounds/hour/vehicle) (2 days in operation) (8 hours/day) (1 ton/2,000 pounds) = **0.001 tons of SO_x of equipment emissions**
Construction truck emissions with vehicle-miles	(# vehicle type) (emission factor) (total # of days in operation) (miles/day)(1 ton/2,000 pounds) = tons of air emissions	(1 dump truck) (0.262 grams/mile/vehicle) (2,600 miles) (1 pound/453.59 grams) (1 ton/2,000 pounds) = **0.001 tons SO_x of vehicle emissions**

Notes: # – number, SOx – sulfur oxide

6.1.3 Surface Disturbance (Fugitive $PM_{2.5}$)

All demolition would be expected to occur on paved surfaces. Therefore, the quantification of dust emissions from construction activity on unpaved surfaces has not been calculated. Best Management Practices would be implemented to limit fugitive dust from unpaved surfaces, including moistening soil with a water tanker and washing down vehicles before the exit the project area.

6.1.4 Alternative 1: Demolition of Both Hangars 2 and 3

Equipment requirements were estimated for the demolition activities associated with the removal of both hangars and removal of demolition materials from Fort Wainwright. Table G-4 provides the equipment assumptions and resultant total equipment emissions.

Table G-4: Total Equipment Emissions for Demolition – Alternative 1

Construction Vehicle Type	Total Days of Operation	Total Emissions (Tons)		
		Exhaust $PM_{2.5}$	SO_2	CO
Front end loader	149	0.110	0.030	0.563
Crane	50	0.018	0.011	0.061
Backhoe	80	0.065	0.010	0.430
Dump truck[a]	70,302	0.033	0.001	0.192
Excavator	24	0.008	0.004	0.027
Dozer	8	0.003	0.001	0.010
Vibratory roller	8	0.004	0.001	0.025
Grader	2.0	0.001	<0.001	0.003
Asphalt paver	1.0	0.001	<0.001	0.004
Steel wheel roller	2	<0.001	<0.001	0.002
Pneumatic wheel roller	1	<0.001	<0.001	0.002
Water tanker	100	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Total Emissions		**0.241**	**0.058**	**1.321**

Notes: CO – carbon monoxide, $PM_{2.5}$ – particulate matter, SO_2 – sulfur dioxide

[a] Dump trucks are in total miles traveled.

6.2 Operations Emissions

6.2.1 Heating and Electrical Source Emissions

Hangars 2 and 3 are currently powered by the central heating and power plant. The existing hangars utilize approximately 3,000 tons of coal for heat and electricity (1,426 – Hangar 2 and 1,556.03 – Hangar 3), or about 1 percent of the overall 300,000 tons of coal burned by the central heating and power plan annually. Under Alternative 1, approximately 3,000 tons of coal would no longer need to burned, resulting in a reduction of emissions.

According to the USAG FWA, the central heating and power plant accounts for 90 percent of all emissions at Fort Wainwright. Using the potential to emit limitations under the Title V permit for Doyon Utilities, it can be determined that 300,000 tons of coal produces approximately 2,354.3 TPY

SO_2, 0.81 TPY $PM_{2.5}$ and 847.6 TPY CO. This assumption equates to 0.007 tons SO_2 per ton of coal, 0.0000027 tons of $PM_{2.5}$ per ton of coal, and 0.0028 tons CO per ton of coal. Therefore, a reduction in 3,000 tons of coal annually would eliminate 23.543 tons of SO_2, 0.0081 tons of $PM_{2.5}$ and 8.476 tons of CO.

There would be no additional generators or daily commuters on Fort Wainwright resulting from the Alternative 1; therefore, there would be no operational emissions to consider in this analysis from these sources.

6.3 Summary of Construction and Operations Emissions

Total emissions were summed by combining the total emissions for demolition, construction and operational reductions to determine whether emissions exceed the *de minimis* values presented in the following Table G-5. Negative total emissions demonstrate an overall reduction in annual emissions due to a decrease in baseline emissions (the reduced load on the central heating and power plant).

Table G-5: Total Annual Emissions – Alternative 1

Construction and Operations	**Total Emissions (tons per year)**		
	$PM_{2.5}$	**SO_2**	**CO**
***de minimis* thresholds**	**100**	**100**	**100**
Demolition and construction	**0.241**	**0.058**	**1.321**
Operational demand	–0.0081	–23.543	–8.476
Total emissions	**0.2329**	**–23.485**	**-7.155**

Notes: CO – carbon monoxide, $PM_{2.5}$ – particulate matter, SO_2 – sulfur dioxide

Under Alternative 1, the total emissions resulting from the demolition of Hangars 2 and 3 and the reduced operational demand on the central heating and power plant would not exceed the *de minimis* threshold for any of the pollutants analyzed. Therefore, a conformity determination is not required. A Record of Non-Applicability has been prepared and is attached to this appendix.

