

APPENDIX E

## Quick Look Questions and Responses

---



TABLE E-1  
Subsistence Quick Look Questions

1	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.1.2.2	<p><b>Would the Proposed Action adversely impact to the availability of any subsistence resources?</b></p> <p><i>The Proposed Action would not substantially change existing access to subsistence activities on USARAK lands; ample USARAK lands are available for subsistence activities.</i></p>
2	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.1.2.2	<p><b>Is the area considered to be important for subsistence access or resource sustainability?</b></p> <p><i>All construction would occur in the cantonment areas of USARAK installations. These are located in urban area for which subsistence access is not applicable. Training at YTA, TFTA, and DTA (and other training areas) are considered important for subsistence, but access availability will not substantially change as a result of the proposed action.</i></p>
3	<b>No</b> Subsection 3.1.2.2	<p><b>Does the Proposed Action reduce the land available or change the timing or availability for subsistence activities?</b></p> <p><i>The Proposed Action will not substantially change access for subsistence activities on USARAK lands. Aviation weapons training will be within impact areas that are already closed to public for safety reasons.</i></p>
4	<b>Yes</b> Subsection 3.1.2.2	<p><b>Have past activities in the area had negative impacts on subsistence resources?</b></p> <p><i>Army Alaska Transformation and recent development in YTA and DTA have restricted access to road accessible training lands. Army efforts have ensured that such restrictions have not served to significantly impact urban resident access during periods where most subsistent activities occur. See Final Environmental Impact Statement for Transformation of U.S. Army Alaska (USARAK, 2004a) and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Construction and the Operation of a Battle Area Complex and a Combined Arms Collective Training Facility within U.S. Army Training Lands in Alaska (USARAK, 2006a).</i></p>
5	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.1.2.2	<p><b>Could the Proposed Action lead to further projects in the area that could negatively impact subsistence resources?</b></p> <p><i>There are no further activities planned in relation to the Proposed Action; however, other nearby projects could cumulatively impact subsistence resources.</i></p>
6	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.1.2.2	<p><b>Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?</b></p> <p><i>Less than significant environmental impacts would occur to this valued environmental component (VEC) under the Proposed Action; however, the potential for greater cumulative impacts is worthy of further analysis.</i></p>

TABLE E-2

## Traffic and Transportation Systems Quick Look Questions

1	<b>NO</b> Bibliography	<b>Are transportation data and the transportation plan for the installation more than 5 to 10 years old and, if so, is the plan subject to current updating/modification efforts?</b> <i>FWA completed a 6-year transportation plan in October 2006; additionally, USARAK implemented the U.S. Army Alaska Regulation 55-2, Transportation and Travel, on 31 January 2001.</i>
2	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.1.2.1	<b>Is there a transportation improvement program for the installation and, if so, will current and anticipated traffic concerns be resolved upon completion of the plan?</b> <i>There is no need for a transportation improvement program because existing roads in the Fairbanks areas and at FWA have the capacity to accommodate the relatively minor increase in population.</i>
3	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.1.2.1	<b>Has a recent (last 5 to 10 years) regional transportation study been conducted via a collaborative effort between the installation and nearby towns and cities?</b> <i>Fairbanks North Star Borough, Coordinated Transportation Plan, May 2007.</i>
4	<b>NO</b> Public Scoping Document	<b>Are there any historical or current conflicts between the installation and various governmental agencies, and/or stakeholder groups, relative to on-post or off-post traffic-related concerns?</b> <i>There were no concerns raised during the public scoping meeting or in writing.</i>
5	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.8.3.1	<b>Is there any evidence of current or anticipated encroachment or rapid urban development that might have implications relative to the traffic and transportation system valued environmental component (VEC)?</b> <i>Rapid population growth is not expected in the Fairbanks or Anchorage areas.</i>
6	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.1.2.1	<b>Will the proposed action(s) over the planning horizon cause increases to on-post and/or off-post traffic levels?</b> <i>A relatively small number of additional Soldiers and family members would be stationed at FWA, resulting in a minor increase in routine traffic, which would not overly stress the existing infrastructure.</i>
7	<b>NO</b>	<b>Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?</b> <i>No long-term adverse impacts to traffic and transportation systems are anticipated</i>

**TABLE E-3**  
Fire Management Quick Look Questions

1	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.1.2.4	<b>Would the Proposed Action increase the potential for wildland fire starts?</b> <i>Risks associated with military training are well documented in previous NEPA analysis. See Final Environmental Impact Statement for Transformation of U.S. Army Alaska (USARAK, 2004a), Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Construction and the Operation of a Battle Area Complex and a Combined Arms Collective Training Facility within U.S. Army Training Lands in Alaska (USARAK, 2006a), and Alaska Army Lands Withdrawal Renewal Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement. Existing fire prevention and response management programs have proven capable of minimizing risk, and would be continued. Overall risk is similar to the No Action alternative.</i>
2	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.1.2.4	<b>Does the Proposed Action involve development of new facilities or firing ranges that could pose a fire risk?</b> <i>No new facilities or firing ranges will be developed in wildland areas.</i>
3	<b>YES</b> Subsections 2.5.3 and 2.5.4	<b>Does the Proposed Action increase the level of intensity of military activity in the area?</b> <i>The proposed action would result in an increased number of training events, including helicopter pilot proficiency training, aviation-only training exercises, individual weapons training and helicopter gunnery. There would also be a significant increase in the number of takeoff and landings of military helicopters on Ladd AAF.</i>
4	<b>YES</b>	<b>Does the affected area contain high levels of flammable vegetative “fuels”?</b> <i>Construction will occur in the cantonment area with no real potential for wildland fires. Live-fire training will occur on preexisting ranges and impact areas. While there is potential for wildland fire starts, current management practices serve to substantially reduce the potential for fire spreads.</i>
5	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.1.2.4	<b>Has fire management been an issue in the past in the area?</b> <i>Fire management, particularly wild land fire management, is an issue on most military installations. Consequently, USARAK has instituted a Wild Land Fire Management Plan as part of the INRMP.</i>
6	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.1.2.4	<b>Will fire risk be significantly increased?</b> <i>Although increased helicopter activity will occur, including live fire training within existing impact areas, current wild land fire prevention strategies will lessen any potential of increased fire risk.</i>
7	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.1.2.4	<b>Has past activity in this area increased fire risk?</b> <i>The presence of additional military personnel and live-fire training has increased the risk of fire starts in the training areas.</i>
8	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.1.2.4	<b>Would future development and other activity occur in the area as a result of the Proposed Action that would increase the fire risk?</b> <i>No foreseeable development is planned for the ranges or impact areas where fire risks are higher.</i>
9	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.1.2.4	<b>Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?</b> <i>While military training presents risk of fire starts, the Proposed Action does not offer any real new or additional risk from existing conditions (the No Action alternative). Several proposed projects will reduce fire risks. The Army is currently in the planning stage of a hazardous fuel reduction project for Stuart Creek Impact Area (IA). The Army is looking at removing hazardous fuels along North Beaver Creek, Skyline, and Brigadier roads, and also creating a fuelbreak from North Beaver Creek Road to the south fork of the Chena River and from Brigadier Road to Chena River's south fork. The Army is also in the planning stages of creating a fuelbreak around Blair Lakes IA. Appropriate NEPA analysis will be conducted prior to initiation of any fire management projects. Additionally, the application of ongoing mitigation and avoidance measures has proven effective for wildland fire management.</i>

