

**Draft Supplemental Environmental Assessment
(SEA) for
Proposal to Improve F-22 Operational Efficiency at Joint Base
Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska**



**Prepared FOR:
Department of the Air Force**

11 January 2022

Letters or other written comments provided may be published in the Final EA. As required by law, substantive comments will be addressed in the Final EA and made available to the public. Any personal information provided will be kept confidential. Private addresses will be compiled to develop a mailing list for those requesting copies of the Final EA. However, only the names of the individuals making comments and their specific comments will be disclosed. Personal home addresses and phone numbers will not be published in the Final EA.

CONTENTS

- Purpose of and Need for Action1**
 - 1.1 Introduction1
 - 1.1.1 Project Setting1
 - Runway Extension Project and 2018 EIS.....1
 - 1.1.2 Decision to Supplement4
 - 1.2 Purpose of the Action.....9
 - 1.3 Need for the Action9
 - 1.4 Decision to be Made9
 - 1.5 Cooperating Agency and Intergovernmental Coordination/Consultations.....9
 - 1.5.1 Cooperating Agencies10
 - 1.5.2 Interagency Consultations.....10
 - 1.5.3 Intergovernmental/Government to Government Consultations.....10
 - 1.6 Public and Agency Review of SEA11
- Description of the Preferred Alternative and Alternatives.....12**
 - 2.1 Proposed Action.....12
 - 2.2 Selection Standards12
 - 2.3 Screening of Alternatives13
 - 2.3.1 Alternative 1: Construct Runway Extension and Ground Improvements to Stabilize Fish and Triangle Lake Hydrology (Preferred Alternative)14
 - 2.3.2 Alternative 2: Construct Runway Extension and Fill Fish and Triangle Lake Wetland Complex with Runway Extension Excavation Spoils14
 - 2.3.3 Alternative 3: Construct Runway Extension and Fill Wetlands East of Fish Lake with Runway Extension Excavation Spoils14
 - 2.3.4 Alternative 4: Construct Runway Extension and Ground Improvement, Fill Fish Lake with Runway Extension Excavation Spoils14
 - 2.3.5 Alternative 5: Construct Runway Extension by Regrading the Runway14
 - 2.3.6 Alternative 6: Extend RW 16 to the South15
 - 2.4 Results of Screening15
 - 2.5 Detailed Descriptions of the Alternatives16
 - 2.5.1 Preferred Alternative: Construct Runway Extension and Ground Improvements to Stabilize Fish and Triangle Lake Hydrology (Preferred Alternative)17
 - 2.5.2 No Action Alternative.....20
- Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences21**
 - 3.1 Safety23
 - 3.1.1 Affected Environment.....23

3.1.2	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative.....	25
3.1.3	Environmental Consequences: No Action Alternative	26
3.2	Physical Resources	26
3.2.1	Earth Resources	26
3.2.2	Water Resources	27
3.2.3	Wetlands	30
3.3	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste	49
3.3.1	Affected Environment	50
3.3.2	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative.....	51
3.3.3	Environmental Consequences: No Action Alternative	52
3.4	Biological Resources	54
3.4.1	Vegetation.....	54
3.4.2	Fish and Wildlife.....	56
3.4.3	Special-Status Species	58
3.5	Cultural Resources	63
3.5.1	Affected Environment	63
3.5.2	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative.....	63
3.5.3	Environmental Consequences: No Action Alternative	64
3.6	Land Use and Recreation	64
3.6.1	Affected Environment	64
3.6.2	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative.....	65
3.6.3	Environmental Consequences: No Action Alternative	66
3.7	Air Quality	66
3.7.1	Affected Environment	68
3.7.2	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative.....	68
3.7.3	Environmental Consequences: No Action Alternative	73
3.8	Other NEPA Considerations.....	73
3.8.1	Unavoidable Adverse Effects.....	73
3.8.2	Relationship of Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity	74
3.8.3	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources	75
List of Preparers		76
References and Resources		77
List of Acronyms and Abbreviations		79

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1. Summary of Project Feature Changes between 2018 EIS and SEA Preferred Alternative4

Table 1-2. Comparison of Potential Environmental Impacts.....7

Table 2-1. Screening of Alternatives against Selection Standards16

Table 3-1. Resource Areas Eliminated from Detailed Analysis22

Table 3-2. JBER Wetland Types, Acreage, and Proportion32

Table 3-3. Wetland Acreage by Class in the Sixmile Creek Outlet Sub-watershed36

Table 3-4. Wetland Acreage by Class in the Ship Creek Outlet Sub-watershed.....37

Table 3-5. 2018 EIS Wetland Impacts for 2018 EIS Selected Alternative F Compared to the Preferred Alternative.
(*) = % of Total Mapped Wetlands on JBER.....42

Table 3-6. Preferred Alternative Direct Wetland Impacts by REV class47

Table 3-7. Preferred Alternative Indirect Wetland Impacts by REV Class.....48

Table 3-8. State of Alaska Soil and Groundwater Cleanup Levels for PFOS and PFOA.....50

Table 3-9. Preferred Alternative Vegetation Impacts Compared to 2018 EIS55

Table 3-10. Current Sortie Patterns that Produce Sound Levels at Water Surface > 88 dB re 20 µPa58

Table 3-11. Preferred Alternative Sortie Pattern Overwater Flight Time for Patterns Producing Powerful Sound
.....60

Table 3-12. Air Quality EIAP Insignificance Indicators.....70

Table 3-13. General Conformity De Minimis Values for Criteria Pollutants for Maintenance Areas.....70

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1. Location of Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson and Proposed Runway Extension.....2

Figure 1-2. 16/34 Extension and Associated Surface Modifications, as described in 2018 EIS3

Figure 1-3. Preferred Alternative Project Footprint and Features in Contrast to 2018 EIS Selected Alternative F
Footprint5

Figure 2-1. Preferred Alternative (Preferred Alternative): Construct Ground Improvements to Stabilize Fish and
Triangle Lake Hydrology18

Figure 2-2. Wetland Complex Overflow Culvert and Excess Water Diversion19

Figure 3-1. Elmendorf Field Bird and Waterfowl Exclusion Zones from 3WGI 91-212.....25

