

SUMMARY OF SCENARIO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS [TABS FINAL VERSION]

SCENARIO #327

TITLE: HSA-0010Rv2 ESTABLISH JOINT BASE LEWIS-McCHORD

GENERAL DESCRIPTION: Realign McChord AFB by transferring the installation management functions to Ft Lewis and Fort Meyer.

This proposal affects the following Army installations:

1. Fort Lewis gains no personnel or MILCON
2. Fort Myer gains no personnel or MILCON
3. Fort Dix loses approximately 90 personnel, Fort Eustis loses approximately 200 personnel, Fort Richardson loses approximately 200 personnel and Fort Sam Houston loses approximately 100 personnel.

ANALYST:

LAST UPDATE: 19 APRIL 2005

Env Resource Area	<i>Gaining</i> Installation Assessment Inst Name: Ft Lewis	Analyst Comments (& data source(s) that drive assessment)
Air Quality	No Impact - Proposal adds no new mission or facilities to Ft Lewis - so no impact to the Environment. This is simply a transference in installation management responsibility to Ft. Lewis.	#213 – Installation is in attainment for NO2 and SO2 and “maintenance” mode for Ozone (1-hour), PM10, and CO. “Unclassifiable” for PM2.5, lead, Ozone (8-hour). #211/212 - No permit/Major Source thresholds projected to be exceeded #220 -Major operating permit #218/ISR2 - No mission impact indicated.
Cultural/Archeological/Tribal Resources	No Impact.	#229 No cemeteries imposing restrictions #230-232 248 archeological resources limiting future construction and training, native people sites (burial sites) #233-234 – 82.5% surveyed; #234 - 5 tribes (Nisqually, Puyallup, Squaxin, Yakima, Coleville Confederated) assert interest and in formal consultation. #235- 3 Historic Districts with 415 historic properties #236 - No Programmatic Agreement ISR2 - Adverse impact to mission (Amber) #201 – No constraints on operation
Dredging	No Impact.	
Land Use Constraints/Sensitive Resource Areas	No Impact.	Buildable Acres – 5,912 acres available, 0 acres req'd #254, 256 - No SRAs that restrict development ISR – No impacts/restrictions CERL – Moderate to High Encroachment Projected
Marine Mammals/Marine Resources	No Impact.	

Noise	No Impact.	#239 – No noise contours extend off installation. CERL - moderate encroachment ISR Rating is “Amber” for Noise
Threatened & Endangered Species/Critical Habitat	No Impact.	#249 – Salmon (Endangered Species – Marine) restricts less than one acre. #259 – Five TES species identified on main installation (Bald Eagle, Bald Eagle YTC, Water Howellia, Northern Spotted Owl, and Spring Chinook Salmon), w/ limited restr. on ranges. 72 acres impacting training and 60% of installation impacted. #260-262 – Critical habitat in place that does not restrict missions, biological opinion in place that does not impose restrictions. #263 – 5 Candidate Species: Taylor’s Checkerspot, Mardon Skipper, Streaked Horned Lark, Mazama Pocket Gopher ISR2 shows no impact. #264 – No proposed candidate critical habitat
Waste Management	No Impact.	Q#269 – Installation does not have RCRA Subpart X permit
Water Resources	No Impact.	#276 – over sole source aquifer #278, 279, 293 – No water restr IREM - infr can support 28K more people, no personnel are added. #822 - dom ww treatment plant
Wetlands	No Impact.	#251, 257 - Installation surveyed for wetlands and wetlands restrict less than 15% of the range.

Env Resource Area	#2 <i>Gaining</i> Installation Assessment Inst Name: Ft. Myer	Analyst Comments (& data source(s) that drive assessment)
Air Quality	No Impact.	Proposal adds no new mission or facilities to Ft Myer - so no impact to the Environment. No personnel moving because this is simply a transference in installation management responsibility to Ft. Myer.
Cultural/ Archeological Resources	No Impact.	
Dredging	No Impact.	
Land Use Constraints/Sensitive Resources	No Impact.	
Marine Mammals/Marine Resources	No Impact.	
Noise	No Impact.	
Threatened & Endangered Species/Critical	No Impact.	
Waste Management	No Impact.	
Water Resources	No Impact.	
Wetlands	No Impact.	

Env Resource Area	<i>Losing</i> Installation Assessment Inst Name: Ft. Dix, Ft. Sam Houston, Ft. Eustis, Ft Richardson	Analyst Comments (& data source(s) that drive assessment)
Air Quality	No Impact.	Environmental impacts to losing installations are considered neutral or positive to all ten resource areas.
Cultural/ Archeological Resources	No Impact.	
Dredging	No Impact.	
Land Use Constraints/Sensitive Resources	No Impact.	
Marine Mammals/Marine Resources	No Impact.	
Noise	No Impact.	
Threatened & Endangered Species/Critical	No Impact.	
Waste Management	No Impact.	
Water Resources	No Impact.	
Wetlands	No Impact.	

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF SCENARIO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS (CONTINUED)

SCENARIO # HSA-0010RV2

IMPACTS OF COSTS

Env Resource Area	Gaining Installation Inst Name: Ft Lewis, Fort Meyer	Losing Installation Inst Name: Fort Dix, Fort Eustis, Fort Sam Houston.
Environmental Restoration*	None for both installations.	None. Installations are not closing.
Waste Management	None for both installations.	N/A
Environmental Compliance	None for both installations.	N/A
COBRA Costs:	None for both installations.	None.