TABLE E-4  
Energy Quick Look Questions

1	<b>NO</b> Section 3.1.2.7.2	<b>Will the Proposed Action result in more than a marginal increase in demand for regional energy and utility resources?</b>
		<i>The proposed action represents a minor increase in energy and utilities demand. This increase is well within the capability of existing utility infrastructure at FWA, FRA, DTA, Eielson AFB, and their respective training areas.</i>
2	<b>NO</b>	<b>Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?</b>
		<i>There are no foreseeable major development projects planned for the study areas with a significant demand for energy utilities to result in a cumulative effect. Existing infrastructure is well positioned to absorb the small additional utility demand resulting from the proposed action.</i>

TABLE E-5  
Airspace Management Quick Look Questions

1	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.2.3	<b>Are existing airspace designations (e.g., SUAs, MOAs, MTRs, etc.) previously established for the installation currently subject to over-utilization?</b>  <i>There are no current problems with over-utilization of these areas.</i>
2	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.2.1.1	<b>Are there concerns with overcrowding of regional airspace or additional restrictions on existing air corridors?</b>  <i>Concerns over airspace overcrowding have been expressed during public scoping meetings, including a comment about the cumulative effect of increased military training in the congested corridor near Fairbanks.</i>
3	<b>YES</b> Subsections 3.2.3.1.1, 3.2.3.1.2, 3.2.3.2.1, 3.2.3.2.2, 3.2.3.3.1, 3.2.3.3.2, 4.2.1, 4.2.2.1.4, 4.2.2.2.4, and 4.2.2.3.4	<b>Are there non-military uses of the current airspace, and are conflicts being articulated?</b>  <i>USARAK helicopters operating outside of installation boundaries share Alaskan airspace with civilian aviation. Airspace co-use becomes particularly strained during hunting and fishing seasons when general aviation activity increases considerably. It has been expressed that the entire aviation system needs to be assessed because of potential conflicts between military and civilian aircraft. This assessment is not part of this Proposed Action.</i>
4	<b>YES</b> Subsection 4.2.2.4	<b>Will the Proposed Action cause a more than marginal increased use of existing airspace?</b>  <i>The Proposed Action will result in a more than marginal increase in the use of existing airspace.</i>
5	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.2.3, 3.2.2.1.1, 3.2.3.1.2, 3.2.3.2.1, 3.2.3.2.2, 3.2.3.3.1, and 3.2.3.3.2	<b>Are future actions by non-military and other military entities expected, and would they cause impacts on airspace resources?</b>  <i>Itinerant (non-local) operations at public airports in the Anchorage area are forecast to increase by approximately 102,384 in the next 20 years. Itinerant operations in the Fairbanks area are forecast to increase by about 15,000 over the same period. The US Air Force is also in the process of reviewing airspace conditions in Alaska. Increased growth could strain local airspace resources.</i>
6	<b>NO</b> Subsection 4.2.1	<b>Will the Proposed Action require new airspace designations or expansions in existing restricted airspace?</b>  <i>None of the alternatives under consideration would alter the structure of airspace compared to the No Action alternative.</i>
7	<b>YES</b> Section 4.12	<b>Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?</b>  <i>Additional cumulative effects are analyzed in Section 4.12.</i>

TABLE E-6  
Cultural Resources Quick Look Questions

<b>Historic Properties</b>		
1	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.3.3.2	<b>Is there an inventory of historic properties (buildings)?</b> <i>In anticipation of the Proposed Action addressed in the EIS, more than 100 properties at FWA were surveyed and evaluated.</i>
1a	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.3.3.1	<b>Are the buildings 50 years of age or older?</b> <i>FWA, formerly known as Ladd Field and Ladd AFB, has supported both Air Force and Army components in its mission and construction history since 1939.</i>
1b	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.3.3.2	<b>Is the building eligible to be on the National Register?</b> <i>Ladd Field is a designated National Historic Landmark (NHL).</i>
1c	<b>YES</b> ICRMP Historic Properties Component	<b>Is the building included in a Programmatic Agreement, Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that would govern work items (repair, replace, modernize, demolish) in the building?</b> <i>There is an MOA between USARAK and the Alaska State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) with regard to retaining Building 3023. However, this building will not be affected under the proposed actions.</i>
1d	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.3.3.2	<b>Is the building a contributing resource in a National Register-eligible or listed Historic District or Cultural Landscape?</b> <i>Ladd Field is an NHL and many buildings surrounding Ladd Field contribute to a Cold War Historic District.</i>
1e	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.3.3.2	<b>Is the building a National Historic Landmark or located in a National Historic Landmark District?</b> <i>Ladd Field is an NHL and many buildings surrounding Ladd Field contribute to a Cold War Historic District.</i>
1f	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.3.3.2	<b>Is the building located near or in the viewshed of a National Register-eligible or listed Historic Property, Historic District, Cultural Landscape, or archeological site?</b> <i>Ladd Field is an NHL and many buildings surrounding Ladd Field contribute to a Cold War Historic District. The viewsheds evaluated in the EIS were identified within and surrounding the NHL to evaluate viewshed effects to the NHL from the Proposed Action.</i>
1g	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.3.2	<b>Is the building located on or near a National Register-eligible or listed archeological site?</b> <i>All identified archeological sites are located well outside the area of focus for the Proposed Action.</i>
1h	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.3.2	<b>Is the building located in or near a National Historic Preservation Act-eligible Native American traditional cultural property site, sacred site (American Indian Religious Freedom Act), or Native American burial area?</b> <i>USARAK and USAF contracted with the Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc. to identify traditional cultural properties, and none were found.</i>
2	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.3.2	<b>Has the area been surveyed for cultural resources?</b> <i>Thirteen archeological surveys have been conducted previously in FWA's Cantonment.</i>
2a	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.3.2	<b>Are prehistoric sites present?</b> <i>All identified archeological sites are located well outside the area of focus for the Proposed Action.</i>