Figure 3-2. Geotechnical Borehole Locations29

Figure 3-3. JBER Wetlands (AFCEC 2021c).....33

Figure 3-4. 2018 Wetland Mapping in Contrast to Current Wetland Mapping.....34

Figure 3-5. Sixmile Creek Outlet Sub-watershed Wetlands36

Figure 3-6. Ship Creek Outlet Sub-watershed Wetlands	37
Figure 3-7. Region of Influence (ROI) Wetlands by Relative Ecological Value (REV) Class.....	40
Figure 3-8. 2018 EIS Wetland Impacts in Contrast to Preferred Alternative Wetland Impacts	43
Figure 3-9. Preferred Alternative Wetland Type Direct Impacts by Wetland Type.....	46
Figure 3-10. Preferred Alternative Direct Wetland Impacts to Relative Ecological Value Class	47
Figure 3-11. Preferred Alternative Indirect Wetland Impacts by REV Class	48
Figure 3-12. Draft Schematic of Soil Analytical Results (Brice 2021).	51
Figure 3-13. Proposed Redistribution of Chemically Impacted Soil	53
Figure 3-14. Vegetation Impacts by Land Cover Type	56
Figure 3-15. Water Surface Area Affected by F-22 Related In-Air Sound Levels	59
Figure 3-16. Water Surface Area Affected by F-22 Related In-Air Sound Levels Under Preferred Alternative..	62

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Interagency/Intergovernmental Coordination and Public Participation

Appendix B. Supporting Documents

Appendix C. Air Quality Analysis

Section 1

Purpose of and Need for Action

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA) is for the Proposed Action, “Proposal to Improve F-22 Operational Efficiency at Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska.”

1.1.1 Project Setting

Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER), the former U.S. Air Force (Air Force) Elmendorf Air Force Base and U.S. Department of the Army Fort Richardson, is in Southcentral Alaska, adjacent to the City of Anchorage, and occupies 73,013 acres of land (Figure 1-1). It became a joint base in 2010 and has hosted a variety of missions and aircraft types throughout its history. JBER is under Air Force command as part of the Pacific Air Forces (PACAF) and is the home of the Alaskan Command, 11th Air Force, Alaskan North American Air Defense region, Air National Guard, and the 3rd Wing (3 WG). The base includes the United States Army Alaska (USARAK) and Alaska National Guard.

Runway Extension Project and 2018 EIS

The 3 WG at JBER and Headquarters (HQ) PACAF identified the need to maintain and improve F-22 operational efficiency, as measured by pilot training time in the training airspace.

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), *Proposal to Improve F-22 Operational Efficiency at Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska* (referred herein as the 2018 EIS) was prepared to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of this Preferred Alternative in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (42 United States Code [USC] 4331 et seq.), the regulations of the President’s Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) that implement NEPA procedures (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] § 1500-1508), the Air Force Environmental Impact Assessment Process Regulations at 32 CFR § 989, and Air Force Instruction (AFI) 32-7061.

After consideration of relevant mission, operational, environmental, efficiency, and technical factors, as well as environmental consequences explained in the 2018 EIS, inputs from the public and regulatory agencies during scoping, and other relevant factors, the Air Force identified Alternative F as the Preferred Alternative (Figure 1-2). In September 2018, the Air Force issued a Record of Decision (ROD) to implement the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) Preferred Alternative, Alternative F, which consists of extending Runway 16/34 to the north for 2,500 feet to create a 10,000-foot north-south runway (RW) and changing operations to use the extended RW for more efficient F-22 flight operations, subject to the availability of funding. The ROD also concluded, in the interim, that Alternative A, which included reconfiguration of operational flight patterns, would be executed until final

design and execution of Alternative F was completed. Major project features of Alternative F are described in section 2.4.2 of the 2018 EIS.

Figure 1-1. Location of Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson and Proposed Runway Extension





Figure 1-2. 16/34 Extension and Associated Surface Modifications, as described in 2018 EIS




1.1.2 Decision to Supplement

Two principal factors led to the decision to supplement the analysis performed in the 2018 EIS. First, while completing the design of the runway extension alternative, selected by the 2018 ROD, the Air Force, in consultation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), determined that changes were necessary to meet the project's purpose and need. Second, the Air Force identified data gaps in the Environmental and Cultural Resource analyses that could be addressed through supplemental analysis. Table 1-1 and Figure 1-3 summarize the changes to Alternative F that will be analyzed in this SEA.

Table 1-1. Summary of Project Feature Changes between 2018 EIS and SEA Preferred Alternative

	Project Feature in 2018 EIS	Changes to Preferred Alternative in SEA
1	<i>Excavating Existing Terrain to Remove Topographic Barriers and Demolition of Existing Facilities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced excavation from ~15 mcy (million cubic yards) to 12 mcy • Affected area, including staging, increased from 557 acres to 655 acres to accommodate the roadway Airlifter Drive design and optimal ground improvements alignment. • Ground improvements design adds appx. 7.2 acres of wetland impacts • Selective tree clearing added to project scope • Enlarged Area of Potential Effect for cultural resources
2	<i>Disposition of Excavated Material and Demolition Debris</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced disposal of excavated material (15 mcy to 12 mcy) • Removed 2 mcy disposal area off end of RW 24 • Included additional gravel extraction/disposal areas analyzed in 2008 Gravel Pit Expansion EA (Air Force 2008) • Identified presence of pre- and polyfluoroalkyl substance (PFAS) /perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) within excavation limits • Enlarged Area of Potential Effect for cultural resources
3	<i>Runway, Overrun, and Taxiway Sub-Base Preparation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary source of sub-base material to be sourced onsite rather than off-installation
4	<i>Drainage Design and Construction</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed ground improvement design shifted alignment to the west to optimize geotechnical conditions; increasing acreage of wetland impacts by about 7.2 acres
5	<i>Runway and Taxiway Paving and Completion</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Length of runway extension increased from 2,500 feet to ~2,900 feet to ensure 10,000 feet of useable runway
6	<i>Constructing and/or Relocating Runway Support Elements</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised Area of Potential Effect for Cultural Resources
7	<i>Roadway Relocation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The final design of the Airlifter Drive design added ~5.8 acres of wetland impacts
8	<i>Flight Operations</i>	No change

*Figure 1-3. Preferred Alternative Project Footprint and Features in Contrast to 2018 EIS
Selected Alternative F Footprint*



The CEQ NEPA regulations direct agencies to prepare a supplement to either a draft or final EIS when either the “agency makes substantial changes to the Preferred Alternative that are relevant to environmental concerns” or there are “significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the Preferred Alternative or its impacts.” Alternatively, agencies may choose to conduct supplemental analysis when they determine that the additional analysis would further the purposes of NEPA. (40 CFR § 1502.9(d)(1)(i)–(ii), (d)(2)). The regulations additionally permit an EIS to be supplemented by an Environmental Assessment (EA) if the agency’s analysis supports a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

The changes to the Preferred Alternative that are relevant to environmental concerns are associated with modifications to the excavation limits, the inclusion of additional areas for gravel sources and disposal areas, development of the ground improvements design, and the evolution of the Airlifter Drive reroute design. Some changes have led to increased impacts, (for example, there is a net increase of about 10.6 acres of wetland impacts) while

other changes potentially reduce the environmental impacts (for example, the updated plans to borrow soil from more proximate locations).