7.0 References

Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (AKDEC). 2012. 18 AAC 50: Air Quality Control. April 8.

The Weather Channel. 2012. Annual Averages: Fairbanks Alaska. http://www.weather.com/weather/wxclimatology/monthly/graph/USAK0083. June 21.

United States Protection Agency (USEPA). 2007. Policies for Addressing PM2.5 Precursor Emissions. PowerPoint Presentation by Rich Damberg. USEPA Office of Air Quality Planning Standards. June 20.

United States Protection Agency (USEPA). 2008. Nonroad2008a Emission Inventory Model: Diesel Construction Equipment and Trucks, Fairbanks, Alaska.

United States Protection Agency (USEPA). 2010. MOVES Mobile Source Emission Factor Model for 2014 Vehicle Emissions.

United States Protection Agency (USEPA). 2012. National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Website: http://www.epa.gov/ttn/naaqs/. Last updated March 22.

This page intentionally left blank.

ATTACHMENT 1: Record of Non-Applicability

This page intentionally left blank.

General Conformity Record of Non-Applicability (RONA)

Action name: Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 at Fort Wainwright, Alaska
Action Identification Number: None
Action Point of Contact Name and Phone: IMPC-FWA-PWE (E. Dick) at 907-361-9867
Action start date: April 2014
Action end date: September 2014

Nonattainment and/or Maintenance Area: Fairbanks North Star Borough
Nonattainment and/or Maintenance Area Pollutants and Precursors: Carbon Monoxide (CO), Fine Particulate Matter ("$PM_{2.5}$"), Sulfur and Nitrogen Oxides (as precursors to $PM_{2.5}$).

Applicable Regulation: General Conformity under Section 176 of the Clean Air Act has been evaluated for this project. Based on the review provided in the Army's Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 at Fort Wainwright (2013), total direct and indirect emission from this action are less than the emission rates published at 40 CFR 93.153(b)(1) for $PM_{2.5}$ nonattainment areas (100 tons per year of $PM_{2.5}$ direct emissions, 100 tons per year of sulfur dioxide, 100 tons per year of nitrogen oxides) and 40 CFR 93.153(b)(2) for maintenance areas (100 tons per year of carbon monoxide). As such, this action does not require a full conformity determination. Emission estimates are provided in Table 3-6 of Section 3.2.2.2 of the EIS.

Additional Information: It should be noted that the conformity review provided in the EIS does not utilize the same version of MOBILE6 that Alaska uses in their State Implementation Plan (i.e. AKMOBILE6). Alaska uses AKMOBILE6 because it more accurately represents the effect of cold start idle emissions and the benefits of electric plug-in units that are common to Fairbanks during the winter. Emission increases tied to this project are limited to the demolition phase of the project, due primarily to construction equipment, and will not occur during the winter–which is when past violations of the carbon monoxide and fine particulate matter standards have occurred.

Additionally, the emissions associated with the hangars' heat and electric load at the Installation's heat and power plant will be eliminated; this will provide a minor air quality benefit during the winter–which is when past violations of the carbon monoxide and fine particulate matter standards have occurred. As such, it is not foreseeable that this project would cause or contribute to increased violations of either the ambient carbon monoxide or fine particulate matter standards.

Eric Dick

Eric Dick
Air Program Coordinator
Public Works–Environmental Division
Fort Wainwright, Alaska

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX H: Past Mitigation Measures for Hangars 2 and 3

This page intentionally left blank.