TABLE E-6  
Cultural Resources Quick Look Questions

2b	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Have these sites been evaluated for National Register eligibility?</b> <i>N/A. There are no prehistoric sites present.</i>
2c	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Are any sites eligible for listing on the National Register?</b> <i>N/A. There are no prehistoric sites present.</i>
2d	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Are the sites contributing resources to an eligible or listed District or Cultural Landscape?</b> <i>N/A. There are no prehistoric sites present.</i>
3	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.3.2	<b>Is the project located in or near a Native American cemetery, traditional cultural property, or sacred site?</b> <i>USARAK and USAF contracted with the Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc. to identify traditional cultural properties, and none were found.</i>
<b>Archeological Resources</b>		
4	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.3.2	<b>Has the area of the proposed project been surveyed for archeological resources?</b> <i>Thirteen previous archeological surveys have been conducted previously in FWA's Cantonment. No archaeological resources would be impacted by the Proposed Action.</i>
5	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.3.2	<b>Are there prehistoric or historic sites present in the area?</b> <i>All identified archeological sites are located well outside the area of focus for the Proposed Action.</i>
5a	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Have the sites been studied/evaluated?</b> <i>N/A. There are no prehistoric sites present. See Historic Properties for historic sites.</i>
5b	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Is the site 50 years of age or older?</b> <i>N/A. There are no prehistoric sites present. See Historic Properties for historic sites.</i>
5c	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Is the site on or eligible for listing on the or on the National Register?</b> <i>N/A. There are no prehistoric sites present. See Historic Properties for historic sites.</i>
5d	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Is the site associated with a significant event?</b> <i>N/A. There are no prehistoric sites present. See Historic Properties for historic sites.</i>
5e	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Is the site a contributing resource in a National Register-eligible or listed Historic District or Cultural Landscape?</b> <i>N/A. There are no prehistoric sites present. See Historic Properties for historic sites.</i>
5f	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.3.2	<b>Is the site located in or near a Native American cemetery, traditional cultural property, or sacred site?</b> <i>USARAK and USAF contracted with the Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc. to identify traditional cultural properties, and none was found</i>
6	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Is there an MOA in place that applies to the proposed project area?</b> <i>N/A. There are no prehistoric sites present. See Historic Properties for historic sites.</i>

TABLE E-6  
Cultural Resources Quick Look Questions

<b>Native American Resources</b>		
7	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.3.2	<p><b>Has the installation identified all federally recognized Indian tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations that are culturally affiliated with the area?</b></p> <p><i>USARAK and USAF contracted with the Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc. to identify traditional cultural properties, and none was found</i></p>
8	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.3.2	<p><b>Has the area of the Proposed Action been surveyed for funerary objects, sacred sites, or objects of cultural patrimony (objects of ongoing historical, traditional, or cultural importance central to the Native American tribe or Native Hawaiian organization)?</b></p> <p><i>Thirteen archeological surveys have been conducted previously in FWA's Cantonment.</i></p>
8a	<b>N/A</b>	<p><b>Are the resources mentioned above present in the area of the Proposed Action?</b></p> <p><i>There are no traditional cultural properties located in the Proposed Action area.</i></p>
8b	<b>N/A</b>	<p><b>Have the resources been studied and summaries of these collections prepared?</b></p> <p><i>N/A. There are no traditional cultural properties present.</i></p>
8c	<b>N/A</b>	<p><b>Have these summaries been provided to lineal descendants and culturally affiliated Native American tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations that may wish to request repatriation of such objects?</b></p> <p><i>N/A. There are no traditional cultural properties present.</i></p>
8d	<b>N/A</b>	<p><b>Will the resources that are found within area of potential effect (APE) require consultation with Native American tribes?</b></p> <p><i>N/A. There are no traditional cultural properties present.</i></p>
9	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.3.2	<p><b>Is it likely that unevaluated resources will be found in the area of Proposed Action?</b></p> <p><i>The probability of discovering unknown archeological resources is low because many buildings were demolished and new buildings constructed to support Cold War activities.</i></p>
10	<b>N/A</b>	<p><b>Are activities (construction, maintenance, or use of the range) conducted as part of the Proposed Action likely to have an adverse effect on the integrity of the resource?</b></p> <p><i>N/A. There are no traditional cultural properties present.</i></p>
11	<b>N/A</b>	<p><b>Will the Proposed Action have the likelihood of altering Native American access to any identified sacred sites?</b></p> <p><i>N/A. There are no traditional cultural properties present.</i></p>
12	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.3.2	<p><b>Is the project located in or near an Alaska Native burial ground, traditional cultural property, or sacred site?</b></p> <p><i>USARAK and USAF contracted with the Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc. to identify traditional cultural properties, and none was found.</i></p>
<b>Summary</b>		
13	<b>YES</b> Subsections 4.3.2.2.2, 4.3.2.3.2, and 4.3.2.4.2	<p><b>Would the Proposed Action result in significant impact to any cultural resources?</b></p> <p><i>Digging and pile driving could result in temporary effects to historic buildings adjacent to the construction site.</i></p>

TABLE E-6  
Cultural Resources Quick Look Questions

14	<b>NO</b> Subsection 4.3.2.2.2 (15-18)	<p><b>Does the Proposed Action affect any cultural resources that have not been evaluated for National Register eligibility?</b></p> <p><i>Construction-related ground disturbance would not result in impacts to cultural resources because the location of the new facilities would be in areas that have a low probability of containing archeological resources.</i></p>
14a	<b>N/A</b>	<p><b>If YES, do those cultural resources warrant an evaluation, possibly including consultation with other parties?</b></p> <p><i>N/A.</i></p>
15	<b>YES</b> ICRMP Historic Properties Component	<p><b>Are any resources covered by previously existing resource Programmatic Agreements or MOAs?</b></p> <p><i>There is an MOA between USARAK and the Alaska SHPO with regard to retaining Building 3023. However, this building will not be affected under the Proposed Action.</i></p>
16	<b>YES</b> Subsection 4.3.2.2.2	<p><b>Are there other potential impacts to cultural resources that individually or collectively could result in significant cumulative effects?</b></p> <p><i>The construction and demolition under the Proposed Action will affect the NHL and the viewsheds surrounding Ladd Field. In addition, other past, present, and future construction projects will contribute to cumulative effects to historic properties, the NHL, and the viewsheds identified surrounding Ladd Field.</i></p>