In the time since the ROD was signed, the Air Force also became aware of additional information relevant to the environmental concerns of the Preferred Alternative. The additional information is based on:

- A wetland delineation conducted by the Air Force that received an Approved Jurisdictional Determination (AJD) from USACE in December 2020.
- Cultural resources surveys conducted by the Air Force in 2020 and USACE in the summer of 2021.
- A Bird-Aircraft Strike Hazard (BASH) survey conducted by Wildlife Services that collected bird data around the Fish and Triangle Lake complex from December 2020 to December 2021.
- Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) encountered by USACE during the geotechnical investigation.
- The requirement to assess the effects of in-air noise on marine mammals identified by the Air Force.

The 2018 EIS included a conservative planning assumption that the project area wetlands, including those in the Fish and Triangle Lake complex, were under the jurisdiction of USACE and that a Department of the Army (DA) permit would be required prior to the placement of fill material in the surface waters and wetlands of the complex and other depressional wetlands within the project area. A wetland delineation of the area was performed in July 2020 and the subsequent wetland delineation report requesting an AJD was submitted in September 2020 to define the jurisdictional status of the wetlands in the runway extension project area. USACE Regulatory Division determined on December 15, 2020 that all the wetlands and surface waters within the scope of the wetland delineation report were “excluded waters” and not subject to regulation under the Clean Water Act (CWA). The AJD is included in Appendix B.

The new wetland information is relevant to the environmental concerns because it changed the acreage of wetlands in the Preferred Alternative area, assigned a non-jurisdictional status to all the wetlands in the Preferred Alternative area, and removed wetland permitting requirements. The new cultural resources information is relevant to environmental concerns because it documented previously unreported sites and evaluated the eligibility of historic properties in the area of potential effect (APE) for direct and indirect effects. The BASH information is relevant because it influences the Air Force’s understanding of flight safety risk and potential mitigation measures. The effects of in-air noise on marine mammals and the discovery of PFAS is relevant to the environmental considerations of the Proposed Action, because the Air Force is required to take a hard look at the effects of its actions on the environment. This additional information informed the proposed project’s design changes. The changes and new information are summarized in Table 1-2.

The information presented in this document will serve as the basis for deciding whether the modified Preferred Alternative would result in a significant impact to the human environment,

requiring the preparation of a supplemental EIS, or whether no significant impacts would occur, in which case a FONSI would be appropriate.

Table 1-2. Comparison of Potential Environmental Impacts

Resource Area	Summary of Potential Impacts from Alternative F, the Selected Alternative from the 2018 F-22 Operational Efficiency EIS	Summary of Potential Impacts as a Result of Changes to the Preferred Alternative or New Circumstances or Information	Difference in Potential Impacts
Airspace Management and Use	Increases F-22 runway use efficiency, adheres to Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Opposite Direction Operations (ODO) guidance, and has the additional benefit of permitting JBER cross runway operations which would expedite both arrivals and departures and reduce hold times.	No change	No change
Acoustic Environment	Minor expansion of the 65 dB noise contour north and south of RW 34.	Shifting the runway 400 feet to the north would slightly reduce noise levels at Mountain View and shift noise contours slightly further north over Knik Arm.	Insignificant reduction to community and expansion to marine mammal noise impact contours.
Safety	Slight increase for the potential for bird-aircraft strikes associated with proximity to Sixmile Lake.	Preliminary study results do not indicate unmitigable BASH risk presented by Fish and Triangle Lake.	Preliminary BASH study results indicate adherence to the JBER BASH plan continues to present typically low BASH risk under 2018 EIS Alternative F or SEA Preferred Alternative.
Air Quality	Nominal increase in temporary, construction phase emissions due to additional paved surface maintenance requirements and change in F-22 operations.	Increase in temporary, construction phase emissions resulting from additional 400 feet of paved surface and maintenance requirements. De minimis increase in annual emissions from installation of three diesel-fired emergency generators.	Increase in temporary, construction phase emissions resulting from additional 400 feet of paved surface and maintenance requirements. De minimis increase in annual emissions from installation of three diesel-fired emergency generators.
Physical Resources <i>Earth Resources</i>	15.3 mcy excavated material disposed in three existing borrow pits.	12 mcy excavated material disposed in two borrow pits. Soils containing PFAS encountered in excavation limits.	3.3 mcy reduction in excavation quantity. Removed 2mcy western borrow pit. Adopted borrow pits from 2008 gravel pit expansion EA. Engaged in Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) coordination to define PFAS management requirements.

Resource Area	Summary of Potential Impacts from Alternative F, the Selected Alternative from the 2018 F-22 Operational Efficiency EIS	Summary of Potential Impacts as a Result of Changes to the Preferred Alternative or New Circumstances or Information	Difference in Potential Impacts
Physical Resources <i>Wetlands</i>	27.9 acres of direct wetland impacts.	Preferred Alternative would directly impact 38.52 acres of wetlands. 2020 wetland delineation and AJD altered acreage and jurisdictional status of wetlands.	10.6 additional acres of wetland impacts. All wetlands in Preferred Alternative area are non-jurisdictional.
Physical Resources <i>Surface Water</i>	No potential to directly disturb any surface waters in proximity to the areas under consideration for runway construction, excavation, or cut and fill activities. Indirect effects to hydrology suspected.	The potential for indirect impacts to hydrology in Fish and Triangle Lakes due to watershed alteration is confirmed.	Potential for minor impacts to hydrograph of Fish and Triangle Lakes are possible; design of ground improvements implemented to mitigate potential effects.
Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste	Potential unexploded ordnance (UXO) discovery. Normal hazardous waste generation.	PFAS management required due to discovery within excavation limits. Coordinating PFAS management with ADEC.	No change
Biological Resources <i>Marine Mammals</i>	May affect, not likely to adversely affect, Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed Cook Inlet Beluga Whales (CIBW) 2018 EIS does not explicitly describe impacts to non-ESA listed marine mammals.	No change	No change.
Biological Resources <i>Vegetation</i>	Less than significant adverse impact to vegetation types and communities abundant in the region.	Selective removal of large trees within the project limits to prevent objects from extending upward into navigable airspace.	Minor increase in vegetation/habitat impacts.
Cultural Resources	No historic properties adversely affected.	No historic properties adversely affected providing avoidance measures identified in Section 3.5.2 are implemented.	No change
Recreation/ Land Use	No impacts to recreational fishing.	Potential impacts to fishing at Fish and Triangle Lakes to mitigate BASH risk. Enlarged grading limits increase impacts to wildlife viewing/hiking opportunities.	Minor increase in recreation/land use impacts associated with enlarged grading limits and potential BASH mitigation.
Transportation and Circulation	Short term construction related impacts to traffic.	No change	No change
Socioeconomics	Beneficial impacts from construction employment and reduced air traffic congestion in the Anchorage Bowl.	No change	No change
Environmental Justice	No disproportionate impacts to off-base minority or low-income populations.	No change	No change