Past Mitigation Efforts at U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Mitigation Required	Undertaking	Affected Historic Resources	Year of MOA	Year of Completion
Conduct HABS Level I	Ongoing use and management of the Ladd Field NHL	Hangars 2 and 3	1986	1986
Structural Assessment and Reuse Study – Building 1024	Ongoing use and management of the Ladd Field NHL	Other contributing elements in the Ladd Field NHL and Cold War Historic District (Building 1024)	1986	1989
Building 1557 - Reduction of Hangar Doors must be reversible and must have drawings to show alterations made	Ongoing use and management of the Ladd Field NHL	Other contributing elements in the Ladd Field NHL and Cold War Historic District (Building 1557)	1986	unknown
Building 1043 – New siding and windows must meet Secretary of the Interior's Standards	Ongoing use and management of the Ladd Field NHL	Other contributing elements in the Ladd Field NHL and Cold War Historic District (Building 1043)	1986	unknown
Building 1543 – Amended lease with BLM to ensure maintenance follows Secretary of the Interior's Standards	Ongoing use and management of the Ladd Field NHL	Other contributing elements in the Ladd Field NHL and Cold War Historic District (Building 1543)	1986	unknown
Building 3203 – Preserve one as mitigation for demolishing other igloos	Demolition of Building 3200	Other contributing elements in the Ladd Field NHL and Cold War Historic District (Building 3200)	1999	2000
Condition Assessment and Economic Analysis - (Hangar 3 and Hangar 6)	Demolition of Buildings in the Ladd Field NHL	Hangars 2 and 3	2001	2003
Condition Assessment and Economic Analysis - (Hangar 2)	Demolition of Buildings in the Ladd Field NHL	Hangars 2 and 3	2001	2003
Establish the Cultural Resources Working Group	Demolition of Buildings in the Ladd Field NHL	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District	2001	2001

Past Mitigation Efforts at U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Mitigation Required	Undertaking	Affected Historic Resources	Year of MOA	Year of Completion
Develop Tri-Fold Public Interpretation Pamphlet on the NHL	Demolition of Buildings in the Ladd Field NHL	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District	2001	2003
Develop Installation of Interpretative Panels within the NHL	Demolition of Buildings in the Ladd Field NHL	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District	2001	2005
Reassessment of the Boundary	Demolition of Buildings in the Ladd Field NHL	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District	2001	2001
Develop Reuse Study for Hangars 2 and 3	Aviation Stationing	Hangars 2 and 3	2009	2012
Update and expand HABS Level I for Hangars 2 and 3	Aviation Stationing	Hangars 2 and 3	2009	2012
Develop Driving Tour of Ladd Field NHL and Cold War Historic District	Demolition of 3723 and Construction of Barracks	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District (Building 3723)	2009	2011
Develop design guidelines to preserve the integrity of the Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District	Aviation Stationing	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District	2009	2012
Develop Tri-Fold Public Interpretation Pamphlet on the Cold War Historic District	Replacement of Roof for Building 2107	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District (Building 2107)	2009	2010
Develop Teaching with Historic Places (Teaching with Historic Places) lesson plan to impart value for the Ladd Field NHL	Aviation Stationing	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District	2009	2012
Assist SHPO with updating and finalizing the Coldest Front: Cold War Military Properties in Alaska	Aviation Stationing	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District	2009	2013
Develop historic context for Cold Weather Testing	Aviation Stationing	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District	2009	2013

Past Mitigation Efforts at U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Mitigation Required	Undertaking	Affected Historic Resources	Year of MOA	Year of Completion
Develop and construct a viewing platform and a minimum of three permanent interpretive panels	Aviation Stationing	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District	2009	2012
Develop Interpretive Website	Demolition of Building 1054	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District (Building 1054)	2009	2012
Collect architectural information on overhangs (Photograph and Measure)	Removal of the Hangars 2 and 3 Shed Roof Overhangs	Hangars 2 and 3	2010	2010
Develop Maintenance Component that highlights Hangars 2 and 3	Removal of the Hangars 2 and 3 Shed Roof Overhangs	Hangars 2 and 3	2010	2012
If overhangs are replaced: drawings must be submitted to consulting parties prior to replacement	Removal of the Hangars 2 and 3 Shed Roof Overhangs	Hangars 2 and 3	2010	NA
Hold Professional Training on Historic Property Management	HVAC system at Building 1555	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District (Building 1555)	2010	2011
Develop General Design Perimeters for Accessibility	Construction of an ADA Ramp onto Building 1051	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District (Building 1051)	2010	2011
Develop public presentation on Cold War History	Demolition of Buildings 2062 and 3721, and Renovation of 1060	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District (Buildings 2062, 3721, 1060)	2010	2012
Develop Accessibility Guidelines for the NHL and Historic District	Construction of an ADA Ramp onto Building 1051	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District (Building 1051)	2010	2012
Develop PowerPoint Presentations, Factsheets and General Design Perimeters for Internal Training: Historic Interior Spaces	HVAC system at Building 1555	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District (Building 1555)	2010	2013