TABLE E-7  
Noise Effects Quick Look Questions

1	<b>NO</b> Subsection 4.4.2.3	<p><b>Will the Proposed Action create noise zones (Zones 1, 2, or 3) that will extend off the installation?</b></p> <p><i>There are no new noise zones created under the Proposed Action. However, existing Noise Zone 2 contours for aircraft noise at Ladd AAF currently extend approximately 1 mile beyond the eastern boundary of FWA and contain a small residential area.</i></p>
2	<b>YES</b> Subsections 2.5.3 and 2.5.4	<p><b>Does the Proposed Action increase the level or intensity of military activity?</b></p> <p><i>There would be an increase in the number of takeoffs and landings of military helicopters under both Alternatives 2 and 3. While the frequency of helicopter operations would increase, the noise levels would not increase (see question #1).</i></p>
3	<b>NO</b> Subsections 4.4.2.2.3 and 4.4.2.3	<p><b>Does the Proposed Action include the use of noisier equipment (or munitions) than that historically used at the proposed site(s)?</b></p> <p><i>The weapons systems are the same as in the No Action alternative and new aircraft (Kiowa and Apache helicopters) are quieter than those that are currently used.</i></p>
4	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.4.2	<p><b>Are there any human populations or populations of sensitive animal species within the noise zones?</b></p> <p><i>Existing NZ II contours for aircraft noise at Ladd AAF currently extend approximately 1 mile beyond the eastern boundary of FWA and contain a small residential area. A small portion of the existing FRA NZ II contours extends into the Cook Inlet and could affect the beluga whale population. (Impacts to beluga whales are addressed in the Wildlife and Fisheries section of the EIS.)</i></p>
5	<b>YES</b> Subsection 4.4.2.2.3 and Public Scoping Document Section 4.2.1	<p><b>Has the adjacent civilian community (nearest the location of the Proposed Action) complained about any noise associated with past or ongoing activities?</b></p> <p><i>During a public scoping in Anchorage, the public expressed concern that noise impact be considered during the EIS process. The EIS considered noise impacts, and neither Alternative 2 nor 3 will result in incompatible land use within the noise zones. Noise levels are not expected to increase under either alternative.</i></p>
6	<b>NO</b> Subsection 4.4.2.2.3	<p><b>Are there local or regional controversies over noise levels at the installation that would indicate the need for a cumulative effects analysis?</b></p> <p><i>No incompatible land use exists within the noise corridors.</i></p>
7	<b>NO</b>	<p><b>Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?</b></p> <p><i>Neither Alternative 2 nor Alternative 3 would increase the noise impacts (i.e., size of noise contours) for any location.</i></p>

TABLE E-8  
Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Wastes Quick Look Questions

1	<b>YES</b> Section 2.2 and Subsection 2.5.4.3	<b>Will the Proposed Action occur on an existing installation?</b> <i>Alternatives 2 and 3 would use established cantonment areas, ranges, helicopter landing zones, drop zones, and impact areas on USARAK lands. No changes to flight corridors are proposed.</i>
2	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.5.1.1	<b>Are all aspects of the Proposed Action covered by a Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plans (SPCCP)?</b> <i>These issues are covered by USARAK Pamphlet 200-1, Hazardous Waste, Used Oil, and Hazardous Materials Management, which contains a SPCCP.</i>
3	<b>YES</b> Subsection 4.5.2.2	<b>Have project proponents taken steps to eliminate the use and potential release of hazardous materials?</b> <i>USARAK will continue to manage hazardous materials using existing environmental systems and programs ("USARAK Pamphlet 200-1") to manage the handling and disposal of hazardous materials and hazardous waste.</i>
4	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.10.3.1	<b>Are there any existing regional concerns related to chemical contamination of groundwater or surface water?</b> <i>Historical industrial operations related to Army activities within the FWA cantonment have resulted in groundwater pollution. This pollution is associated with underground storage tanks (USTs), chemical storage facilities, and chemical pollution that occurred in the early history of the installation. There are no indicators of surface water or deep groundwater pollution.</i>
5	<b>YES</b> Section 4.12	<b>Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?</b> <i>Additional cumulative effects analysis is performed in Section 4.12</i>

TABLE E-9  
Biological Resources Quick Look Questions

<b>Threatened and Endangered Species</b>		
1	<b>YES</b> Section 3.6	<b>Has the installation been surveyed for the presence of federal- or state-listed threatened or endangered species (TES)?</b>
1a	<b>YES</b> Section 3.6	<b>Did the survey reveal the presence of any federal- or state-listed TES?</b> <i>There are no terrestrial TES occur on USARAK lands. However, the Cook Inlet Beluga Whale has recently been listed as endangered under the ESA/MMPA. The Beluga is known to use Eagle River, which is located within the active Eagle River Flats military impact area.</i>
2	<b>NO</b> Section 3.6	<b>Are there any proposed species that may be placed on the TES list in the future?</b>
3	<b>NO</b> Section 3.6	<b>If TES have been found, has the U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service (USFWS) been consulted?</b> <i>Not on this proposed action. The Army is currently consulting with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) regarding the EIS for Year-Round Firing at Eagle River Flats Impact Area.</i>
4	<b>YES</b> Section 3.6	<b>Does the installation have an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP)?</b> <i>Yes.</i>
5	<b>NO</b> Section 3.6	<b>Does the installation have an Endangered Species Management Plan (ESMP)?</b> <i>There is no formal ESMP, though USAG Fort Richardson is currently preparing a Biological Assessment on the potential impacts to beluga whales associated with military training at Eagle River Flats Impact Area. Surveys have been conducted in Eagle River and Eagle Bay and beluga whales have been observed. The INRMP Ecosystem Management Plan does discuss TES issues.</i>
6	Section 3.6.3.3.1	<b>What is the viability, size, and distribution of the TES?</b> <i>At FRA, beluga whales have been observed in the adjacent near-shore waters of Cook Inlet and in the Eagle River Flats. Some whales also have been observed as much as 1.25 miles upstream in the Eagle River (USARAK, 2007). The most recent (2008) survey estimates that 375 beluga whales comprise the Cook Inlet population (NOAA, 2008).</i>
7	Section 4.6.2.1.2 and 4.6.2.3.3	<b>What pertinent factors adversely affect the TES?</b> <i>Increases in helicopter operations at FRA would increase the potential for disturbance to beluga whales; however, this would not occur under the Proposed Action.</i>
8	<b>NO</b> Subsection 4.6.2.1.2	<b>Is the critical habitat within or adjacent to the proposed project site?</b> <i>No critical habitat has been designated yet for beluga whales.</i>
9	<b>NO</b> Subsection 4.6.2.3.3	<b>Would the actions involved in construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed project affect TES or its habitat?</b> <i>No construction would occur near TES habitat</i>
10	<b>N/A</b>	<b>What are the immediate and long-term threats to any TES and their habitats according the Biological Assessment (BA) and/or ESMP?</b> <i>The Beluga Whale Biological Assessment is not yet completed.</i>
11	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Does the USFWS agree, in writing, with the BA and its determination of jeopardy?</b> <i>The Beluga Whale Biological Assessment is not yet completed.</i>