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE ACTION

The purpose of the SEA Preferred Alternative has not changed from the purpose of the 2018 EIS; it is to provide the 3 WG with the flexibility to distribute F-22 departures and arrivals on JBER's runways by extending the runway to the north to achieve a 10,000-foot north/south runway. Flexibility is defined as the Air Force's ability to use JBER runways in the most efficient manner possible within operational, airspace, and environmental constraints. Efficiency is measured by the amount of pilot training time in the airspace during a training mission. Improved flexibility would permit JBER to address the existing challenges to flight operations, including efficiency and safety (Air Force 2018).

1.3 NEED FOR THE ACTION

As discussed in section 1.2.1 of the 2018 EIS, the 3 WG needs to reduce restrictions to F-22- use of JBER runways to accomplish improved flexibility and efficiency of F-22 flight operations. The restrictions that need to be addressed consist of those established by the Plus-Up EA/FONSI (Air Force 2011), restrictions to runway use that do not permit the Air Force to avoid and/or reduce ODO constraints, and restrictions that do not allow for military departure and/or arrival operations to reduce congestion and improve safety associated with airspace congestion. In the process of removing and/or reducing restriction to runway use, the Air Force needs to address on- and off-base acoustical impacts. Additional information regarding the factors that created the Air Force's need are found in section 1.2.1 of the 2018 EIS.

1.4 DECISION TO BE MADE

This SEA evaluates whether the implementation of the fully designed Alternative F, the selected alternative from the 2018 ROD, would result in significant impacts on the human environment, with consideration of the design changes and new information relevant to the environmental concerns of the Preferred Alternative. If significant impacts are identified, JBER would undertake mitigation to reduce impacts to below the level of significance, supplement the 2018 EIS in accordance with CEQ regulations, or abandon the Preferred Alternative.

This SEA is a planning and decision-making tool that will be used to guide JBER in implementing the Preferred Alternative in a manner consistent with Air Force standards for environmental stewardship.

1.5 COOPERATING AGENCY AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION/CONSULTATIONS

Per the requirements of Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 (42 USC 4231(a)) and Executive Order (EO) 12372, Federal, state, and local agencies with jurisdiction that could be affected by the Preferred Alternative were notified during the development of this SEA.

Appendix A contains the list of agencies consulted during this analysis and copies of correspondence.

1.5.1 Cooperating Agencies

There are no cooperating agencies participating in this NEPA evaluation.

1.5.2 Interagency Consultations

Per the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and implementing regulations (54 U.S.C. 300101 et seq.), findings of effect, where not already addressed in the 2018 EIS, and request for concurrence on those findings were transmitted to the Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer (Alaska SHPO) on 25 October 2021 (Air Force 2021b). Concurrence with a finding that two historic properties were not adversely affected, and no historic properties were affected regarding 39 cultural resources was received from the Alaska SHPO on 17 November 2021 (SHPO 2021). Correspondence regarding the findings and concurrence on the assessment of effect is included in Appendix A.

The Air Force engaged in informal consultation under section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Protected Resources Division (PRD) regarding the Preferred Alternative to improve F-22 operational efficiency at JBER in 2016 as part of the 2018 EIS. NMFS concurred with the Air Force's determination that Preferred Alternative "may affect but was unlikely to adversely affect" the endangered Cook Inlet beluga whale (NMFS # AKR-2016-9561) on 5 August 2016. The Air Force engaged in discussion with NMFS in 2021 regarding the continued applicability of the Air Force's 2016 Biological Evaluation (BE) prepared in support of the 2018 EIS. On 1 October 2021, the Air Force determined that the prior consultation still applies, and reopening of consultation is not appropriate, and provided that position to NMFS in the form of a memorandum. The Air Force memorandum and 2016 NMFS Letter of Concurrence are included in Appendix B.

The Air Force requested a species list from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on 21 September 2021. The species list fulfills the requirements of consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). There were no additional threatened, endangered, or candidate species on the list, which is included in Appendix A.

1.5.3 Intergovernmental/Government to Government Consultations

EO 13175, *Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments* directs Federal agencies to coordinate and consult with Federally Recognized Tribes whose interests might be directly and substantially affected by activities on federally administered lands. Consistent with that executive order, Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 4710.02, *Interactions with Federally-Recognized Tribes*, and Department of Air Force Instruction (DAFI) 90-2002, *Interaction with Federally-Recognized Tribes*, Federally Recognized Tribes that are historically affiliated with the JBER geographic region will be invited to consult on all proposed undertakings that have a potential to affect properties of cultural, historical, or religious significance to the Tribes. Federal agencies must also consult with Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) corporations on the same basis as Federally Recognized

Tribes under Executive Order No. 13175 (see section 161 of Public Law (PL) 108-199, as amended by section 518 of PL 108-447). The government-to-government consultation process is distinct from NEPA consultation or the interagency coordination process, and it requires separate notification of all relevant Tribes. The timelines for Tribal consultation are also distinct from those of other consultations. The JBER point-of-contact for Federally Recognized Tribes and ANCSA corporations is the Alaska Native liaison.

The Federally Recognized Tribal governments and ANCSA corporations whose interests might be directly and substantially affected by the Preferred Alternative were invited to engage in Government-to-Government Consultation on 1 October 2021. The Federally Recognized Tribal governments and ANCSA corporations that were coordinated or consulted with regarding these actions, as well as responses received by the time of publication, are listed in Appendix A. Federally Recognized Tribal governments and Certified Local Government (Anchorage Historic Preservation Commission) were also consulted under the National Historic Preservation Act.

1.6 PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW OF SEA

The Preferred Alternative has the potential to impact wetlands and is subject to the requirements and objectives of EO 11990, *Protection of Wetlands*. The Air Force published early notice that the Preferred Alternative would occur in a wetland in the newspapers of record (listed below) on 24 October 2021. The notice identified state and Federal regulatory agencies with special expertise that had been contacted and solicited public comment on the Preferred Alternative and any practicable alternatives.

A Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft SEA and FONSI/Finding of No Practical Alternative (FONPA) was published in the newspapers of record (listed below), announcing the availability of the SEA for review on **19 January 2022**. The NOA invited the public to review and comment on the Draft SEA. The Draft SEA was posted on the JBER Environmental website <https://www.jber.jb.mil/Services-Resources/Environmental/Environmental-Planning/>. The public and agency review period ended on **18 February 2022**. The list of contacts, NOA, public and agency comments will be included in Appendix A of the Final SEA.

The NOA and early notice of project execution in wetlands was published in these newspapers:

- Anchorage Daily News, 300 W 31st Ave., Anchorage, AK 99503.
- Mat-Su Valley Frontiersman, 5751 Mayflower Ct., Wasilla, AK 99654

Copies of the Draft SEA and FONSI/FONPA were also made available for review at these locations:

- Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson Library, Bldg. 7, JBER-R, AK 99505
- Anchorage Public Library, 3600 Denali St., Anchorage, AK 99503
- Chugiak-Eagle River Library, 12001 Business Blvd. #176, Eagle River Town Center, Eagle River, AK 99577

Section 2

Description of the Preferred Alternative and Alternatives

2.1 PROPOSED ACTION

The Proposed Action for this SEA is the implementation of Alternative F and the mitigation measures described in the ROD. The Air Force would extend the northward departure and arrival runway (RW), called RW 16/34, and alter flight operations to satisfy the Purpose of and Need for the Action described in sections 1.2 and 1.3 of this SEA.

Alternative F would extend RW 16/34 by 2,500 feet to establish a 10,000-foot north-south runway and two supporting taxiways, and provides appropriate shoulder, grading, drainage, arm and disarm pad, and airfield visual navigation aids required to accommodate the existing mission at JBER. F-22 departures use RW 24 going west with a turn to the north toward training airspaces. Diesel-fired, emergency generators would be installed for two of the navigational aids and the airfield lighting vault to ensure uninterruptable power during outages from the local electrical utility. This would ensure that this equipment remains operational at all times. Arrivals primarily use RW 16 from the north. F-22 sorties under the various alternatives are described in section 2.4 of the 2018 EIS. Since the design proposed in the 2018 EIS, changes to the original Region of Influence (ROI) were required to include necessary changes to the design re-routing Airlifter Drive, addition of local gravel resources and disposal areas, additional vegetation removal areas required to meet updated airspace requirements, and resolution of effects to hydrology identified between the airfield and lands adjacent. Additionally, the SEA addresses an additional 400-foot northward shift of the runway that was determined to be necessary to meet operational requirements for Instrument Landing System (ILS) runway lighting, which the current runway configuration fails to meet. The total proposed runway extension will be approximately 2,900 feet. This northward shift in the final approach fix would equate to a minimal drop in altitude above water (approximately 25 feet) given the shallow glide slope (3 degrees). Section 1.1.2 in the Proposed Action's Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives (DOPAA) includes an extensive discussion of the Proposed Action design compared to the 2018 EIS design.

The most distinctive difference between the alternatives presented in section 2.3 below can be attributed to varying design alternatives to manage hydrologic effects between the Fish and Triangle Lakes Complex and the extended runway. In Alternatives 1 through 4, the extended runway construction would occur as proposed in the 2018 EIS, incorporating necessary design features described in Table 1-1, above.

2.2 SELECTION STANDARDS

NEPA and the CEQ regulations mandate the consideration of reasonable alternatives for the Preferred Alternative. "Reasonable alternatives" are those that also could be utilized to meet

the purpose of and need for the Preferred Alternative. Per the requirements of 32 CFR § 989, the Air Force Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) regulations, selection standards are used to narrow the field of all possible alternatives to those considered reasonable.

In addition to supporting the Purpose of and Need for the Action, reasonable alternatives must meet these baseline requirements:

- Be compatible with the existing, ongoing military mission and activities at JBER.
- Be compatible with existing infrastructure and development at JBER and in its vicinity.
- Meet applicable Department of Defense (DoD) installation master planning criteria, consistent with UFC 2-100-01, Installation Master Planning.
- Align with the 2011 Air Force Civil Engineering Strategic Plan (Air Force 2011).
- Meet current Air Force requirements for functional space, consistent with Air Force Manual 32-1084, Facility Requirements (20 April 2012).
- Meet applicable DoD antiterrorism/force protection (AT/FP) criteria, consistent with Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) 4-010-01, DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings and the Air Force Installation Force Protection Guide.
- Support and enhance the morale and welfare of personnel assigned to the installation, their families, and civilian staff, consistent with Department of Defense Instruction 1015.10, Military Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) Programs (6 July 2009).
- Be consistent with the Sikes Act and EO 13443.

In addition to the baseline requirements, the Air Force developed these selection standards based on operational, technical, or environmental factors to select reasonable alternatives:

1. Promote the preservation of recreational fishing values and comply with ADFG's stocking program
2. Meet JBER Flight safety requirements, including BASH objectives
3. Be consistent with applicable law for the avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of adverse effects to wetlands, surface water, cultural resources (including resources eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or of cultural significance to Federally Recognized Tribes), and other environmental effects as prescribed by law.
4. Enable the complete construction of the RW 34 extension project by October of 2025 to maintain lethality advantage over near-peer adversaries.

2.3 SCREENING OF ALTERNATIVES

The following alternatives that might meet the purpose and need for the runway extension were considered:

2.3.1 Alternative 1: Construct Runway Extension and Ground Improvements to Stabilize Fish and Triangle Lake Hydrology (Preferred Alternative)

Ground improvements would be constructed east of Fish Lake to stabilize the hydrology in the Fish and Triangle Lake wetland complex. The intent of the ground improvements would be to reduce the potential hydrologic impacts associated with runway extension excavation. The Preferred Alternative (Alternative 1) would incur the cost of constructing the ground improvements and transporting substantial quantities of spoils material offsite.

2.3.2 Alternative 2: Construct Runway Extension and Fill Fish and Triangle Lake Wetland Complex with Runway Extension Excavation Spoils

The Fish and Triangle Lake wetland complex would be filled with clean spoils material generated by the runway extension excavation. Alternative 2 would have the largest area of wetland impacts, including the complete loss of Fish and Triangle Lakes, but has the lowest construction costs of alternatives under consideration due to the simplicity of the design and reduced material haul costs.