Past Mitigation Efforts at U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Mitigation Required	Undertaking	Affected Historic Resources	Year of MOA	Year of Completion
Develop PowerPoint Presentations, Factsheets and General Design Perimeters for Internal Training: Additions to Historic Buildings	Demolition of 2062, 3721 and Renovation of 1060	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District (Buildings 2062, 3721, 1060)	2010	2013
Develop Historic Buildings Assessment Report for entire Ladd Field NHL (if overhangs of Hangars 2 and 3 not replaced in 3 years)	Removal of the Hangars 2 and 3 Shed Roof Overhangs	Hangars 2 and 3	2010	2013
Develop PowerPoint Presentations and Factsheet for Internal Training: Repair vs. Replacement	Renovations to Building 2079	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District (Building 2079)	2011	2011
Develop PowerPoint Presentations, Factsheets and General Design Perimeters for Internal Training: Energy Conservation	Renovations to Building 3004	Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District (Building 3004)	2011	2012
HABS Documentations Level I:Building 1561 (1986), Building 1542 (1986), Building 1555 (1986), Building 1562 (1986), Building 1557 (1986), Building 1050 (2001), Building 1560 (2001), Building 3006 (2001), Building 3009 (2001), Building 3020 (2001), and Building 3028 (2001)	1) Ongoing use and management of the Ladd Field NHL; 2) Demolition of Buildings in the Ladd Field NHL	Other contributing elements in the Ladd Field NHL and Cold War Historic District (Buildings 1561, 1542, 1555, 1562, 1557, 1050, 1560, 3006, 3009, 3020, 3028)	1986, 2001	1986, 2003
Updated AHRS cards: Building 1054 (2009), Building 1050 (2001), Building 1560 (2001), Building 3006 (2001), Building 3009 (2001), Building 3020 (2001), Building 3028 (2001), and Building 3723 (2009)	1) Demolition of Buildings in the Ladd Field NHL; 2) Demolition of 1054	Other contributing elements in the Ladd Field NHL and Cold War Historic District (Buildings 1050, 1054, 1560, 3006, 3009, 3020, 3028, 3723)	2001, 2009	2003, 2010

Past Mitigation Efforts at U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Mitigation Required	Undertaking	Affected Historic Resources	Year of MOA	Year of Completion
HABS Documentations Level II: Building 2060 (1999), Building 2079 (2011), Building 3200 (1999), Building 3201 (1999), Building 3204 (1999), Building 1001 (2002), Building 1004 (2002), Building 1053 (2002), Building 1059 (2002), Building 1579 (2002), Building 2106 (2002), Building 3595 (2002), Building 3721 (2002), Building 4069 (2006), Building 2062 (2010), and Communication Tower (2010)	1) the Relocation of Building 2060; 2) Demolition of Building 2107 and Building 4069; 3) Demolition of Cold War Era Building and the Renovation of 3595	Other contributing elements in the Ladd Field NHL and Cold War Historic District (Buildings 2060, 2079, 3200, 3201, 3204, 1001, 1004, 1053, 1059, 1579, 2106, 3595, 3721, 4069, 2062, Communication Tower)	2007, 2002	multiple years

Notes: ADA – Americans with disabilities act; AHRS – Alaska heritage resources survey; BLM – Bureau of Land Management; Cold War Historic District – Ladd Air Force Base Cold War Historic District; HABS – historic American buildings survey; HVAC – heating, ventilation, and air conditioning; Field NHL – Ladd Field National Historic Landmark; MOA – memorandum of agreement; NA – not applicable; SHPO – State Historic Preservation Office

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX I: Cumulative Effects Analysis Quick Look Questions

This page intentionally left blank.

Table I-1
Air Quality Quick Look Questions

Quick Look Questions	Alternative 1: Demolition of Hangars 2 and 3	Alternative 2: No Action
Is the installation located completely, or partially, in a designated non-attainment area or maintenance area relative to compliance with ambient air quality standards?	Yes	Yes
Will the alternative emit criteria and/or hazardous air pollutants during its construction and/or operational phase?	Yes	Yes
Will such emissions exceed "*de minimus*" standards, as designated in federal or state air quality regulations?	No	No
Are there any sensitive receptors of air pollutant effects associated with the installation (e.g., forests, agricultural crops, threatened or endangered plant or animal species, and human beings with breathing difficulties or other respiratory illnesses)?	No	No
Are there wide variations in the monthly and/or seasonal patterns of atmospheric dispersion conditions at the installation?	Yes	Yes
Within the last five years, has the installation been subject to Notices of Violations or fines relative to Clean Air Act requirements?	No	No
Are there any concerns that federal and state source-oriented permits may not be up to date, and are there any specified conditions not being met?	No	No
Will the alternative emit significant amounts of carbon dioxide or other greenhouse gases?	No	No
Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?	**No**	**No**
Cumulative Effects Analysis Level: (1) Quick Look		