TABLE E-9  
Biological Resources Quick Look Questions

12	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Does the BA find that the TES could potentially be in jeopardy from the Proposed Action?</b> <i>The Beluga Whale Biological Assessment is not yet completed.</i>
<b>Wildlife and Fisheries</b>		
13	<b>NO</b> Subsections 3.6.3.5 and 4.6.2	<b>Would the alternatives result in a significant impact to any wildlife or fish species identified as management priorities by the installation's Ecosystem Management Plan?</b> <i>The primary impacts of the proposed actions are contingent on the extent of training area and flight corridor use. These impacts would range from low to very low. Additionally, construction in the Cantonment would have low or no effect on wildlife and fish populations because the Cantonment is primarily an urban environment.</i>
<b>Vegetation</b>		
14	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.1.2.2	<b>Would the Proposed Action result in a significant loss of vegetation?</b> <i>Ground-disturbing activities are limited to the cantonment area, which consists of urban, landscaped, or previously disturbed vegetation.</i>
15	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Has a forest stand or vegetation community map been created for the area?</b> <i>Ground-disturbing activities are limited to the cantonment area, which consists of urban, landscaped, or previously disturbed vegetation.</i>
16	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Is the proposed site effectively managed as part of an installation Integrated Training Area Management (ITAM) program?</b> <i>Any ground disturbance under the Proposed Action will occur in the cantonment area, which is not managed by the ITAM program.</i>
17	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.1.2.2	<b>Will the Proposed Action affect salvageable lumber?</b> <i>Ground-disturbing activities are limited to areas within the cantonment area that do not have salvageable timber.</i>
18	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.1.2.2	<b>Is the site characterized by poor vegetative cover or high erosion?</b> <i>Ground-disturbing activities are limited to the cantonment area, which consists of urban, landscaped, or previously disturbed vegetation. Erosion control measures outlined in the FWA BMPs will prevent additional sedimentation to waters of the US as a result of construction activities.</i>
19	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.1.2.2	<b>Would a significant amount of rare plant habitat be impacted by the Proposed Action?</b> <i>No listed, proposed, or candidate species are known to occur on the FWA cantonment area.</i>
20	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.1.2.2	<b>Would the Proposed Action result in the potential introduction or spread of any highly invasive plant species?</b> <i>Most non-native plant populations in Alaska are small and largely restricted to areas of anthropogenic disturbance. Invasive species occur on all three posts in Alaska; however, invasive plant species proliferation is currently minimal within the FWA cantonment area. BMPs, such as washing vehicles prior to entering construction sites, would drastically decrease the spread potential of invasive species.</i>
<b>Wetlands</b>		
21	<b>NO</b> Section 3.6	<b>Are TES associated with any of the wetlands resources in the vicinity of potential installation proposed actions?</b> <i>The Cook Inlet Beluga Whale utilizes the Eagle River, which is located within Eagle River Flats, tidal marsh.</i>

TABLE E-9  
Biological Resources Quick Look Questions

22	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.1.2.3	<b>Would the Proposed Action result in significant impact to wetlands?</b> <i>The standard mitigation measures employed by the Army will be effective in avoiding and minimizing impacts during construction and training activities.</i>
23	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.1.2.3	<b>Does a wetland delineation exist for the Proposed Action footprint?</b> <i>The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Waterways Experiment Station and Cold Region Research and Engineering Laboratory have delineated the wetlands on FWA and DTA. Wetlands are currently being delineated within the FWA cantonment area.</i>
24	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.1.2.3	<b>Are future actions by non-military and other military entities expected and would they cause impacts on wetland resources?</b> <i>Yes, future development is proposed for Interior Alaska as well as FWA, and will likely impact wetland resources as approximately 43% of the state of Alaska is classified as wetland. The Army will continue to avoid wetlands to the greatest extent possible. And where not possible, the Army will minimize impacts to wetlands and prescribe mitigation measures.</i>
<b>Summary</b>		
25	<b>YES</b> (Cantonment Only) Subsection 2.5	<b>Does the Proposed Action involve a new disturbance, or does it extend beyond the existing disturbance boundaries?</b> <i>There would be new construction disturbance associated with the Proposed Action. However, this disturbance would occur in the cantonment area, which consists of urban, landscaped, or previously disturbed terrain.</i>
26	<b>YES</b> Subsections 4.6.2.2.1 through 4.6.2.2.5 and 3.1.2.2	<b>Have previous projects in this area affected the same species or habitats that could be affected by the Proposed Action?</b> <i>All training activity would occur in preexisting flight corridors, ranges, training areas, and landing pads.</i>
27	<b>YES</b> Subsection 4.6.2	<b>Would the Proposed Action likely result in further construction projects or increased activity in the area in the future that could affect the same species and habitats potentially being affected by the Proposed Action?</b> <i>There will be a marked increase in the helicopter activity in current flight corridors.</i>
28	<b>NO</b> Subsection 4.6.2	<b>Does the Proposed Action involve development that would cause significant loss of preferred habitat for any management priority species?</b> <i>The only land disturbance associated with the Proposed Action is in the cantonment area.</i>
29	<b>YES</b> Subsections 2.5.3 and 2.5.4	<b>Does the Proposed Action increase the level of intensity of military activity in the area?</b> <i>The frequency of helicopter flights on the installations and through the corridors would increase under the proposed action.</i>
30	<b>YES</b> Subsections 4.6.2.2.1 through 4.6.2.2.6 and 4.6.2.3.1 through 4.6.2.3.3	<b>Is habitat for a Species of Concern being affected?</b> <i>There could be minor impacts to a number of Species of Concern.</i>
31	<b>YES</b> (Migratory Corridors) Subsection 4.6.2.2.6	<b>Are there special interest management areas in the vicinity that could be affected by the Proposed Action?</b> <i>Sandhill cranes are likely to encounter military aircraft using the flight corridor between FRA and FWA. Of particular concern along the flight corridor is the Isabel Pass to FWA and DTA because it transects the primary migration corridor used by large numbers of cranes. Special interests management areas are described in Section 3.6; none are likely to adversely affected by the Proposed Action.</i>