2.3.3 Alternative 3: Construct Runway Extension and Fill Wetlands East of Fish Lake with Runway Extension Excavation Spoils

The wetlands east of Fish Lake would be filled with clean spoil material generated by the runway extension. The footprint of Alternative 3 is the same as Preferred Alternative, but Alternative 3 does not include a barrier wall. Alternative 3 would avoid immediate direct impacts to Fish and Triangle Lake. However, the absence of an engineered solution to stabilize local hydrology is expected to cause latent impacts to the Fish and Triangle Lake wetland complex. Alternative 3 avoids the cost of constructing ground improvements but would incur the cost of transporting substantial quantities of spoils offsite.

2.3.4 Alternative 4: Construct Runway Extension and Ground Improvement, Fill Fish Lake with Runway Extension Excavation Spoils

Ground improvements would be constructed east of Fish Lake (along the same alignment as the Preferred Alternative ground improvements). Fish Lake, along with wetlands and other surface waters, on both sides of the ground improvements would be filled. Alternative 4 avoids direct impacts to Triangle Lake and provides high confidence in stabilizing hydrology through the construction of ground improvements. Alternative 4 would provide some cost savings by allowing onsite spoils disposal in the Fish Lake wetlands but would still incur the cost of ground improvement construction.

2.3.5 Alternative 5: Construct Runway Extension by Regrading the Runway

The entire 16/34 RW and 06/24 RW complex would be elevated so that the finished runway elevation was high enough to avoid hydrologic impacts to the Fish and Triangle Lake wetland complex. Alternative 5 would require the demolition of the existing runway, transportation of enough fill material to elevate the runway high enough to prevent water from Fish and Triangle Lake from flowing onto the runway, and reconfiguration of all

surrounding facilities such as maintenance hangers, rearming pads, offices, control towers, and related infrastructure.

2.3.6 Alternative 6: Extend RW 16 to the South

RW 16/34 would be extended 2,500 feet to the south to achieve the 10,000-foot runway length. The southern extension of the runway would require the relocation of Arctic Warrior Drive and the Alaska Railroad. The extended runway would cross Ship Creek and encroach into the Eagleleglen Fitness Park curtilage.

2.4 RESULTS OF SCREENING

The selection standards described in Section 2.2 were applied to the alternatives to determine which alternative(s) could serve the runway extension project and fulfill the purpose of and need for the action. The results of the screening are depicted in Table 2-1.

The following reasonable alternatives that might meet the purpose and need were considered:

- Preferred Alternative: Construct Ground Improvements to Stabilize Fish and Triangle Lake Hydrology

The following alternatives have been eliminated from further consideration on the basis of the Section 2.1.1 selection standards.

- Alternative 2: Fill Fish and Triangle Lake Wetland Complex with Runway Extension Excavation Spoils
- Alternative 3: Fill Wetlands East of Fish Lake with Runway Extension Excavation Spoils
- Alternative 4: Construct Ground Improvements between Fish and Triangle Lakes, Fill Fish Lake
- Alternative 5: Regrade the runway
- Alternative 6: Extend RW 16

Table 2-1. Screening of Alternatives against Selection Standards

Selection Standards	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5	Alt 6
1. Promotes the preservation of recreational fishing values		Complete loss of Fish and Triangle Lake fishing opportunities	Indirect impact to Fish and Triangle Lake fishing opportunities	Partial loss of Fish and Triangle Lake fishing opportunities		
2. Meets JBER flight safety requirements, including BASH objectives						
3. Is consistent with applicable law for the avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of trust resources		Includes significant avoidable direct wetland impacts	Includes significant avoidable indirect wetland impacts	Includes significant avoidable direct wetland impacts	APE has not been assessed for cultural resources	APE has not been assessed for cultural resources
4. Enables the complete construction of the RW 34 extension project by October of 2025		Significant impacts would require the preparation of an EIS	Significant impacts would require the preparation of an EIS	Significant impacts would require the preparation of an EIS	Design process has not begun and would require several years to complete	Design process has not begun and would require several years to complete

Green cell signifies fully compliant; yellow cell signifies partially compliant, and red cell signifies non-compliant

2.5 DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS OF THE ALTERNATIVES

NEPA and the CEQ regulations mandate the consideration of reasonable alternatives to the Preferred Alternative. “Reasonable alternatives” are those that also could be utilized to meet the purpose of and need for the Preferred Alternative.

The NEPA process is intended to support flexible, informed decision-making; the analysis provided by this SEA and feedback from the public and other agencies will inform decisions made about whether, when, and how to execute the Preferred Alternative. Among the alternatives evaluated is a No Action alternative. The No Action alternative will substantively analyze the consequences of not taking the Preferred Alternative, not simply conclude no impact, and will serve to establish a comparative baseline for analysis.

The initial array of alternatives considered in this SEA present potential solutions to the problem of water migrating out of the wetland complex eastward, as a result of the runway extension excavation necessary to conform the extension with the existing airfield. The only Preferred Alternative: Construct Runway Extension and Ground Improvements to Stabilize Fish and Triangle Lake Hydrology, was found to answer the purpose of and need for the action and to satisfy the selection standards. Preferred Alternative and a “No Action” Alternative are carried forward for detailed analysis.

2.5.1 Preferred Alternative: Construct Runway Extension and Ground Improvements to Stabilize Fish and Triangle Lake Hydrology (Preferred Alternative)

Under the Preferred Alternative, JBER would extend RW 16/34 as described in the 2018 EIS and modified in Table 1, section 1.1.3 of the SEA, and construct ground improvements to stabilize the hydrology in the Fish and Triangle Lakes wetland complex. Ground improvement is the modification of existing site foundation soils or project earth structures to provide better performance under design and/or operational loading conditions. As described in the alternatives presented here, ground improvement consists of improving the existing soils and embankments with materials such as cement and bentonite to reduce the seepage and hydraulic conductivity of the soils.

The runway extension construction project is expected to last 3 years. Specific details about the construction method and schedule are dependent on the selected construction contractor's means and methods. Those details will not be available until a construction contractor is selected and work plans are submitted. The construction of the ground improvements would likely occur in the early stages of the project and could take approximately 6-12 months to complete. Construction of the ground improvements would occur in both summer and winter conditions as frozen wetland materials are significantly easier to work and offer a more stable environment to minimize impacts to adjacent wetlands. The Preferred Alternative would not be expected to require any additional maintenance beyond the same sort of vegetation management that the other alternatives would incur, and the ground improvement structure does not have a scheduled wear out date or life expectancy.

The wetlands to the east of the ground improvement feature would be drained by the excavation associated with the runway extension and back filled with clean excess spoils material (sand, gravel, and silt). Organic material, including excavated wetland soils, would be stockpiled for reuse during revegetation. Approximately 1,565 cy of topsoil would be required to revegetate the spoils disposal area, in addition to the reused organics from the wetland excavation. Approximately 6 mcy of the 12 mcy total volume of spoils would be disposed in the runway extension project area and the remaining 6 mcy would be transported to an approved disposal area. Grading in the area of ground improvements would be directed toward the west (away from the runway) to the maximum extent practicable to minimize reduction in the drainage area feeding Fish and Triangle Lakes.