Table I-2
Safety Quick Look Questions

Quick Look Questions	Alternative 1: Demolition of Hangars 2 and 3	Alternative 2: No Action
Are there currently safety concerns at the site?	Yes	Yes
Will the alternative improve safety?	Yes	No
Has safety been sufficiently integrated into the alternatives?	Yes	No
Will the alternative create any new safety concerns?	No	No
Does the alternative adequately address safety impacts for all populations?	Yes	No
Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?	**No**	**No**
Cumulative Effects Analysis Level: (1) Quick Look		

Table I-3
Environmental Justice and Protection of Children Quick Look Questions

Quick Look Questions	Alternative 1: Demolition of Hangars 2 and 3	Alternative 2: No Action
Would the proposed action result in any significant impacts to any resource areas?	No	No
Does the proposed action have a disproportionate adverse impact on minority populations or children?	No	No
Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?	**No**	**No**
Cumulative Effects Analysis Level: (1) Quick Look		

Table I-4
Sustainability Quick Look Questions

Quick Look Questions	Alternative 1: Demolition of Hangars 2 and 3	Alternative 2: No Action
Will the proposed action result in more than a marginal increase in demand for regional energy and utility resources?	No	No
Will the alternative help the Army meet its sustainability goals?	Yes	No
Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?	No	No
Cumulative Effects Analysis Level: (1) Quick Look		

Table I-5
Transportation Quick Look Questions

Quick Look Questions	Alternative 1: Demolition of Hangars 2 and 3	Alternative 2: No Action
Would the proposed alternative result in significant impacts to transportation?	No	No
Is the community undergoing rapid growth, or is the community seeing reduction in growth?	No	No
Does the proposed alternative add to that trend or does it reduce (mitigate) that trend?	No	No
Will the proposed alternative require on-post land use classification changes that exceed plus or minus 5%?	No	No
Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?	**No**	**No**
Cumulative Effects Analysis Level: (1) Quick Look		

Table I-6
Cultural Resources Quick Look Questions

Quick Look Questions	Alternative 1: Demolition of Hangars 2 and 3	Alternative 2: No Action
Is there an inventory of historic properties (buildings)?	Yes	Yes
Is the property 50 years of age or older?	Yes	Yes
Has the property been evaluated for exceptional significance?	No	No
Is the property eligible to be on the National Register?	Yes	Yes
Is the property included in a Programmatic Agreement or Memorandum of Agreement that would govern work items (repair, replace, modernize, demolish) in the building?	Yes	Yes
Is the property a contributing resource in a National Register eligible or listed Historic District or Cultural Landscape?	Yes	Yes
Is the property a National Historic Landmark or located in a National Historic Landmark District?	Yes	Yes
Is the property locate4d near or in the view shed of a National Register eligible or listed Historic Property, Historic District, Cultural Landscape, or archaeological site?	Yes	Yes
Is the property a National Register eligible or listed archaeological site?	No	No
Is the property a National Register eligible property of traditional religious and cultural importance to federally-recognized Indian tribes?	No	No
Is the property located in or near a sacred site (AIRFA), or Native American Burial area?	No	No
Is an additional cumulative effects analysis needed?	Yes	Yes
Does the proposed action have an effect on a historic district as a whole?	Yes	Yes
Have there been previous effects to the historic district including alterations to viewsheds?	Yes	Yes
Does the Proposed Action have an effect on any aspect of the property's integrity?	Yes	Yes
Have any of these aspects of integrity been previously affected?	Yes	Yes
Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?	**Yes**	**Yes**
CEA Level: (2) Analysis and Discussion		

Table I-7
Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Waste Quick Look Questions

Quick Look Questions	Alternative 1: Demolition of Hangars 2 and 3	Alternative 2: No Action
Will the proposed alternative occur on an existing installation?	Yes	Yes
Are there any known or suspected contaminated sites at (or near) the proposed site?	Yes	Yes
Would the proposed alternative increase the use of hazardous materials?	Yes, in the short-term.	Yes, during demolition.
Does the proposed action involve new hazardous material/hazardous waste management activities or procedures at the installation?	No	No
Are all aspects of the proposed alternative covered by a Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plans?	No	No
Have project proponents taken steps to eliminate the use and potential release of hazardous materials?	Yes	Yes
Are there any existing regional concerns related to chemical contamination of ground or surface waters?	Yes	Yes
Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?	**Yes**	**Yes**
Cumulative Effects Analysis Level: (2) Analysis and Discussion		

This page intentionally left blank.

Fort Wainwright
Disposition of Hangars 2 & 3

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA

MAY 2013

IMCOM
SOLDIERS • FAMILIES • CIVILIANS