TABLE E-9  
Biological Resources Quick Look Questions

32	<b>YES</b>	<b>Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?</b>
	Subsection 4.12	<i>Cumulative effects analysis for Wildlife and Fisheries is provided in Section 4.12.</i>

**TABLE E-10**  
Air Quality Quick Look Questions

1 <b>YES</b> Subsections 3.7.1 and 3.7.3.	<p><b>Is the installation located completely, or partially, in a designated non-attainment area or maintenance area relative to compliance with national ambient air quality standards NAAQS?</b></p> <p><i>FWA is classified as a Nonattainment Area Major Facility because it has the potential to emit more than 100 tpy of a regulated air contaminant, CO, in an area classified as nonattainment or maintenance area for that contaminant. FWA is also a Hazardous Air Pollutant (HAP) Major Facility because it has the potential to emit more than 25 tpy of HAPs.</i></p> <p><i>In December 2008, EPA designated the Fairbanks area, including FWA, as nonattainment for the new standard for particulate matter less than 2.5 microns (PM<sub>2.5</sub>). The primary sources for emissions were determined to be home heating from woodstoves and distillate oil, industrial sources, and mobile emissions. The State of Alaska, North Star Borough, and City of Fairbanks expressed concerns with the monitoring data used to develop the nonattainment boundary, and the City has committed to a long-term monitoring program to collect additional data to inform the boundary.</i></p>
2 <b>YES</b> Subsection 4.7.2.4, Appendix D	<p><b>Will the Proposed Action emit a criteria pollutant and/or hazardous air pollutants during its construction and/or operational phase?</b></p> <p><i>Air emissions would occur at FWA from construction activities, operation of new generators, and increased mobile source emissions from new personnel. Emissions from these sources are below construction permit de minimus levels and below general conformity thresholds for CO and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Direct and indirect emissions will not increase emission levels above the NAAQS or significantly impact the timely attainment of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS.</i></p>
2a <b>NO</b> Subsections 4.7.2.2.3, 4.7.2.3.3, 4.7.2.4, and Appendix D	<p><b>Will such emissions exceed “de minimus” standards, as designated in federal or state air quality regulations?</b></p> <p><i>Construction emissions would be short term and are not expected to cause a violation of any applicable NAAQS. Mobile source emissions associated with new personnel would contribute a small amount to regional emissions and would not be expected to cause a violation of any applicable NAAQS. Generators and maintenance activities at new facilities on FWA will generate emissions, primarily nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) and sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) and are below minor permit to construct de minimus levels. Emissions would fall within the Title V permit conditions for operational use and hours, and would not be expected to cause a violation of any applicable NAAQS. In addition, direct and indirect emissions are below general conformity thresholds for CO and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and will not increase emissions above the NAAQS or significantly impact the timely attainment of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS.</i></p>
3 <b>NO</b>	<p><b>Are there any sensitive receptors of air pollutant effects associated with the installation (examples of such receptors include forests, agricultural crops, threatened or endangered plant or animal species, and human beings with breathing difficulties or other respiratory illnesses)?</b></p> <p><i>Construction, generator emissions would be localized and away from residential and natural areas; while, mobile sources of emissions would be minor compared to the area vehicle emissions burdens in each air quality region.</i></p>
4 <b>YES</b> Subsections 3.7.3.1 and 3.7.3.3.1	<p><b>Are there wide variations in the monthly and/or seasonal patterns of atmospheric dispersion conditions at the installation?</b></p> <p><i>During winter, temperature inversions occur at FWA that contribute to poor air quality. In summer, wildfires can cause smoky periods lasting from days to weeks that affect both visibility and air quality.</i></p>
5 <b>NO</b>	<p><b>Within the last 5 years, has the installation been subject to Notices of Violations (NOVs) or fines relative to Clean Air Act requirements?</b></p>

**TABLE E-10**  
Air Quality Quick Look Questions

6	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.7.3.1.1	<p><b>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?</b></p> <p><i>FWA, as a major source for air contaminants, is required to obtain a Title V permit. Currently, FWA operates under ADEC Title V permit #AQ236TVP02, which was issued on December 5, 2008, and expired on December 4, 2013. The Central Heat and Power Plant (CHPP) was privatized and is operating under permit #AQ1121TVP01 managed by Doyon Utilities LLC. Doyon Utilities LLC Title V permit was issued December 5, 2008 and will expire December 4, 2013. The two permitted facilities, FWA and CHPP, would be combined for any potential permit modeling analysis.</i></p> <p><i>FWA is participating with federal, state, and regional officials to provide air quality monitoring data to inform nonattainment boundaries for PM<sub>2.5</sub>. At this stage, it is not clear what additional measures, if any, will be required at FWA to reduce PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions.</i></p>
7	<b>NO</b> Appendix D	<p><b>Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?</b></p> <p><i>The Proposed Action has demonstrated general conformity and would not contribute to violation of NAAQS. Other regional actions that could contribute to violations of NAAQS also are independently reviewed for conformity. The Fairbanks North Star Borough and ADEC will be implementing emission monitoring, a future vehicle emission testing study for PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and other measures to achieve attainment of PM<sub>2.5</sub>. An attainment demonstration plan will be developed to define these measures.</i></p>

TABLE E-11  
Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice Quick Look Questions