The ground improvement feature is designed to interrupt the west to east groundwater movement within the wetland complex into the adjacent RW 16/34 extension project work area. This low permeability wall-like feature would be constructed from a bentonite/cement mix that would extend across the wetland complex about 120 feet east of Fish Lake (Figure 2-1). It would have a total length of approximately 850 feet with each end terminated into relatively lower permeability soils that occur north and south of the wetland complex. The ground improvement base would extend to a depth of 45 feet below the ground surface, which is at least 30 feet or more below the more permeable surficial soils depending on location along the alignment. The top of the feature would be at the ground surface elevation of 300 feet, which is approximately 3 to 4 feet above the typical surface water elevation of

Fish Lake. The preferred alternative would include a culvert connected to the stormwater drainage system to allow excess water to escape the depression surrounding Fish and Triangle Lake. The culvert would direct any excess water (above the existing water surface elevation) under Airlifter Drive, where it would be discharged on the surface to infiltrate and travel as surface flow south towards the existing Airlifter Drive. Any remaining water would be captured by the extended runway drainage system (Figure 2-2).

The design has incorporated multiple features to minimally impact the lakes and wetland complex; including the cement bentonite ground improvements to maximally reduce potential subsurface drainage, civil site grading to maximally direct stormwater runoff from the surrounding areas back to the lakes and wetland complex to recharge the water level, and stormwater overflows to ensure the water level does not exceed that of the existing conditions. The Preferred Alternative is shown in Figure 2-1.

Figure 2-1. Preferred Alternative (Preferred Alternative): Construct Ground Improvements to Stabilize Fish and Triangle Lake Hydrology





Figure 2-2. Wetland Complex Overflow Culvert and Excess Water Diversion



2.5.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative cannot be considered reasonable as it fails to address the purpose of and need for the action as described in section 1. However, it will be carried forward for further analysis, consistent with CEQ regulations, to provide a baseline against which the impacts of the Preferred Alternative and alternatives can be assessed.

Under the No Action Alternative, the proposed construction of the extended RW 16/34 would not occur and F-22 flight operations at JBER would continue consistent with the description of Alternative A from the 2018 EIS. Alternative A was intended as an interim measure to improve operational efficiency until the runway extension could be designed and constructed.

The No Action Alternative would continue to distribute annual F-22 sorties to concentrate departures on RW 34 and arrivals on RW 06, and it would allow F-22 operations to depart directly toward the most used training airspaces. The No Action Alternative does not include construction of any features and would only impact runway operations. No new, stationary emission sources would be installed under the No Action Alternative.

Section 3

Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

The ROI for the Preferred Alternative is the JBE054 RW 16/34 Extension Project Limits, unless otherwise specified below for a particular resource area where a resource would have a different ROI.

This section describes the current conditions of the environmental resources, either man-made or natural, that would be affected by implementing the Preferred Alternative or the No Action Alternative.

Based on the scope of the Preferred Alternative, issues with minimal or no changes to the impacts described in the 2018 EIS were identified through a preliminary screening process. This resulted in five resource areas being eliminated from further consideration.

Table 3-1 describes those resource areas not carried forward for a detailed analysis, along with the rationale for their elimination.

Table 3-1. Resource Areas Eliminated from Detailed Analysis

Resource Area	Reason Eliminated from Detailed Analysis
Airspace Management and Use	The impacts of the Preferred Alternative on Airspace Management and Use were analyzed in sufficient detail in section 4.1 of the 2018 EIS. The changes to the Preferred Alternative and new information that emerged after the 2018 EIS would not alter the description of consequences to Airspace Management and Use described in the 2018 EIS. The Preferred Alternative would have a beneficial impact on Airspace Management and Use due to reduced airspace congestion in the Anchorage Bowl.
Acoustic Environment	The impacts of the Preferred Alternative on the Acoustic Environment were analyzed in detail in section 4.2 of the 2018 EIS. Changes to the Preferred Alternative pursuant to the complete design of the runway extension (specifically the approximate 400-foot increase in the length of the runway extension) were evaluated and found to be inconsequential to the impacts already analyzed for the Acoustic Environment. The 400 feet northward shift would slightly reduce the community noise effects of F-22 flight operations (refer to the Memorandum for Record (MFR) in Appendix B dated 25 March 2021). The northward shift would reduce the altitude at which aircraft using RW 16/34 cross over the Knik Arm by less than 50 feet, but the minor altitude reduction would not have perceptibly different consequences on the acoustic impacts of F-22 operations on animals under the flight path than the consequences described in the 2018 EIS. The Air Force determined the ESA consultation associated with the 2018 EIS continues to be applicable to the Preferred Alternative in a MFR dated 1 October 2021 (Appendix B).
Transportation and Circulation	The impacts of the Preferred Alternative on Transportation and Circulation were described in sufficient detail in section 4.10 of the 2018 EIS. Construction activity would result in minor increases to local traffic; however, these increases would be temporary and cease once the project is complete. As a result, the Air Force anticipates no new significant short or long-term adverse impacts, and this resource area was not carried forward for detailed analysis. There would be no new significant impacts to Utilities/Transportation Resources.
Socioeconomic Resources/Environmental Justice	Impacts to Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice was analyzed in sufficient detail in section 4.11 and 4.12, respectively, of the 2018 EIS and Air Quality impacts were found to be less than significant. There have been no changes to the Preferred Alternative that would substantially alter the Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice impacts analyzed in the 2018 EIS since the ROD was signed. There are no new Socioeconomic Resources or Environmental Justice circumstances or information relevant the environmental concerns that warrant detailed analysis. There would be no new significant impacts to Socioeconomic Resources or Environmental Justice.

These resource areas are carried forward for detailed analysis:

- Safety
- Physical Resources
 - Earth Resources

- Water Resources
- Wetlands
- Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste
- Biological Resources
 - Vegetation
 - Fish and Wildlife
 - Special Status Species
- Cultural Resources
- Land Use and Recreation
- Air Quality

3.1 SAFETY

This resource area considers safety issues associated with the proposed changes in runway use patterns and whether these changes would affect the potential for BASH. Safety in the affected environment was described in section 3.3 of the 2018 EIS and the consequences of the Preferred Alternative on safety were described in section 4.3 of the 2018 EIS.

Preliminary results of the US Department of Agriculture Wildlife Services Program 2021 BASH study were briefed to the Air Force on October 2021 and those early indications were used to inform the content of this section of the SEA.