1	<b>YES</b> Table 3.8b Subsections 3.8.3.1.1 and 3.8.3.2.1	<b>Has the local region of influence (ROI) undergone any major changes in economic activity or population in the last 10 years?</b>  <i>Since the 2000 Census, 2004 with the Transformation of US Army Alaska, more than 4,000 Soldiers, family members and civilian employees (some of the latter hired from the local area) have been added to the Fort Wainwright population. During the same period, approximately 6,000 have been added to the Fort Richardson population.</i>
1a	<b>YES</b> Subsections 4.8.2.2.1 and 4.8.2.3.1	<b>Will the Proposed Action contribute to this ongoing trend?</b>  <i>There would be moderate population increases to Fairbanks (2 percent under Alternative 2, 4.8 percent under Alternative 3) and minor population increases to Anchorage under the proposed actions.</i>
2	<b>YES</b> Table 3.8b	<b>Is the community undergoing rapid growth?</b>  <i>Since 2000, the population of Fairbanks and Anchorage has increased 14.4 and 12.5 percent, respectively, a higher percentage than the State of Alaska at 8 percent. [Anchorage and Fairbanks account for 67 percent of the total population of Alaska.] At least 3 percent of the growth in the Fairbanks area was due to military growth.</i>
2a	<b>NO</b> Table 3.8b	<b>Is the community seeing reduction in growth?</b>  <i>See Question 2 above.</i>
2b	<b>ADD TO</b> Subsections 4.8.2.2.1 and 4.8.2.3.1	<b>Does the Proposed Action add to that trend or does it reduce (mitigate) that trend?</b>  <i>The Fairbanks area will see the addition of approximately 1,705 Soldiers and family members under Alternative 2 (2 percent increase) and about 3,480 Soldiers and family members (5 percent increase) under Alternative 3. There would be a minor impact to the population of Anchorage under Alternative 3 (1,040 Soldiers and family members, or 0.3 percent), and no impact to the population of Anchorage under Alternative 2.</i>
3	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.8.1	<b>Are political stresses evident over the use of community lands or services infrastructure?</b>  <i>Scoping comments indicate that socioeconomics is not a major concern in the surrounding communities for this project, with the exception of effects on housing demand in the Fairbanks area (one comment).</i>
4	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.3.3.2	<b>Would the Proposed Action result in any significant impacts to any resource areas?</b>  <i>Because of the more limited market, the population increase associated with Alternative 2 will result in more competition for housing and essential services in the Fairbanks area. Alternative 3 would result in even greater competition for housing, but school capacities would not be adversely impacted.</i>
5	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.1.2.10	<b>Does the Proposed Action have a disproportionate adverse impact on minority populations?</b>  <i>Minority or low-income populations would not experience disproportionate effects from the Proposed Action.</i>
6	<b>YES</b>	<b>Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?</b>  <i>No projects have been identified for the Fairbanks area, about which enough is known to assess possible cumulative analysis. The Grow the Army initiative would result in only minor population growth at Fort Wainwright.</i>  <i>Alternative 3 in combination with population increases from Grow the Army at Fort Richardson would result in more competition for on-Base barracks (currently at a deficit) and family housing (currently at a surplus) and would further increase school enrollments.</i>

TABLE E-12

## Soils and Permafrost Effects Quick Look Questions

1	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.9.2	<b>Does the Proposed Action involve a new range or maneuver area, or does it extend beyond the existing boundaries of either?</b> <i>The Proposed Action will use preexisting ranges and maneuver areas.</i>
2	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.10.3.1	<b>Are there sensitive downstream land uses, and has sedimentation/pollution been a downstream issue in the past?</b> <i>Fairbanks is located downstream from FWA on the Chena River. Approximately 15 miles of the Chena River near Fairbanks have been on the State of Alaska's Subsection 303(d) list of impaired waters since 1990. The primary pollutants of concern include sediment from urban runoff.</i>
4	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.9.3.1	<b>Will permafrost be significantly impacted?</b> <i>There is a possibility that permafrost is located in areas of proposed construction on FWA. Increased training activities on training lands would likely cause increased permafrost degradation. Best management practices (BMPs) followed by the Army, however, mitigate these impacts so that they are not significant.</i>
5	<b>NO</b> Subsections 4.9.2.2.2 and 4.9.3	<b>Would the Proposed Action result in a significant impact to soil resources?</b> <i>Most of the construction area is currently urbanized and will be managed using BMPs.</i>
6	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.9.3.1	<b>Does the Proposed Action fall within an area covered by an existing soil survey?</b> <i>There is a soil survey for the proposed project areas.</i>
7	<b>NO</b> Subsection 4.9.3	<b>Would implementation of the Proposed Action jeopardize soil stability and increase erosion potential beyond the construction and stabilization period?</b> <i>BMPs would be implemented to reduce impacts to soils during construction activities, and disturbed soils would be revegetated following construction.</i>
8	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Are the proposed sites effectively managed as part of an installation Integrated Training Area Management/Land Rehabilitation and Maintenance (ITAM/LRAM) program?</b> <i>ITAM only manages training area lands, and the construction portion of the Proposed Action would only affect soil erosion within the cantonment area.</i>
9	<b>YES</b> Subsections 2.5.3 and 2.5.4	<b>Does the proposed Action increase the level of intensity of military activity on military lands?</b> <i>Existing ranges, landing zones, refueling points and impact areas would be used more intensely for integrated air and ground training. The new training, however, is primarily aerial (which would support existing ground training to make it more realistic)..</i>
10	<b>NO</b> Subsection 4.9.3	<b>Are there other potential impacts to soil resources that individually or collectively could result in significant cumulative effects?</b> <i>The only potential soil impacts would result from proposed construction and training activities.</i>
11	<b>NO</b>	<b>Is the site highly eroded and characterized by gullies and/or poor vegetative cover?</b> <i>The proposed construction area is in a currently urbanized area.</i>
12	<b>NO</b> Subsection 4.9.3	<b>Are there sensitive soils within the proposed project that would require additional stabilization measures from the Proposed Action beyond standard best management practices (BMPs)?</b> <i>Permafrost will be avoided during siting of construction areas. However, when construction in permafrost is unavoidable, standard BMPs will be implemented. No special BMPs are needed.</i>

TABLE E-12

Soils and Permafrost Effects Quick Look Questions

---

13	<b>NO</b>	<b>Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?</b> <i>Construction of facilities within the FWA Cantonment will have a minimal effect on soils and permafrost because the construction areas are largely urbanized already. Disturbance of soils or permafrost during construction can be managed effectively with standard BMPs.</i>
----	-----------	--

---

TABLE E-13

## Water Resources Management Quick Look Questions

1	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.10.3.1	<p><b>Is the installation located completely, or partially, in a designated sole source aquifer area, and/or have local surface waters been designated as having water quality concerns relative to compliance with water quality standards or criteria?</b></p> <p><i>There are no sole source aquifers in Alaska (USEPA, 2008). However, approximately 15 miles of the Chena River near Fairbanks have been on the State of Alaska's Section 303(d) list of impaired waters since 1990 for petroleum hydrocarbons, oil and grease, and sediment. The Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation is collecting additional water quality data and expects to issue total maximum daily limit (TMDL) standards for the impaired segment in 2010.</i></p>
2	<b>NO</b> Subsection 4.10.2.2.3	<p><b>During its construction and/or operational phase, will the Proposed Action exhibit point and/or nonpoint emissions of water pollutants?</b></p> <p><i>Construction of new facilities will result in ground disturbance, and sediment could enter the Chena River unless mitigation measures (best management practices) are followed to prevent such emissions. All construction on FWA, however, will need to comply with a storm water general permit and associated Storm Water Management Plan to protect water quality during construction. The Army requires that construction contractors obtain the necessary permits. Operation of new facilities, particularly those that generate or use petroleum products, could also pollute surrounding waters if storm water is not properly managed. Permanent water quality treatments, such as oil-water separators, would be employed in new construction to protect long-term water quality. Therefore, no adverse impacts would be expected from either construction or operation of new facilities.</i></p>
2a	<b>NO</b> Subsection 4.10.2.2.3	<p><b>Will such emissions exceed standards as designated in federal or State water quality regulations or permits?</b></p> <p><i>Construction and operation of new facilities will comply with water quality regulations, and potential adverse impacts to water quality would be minimal. Compliance with the required NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges during construction along with the respective storm water pollution prevention plans (SWPPPs) and best management practices (BMPs), FWA's Multi-Sector General Permit (MSGP) for Industrial Activities for operations, and FWA's municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) permit would improve the quality of water entering the Chena River.</i></p>
3	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.10.3.1	<p><b>Is the installation located in an area where the available surface and/or groundwater supplies are already stressed due to excessive use and/or drought conditions?</b></p> <p><i>FWA is underlain by an alluvial aquifer that is recharged by the Tanana River. Groundwater potential is best along the alluvial banks of the river, where wells may yield approximately 300 gallons per minute at less than 200 feet in depth.</i></p>
4	<b>NO</b> Subsection 4.10.2.1	<p><b>Will the additional water requirements for the Proposed Action be large in relation to the available surface and/or groundwater supplies?</b></p> <p><i>Available water supply and potable water production capacity is more than adequate to absorb the additional populations represented by Alternatives 2 and 3.</i></p>
5	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.10.3.1	<p><b>Are there wide variations in the monthly and/or seasonal patterns of water use at the installation?</b></p> <p><i>Water use is typically higher during the summer months, but peak use is well below existing capabilities.</i></p>
6	<b>NO</b>	<p><b>Does the proposed action threaten any sensitive receptors of water? (Examples of such receptors include aquatic ecological resources, threatened or endangered plant or animal species, and excessive human health risk levels.)</b></p> <p><i>Adherence to storm water construction permits and established BMPs will be sufficient to prevent the likelihood of contamination.</i></p>

TABLE E-13

## Water Resources Management Quick Look Questions

7	<b>NO</b> Subsection 3.10.3.1	<p><b>Within the last 5 years, has the installation been subject to Notices of Violations (NOVs) or fines relative to Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) or Clean Water Act (CWA) permit requirements? 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?</b></p> <p><i>FWA expects receipt of a new MSGP and a new MS4 permit. The previous MSGP was issued in 2001 and has expired. FWA continues to operate under the previous permit until the new permit is issued. There are currently no CWA permit NOVs. USARAK has recently privatized its utilities and SDWA responsibility has been transferred to a private utility. Nonetheless, SDWA compliance has been maintained.</i></p>
8	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.10.3.1	<p><b>Does the installation drain to an impaired waterbody?</b></p> <p><i>The majority of FWA storm water flows into the Chena River, which is listed on the State of Alaska's Section 303(d) list for impaired waters.</i></p>
9	<b>NO</b> Subsection 4.10.2.2.3	<p><b>Would the Proposed Action result in an adverse impact to surface water?</b></p> <p><i>Construction and operation of new facilities will comply with water quality regulations, and potential adverse impacts to water quality would be minimal. Compliance with the required NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges during construction, MSGP, and MS4 permit would improve the quality of water entering the Chena River).</i></p>
10	<b>YES</b> Figure 2.4b-c	<p><b>Does the Proposed Action involve development within a floodplain?</b></p> <p><i>The entire site is within the 100-year floodplain. Building within a floodplain is prohibited by Executive Orders 11988 and 11990 unless there is no practicable alternative. With the exception of the hills in the northern portion of FWA, the remainder of the cantonment area is situated within the floodplain. Consequently, there are no practicable siting alternatives. USACE's Chena River Lakes Flood Control Project protects the southern Fairbanks area including FWA.</i></p>
10a	<b>NO</b> See FONPA in Appendix C	<p><b>Are there any practicable alternatives available to constructing within a floodplain?</b></p> <p><i>No. The entire FWA cantonment area is within a floodplain (see FONPA analysis in Appendix C).</i></p>
11	<b>NO</b> Figure 2.4b-c	<p><b>Are there seasonally flooded areas within the footprint?</b></p> <p><i>USACE's Chena River Lakes Flood Control Project protects the southern Fairbanks area including FWA.</i></p>
12	<b>NO</b> Figure 2.5a-c	<p><b>Are streams, lakes, or ponds present within the footprint?</b></p> <p><i>There are no streams, lakes, or ponds within the footprint of the Proposed Action.</i></p>
13	<b>YES</b> Subsections 2.5.3 and 2.5.4	<p><b>Does the Proposed Action increase the level of intensity of military activity on military lands?</b></p> <p><i>The increased intensity of the proposed training consists primarily of aerial maneuvers. However, existing ranges, landing zones, refueling points, and impact areas would also be used. Training activities and lands would continue to be managed to minimize erosion and water quality impacts.</i></p>
14	<b>NO</b> Subsection 4.10.2.2.2	<p><b>Could the Proposed Action lead to further projects or activity in the area that could negatively affect surface water?</b></p> <p><i>There are no further proposed actions for the area and adverse impacts from O&amp;M are expected to be less than significant.</i></p>
15	<b>NO</b> Figure 2.5b-c	<p><b>Does the Proposed Action involve clearing vegetation within 75 feet of open water?</b></p>



**TABLE E-13****Water Resources Management Quick Look Questions**

16	<b>YES</b> Subsection 3.10.3.1	<b>Have negative impacts to surface water been an issue in the past?</b> <i>Approximately 15 miles of the Chena River near Fairbanks have been on the State of Alaska's Section 303(d) list of impaired waters since 1990. The primary pollutants of concern are petroleum hydrocarbons, oil and grease, and sediment from urban runoff. The Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation expects to complete a pollutant wasteload allocation for the Chena River in 2010.</i>
17	<b>NO</b> Subsection 4.10.2.4	<b>Are there other potential impacts to surface water that individually or collectively could result in significant cumulative effects?</b> <i>New development by others proposed that could affect the Chena River is subject to water quality regulations that require both short- and long-term treatment of storm water. Several roadway projects in the Fairbanks area are proposed; in each case, the Alaska Department of Transportation is including permanent water quality treatment in the proposed designs. The permanent water quality treatment will treat previously untreated runoff, improving water quality in the Chena River by filtering roadway runoff before it is discharged to the river.</i>
18	<b>NO</b>	<b>Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?</b> <i>No long-term adverse impacts to water resources are anticipated. Compliance with storm water discharge permits (and associated SWPPPs, and BMPs) during construction and operation will prevent pollutant discharges into the Chena River. Because new development (by others) must include water quality treatment, water quality would likely be improved and will not be degraded.</i>