3.1.1 Affected Environment

The BASH plan for JBER-Elmendorf is 3rd Wing Instruction (3WGI) 91-212, *Bird/Wildlife Aircraft Strike Hazard (BASH) Program* (23 July 2020). 3WGI 91-212 implements Air Force Instruction 91-212, *Bird Aircraft Strike Hazard (BASH) Management Techniques*, and is used in conjunction with Air Force Policy Directive (AFPD) 91-2, Safety Programs, AFI 91-202, *U.S. Air Force Mishap Prevention Program*, AFI 91-204, *Safety Investigations and Reports*, AFI 91-223, *Aviation Safety Investigations and Reports*, Pacific Air Command Air Force guidance, and 11th Air Force guidance.

BASH extends to terrestrial animals, but the presence of the airfield perimeter fence excludes most large mammals (such as moose and bears) that have the potential to present an aircraft safety hazard, so the primary BASH risk on JBER is presented by birds. Species of particular concern include waterfowl such as Canada Goose, Trumpeter and Tundra Swan, Sandhill Crane and gulls, as well as raptors, including owls (Air Force 2011). The 2021 BASH study indicated the guilds (a guild is a group of species that use the same class of environmental resources in the same way) observed in the ROI include raptors, corvids, passerines, waterfowl, loons, shorebirds, wading birds, gulls, and upland birds. Raptors, corvids, and waterfowl are the guilds of greatest concern due to the size and behavior of the birds. For example, raptors, corvids (particularly Common Ravens), and waterfowl are large and the altitude of their flight has the potential to interact with arriving and departing aircraft


Current BASH management plan components include bird dispersal, habitat modification, and research related to the management programs. The application of the BASH plan components is organized by the bird and waterfowl exclusion zones depicted in Figure 3-1.

Bird Dispersal: The US Department of Agriculture, Wildlife Services (USDA-WS) is primarily responsible for dispersal of terrestrial wildlife within and up to ¼ mile outside the airfield security fence and birds within the exclusion zones following guidance in both the wildlife hazard management protocol and the 3 WG/JBER USDA -WS Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). Dispersal priority is large birds, flocking birds, and singular smaller species. Birds and mammals are dispersed using methods including, but not limited to, physical harassment, vehicle harassment, shooting, or with pyrotechnics.

Habitat modification: The 673d Civil Engineer Group (673 CEG) is responsible for vegetation management. Portions of the ROI fall within the airfield zone (AZ), clear zone (CLZ), WEZ remainder (WR), and beyond the extent of the Elmendorf Field Bird and Waterfowl Exclusion Zone (WEZ). The AZ is bounded by the airfield perimeter fence, the CLZ is off the end of the runway outside the perimeter fence, and the WR is that portion of the WEZ not otherwise designated. The AZ is managed with the goal of establishing and maintaining the dominance of dense, erect grasses such as bluejoint reed-grass, beach wildrye, red fescue, and similar domestic species. The CLZ is managed to establish and maintain the dominance of shrubland species. The WEZ is managed to establish and maintain shrubland, except for the grasses within 50 meters of the airfield perimeter fence. The area outside the WEZ is not managed with a specific vegetation goal and some areas are ponded during portions of the year, which can attract waterfowl.

The BASH risk to aircraft operating on the Elmendorf Field is normally low due to the cooperation of 673d CEG, USDA-WS, and airfield users, but may increase during migration seasons or in response to other factors.

Figure 3-1. Elmendorf Field Bird and Waterfowl Exclusion Zones from 3WGI 91-212



3.1.2 Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative

The extension of the runway by approximately 2,900 feet would translocate the end of the runway closer to the Fish and Triangle Lake wetland complex and Sixmile Lake, which would reduce the altitude of departing and arriving aircraft in vicinity of the waterbodies (Figure 2-1). The reduction in altitude has the potential to bring more birds into conflict with airfield operations.

The Bird Exclusion Zone (BEZ) and WEZ would be expanded northward to envelop the extended runway and allow proper mitigation of BASH risks. The AZ expansion would convert the ground within the perimeter fence to semi-improved and vegetation would be managed to improve visibility and discourage bird use by planting erect grasses, while the CLZ would begin outside the perimeter fence and be managed in the same way. The grounds within the expanded AZ and CLZ are inside the excavation limits of the Preferred Alternative, so they would be graded to bring the terrain into compliance with the drainage design and prevent ponding. The expansion of vegetation management and drainage improvements within the excavated area would make the ROI less desirable for birds and

reduce activity. An area extending approximately 3,000 feet from the end of the proposed runway and 1,500 feet from either side would be excavated to construct the design grade, which would have the additional effect of removing snags such as fallen trees, widow-makers (detached or broken limb or tree-top), seed bearing trees, and branches from the ROI, further reducing the desirability of the ROI to birds.

The Air Force has multiple mitigation options available under 3WGI 91-212 to reduce the BASH risk associated with the runway extension. Additional effort could be invested in hazing wildlife and the management of all areas of the airfield, which could reduce airfield desirability to wildlife. Fish and Triangle Lake management could also be modified to reduce the presence of raptors attracted to fish waste. These modifications could range from increasing education, outreach, and signage to alert anglers of the hazards and illegality of feeding raptors to the suspension of lakes stocking. The JBER BASH plan would be updated after the construction of the runway extension is completed and the 2021 BASH survey report is finalized.

The implementation of the preferred alternative would have positive impacts on aircraft safety over the Anchorage bowl by reducing airspace congestion. The preferred alternative would shift F-22 sorties farther away from the Ted Stevens International Airport by reducing the emphasis on RW 06/24 in favor of RW 16/34. The impact of extending the runway on safety remains low, with consideration of applicable management strategies and mitigations consistent with the description of safety impacts described in the 2018 EIS.

3.1.3 Environmental Consequences: No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the Air Force would continue airfield operations in the current manner, including the implementation of the existing BASH plan. The risk of bird and wildlife hazards to aircraft operation would not change. Negative flight safety impacts would persist due to the continued airspace congestion over the Anchorage Bowl caused by the emphasis of annual F-22 arrivals on RW 06.

3.2 PHYSICAL RESOURCES

Physical resources consist of earth and water resources, including wetlands. Physical Resources are discussed in sections 3.5 and 4.5 of the 2018 EIS.

3.2.1 Earth Resources

Earth Resources include the geology, soils, and topography of JBER.

3.2.1.1 Affected Environment

Earth Resources are discussed in section 3.5.1 of the 2018 EIS. The only substantive change to information regarding the earth resources in the affected environment includes the discovery of PFOS (perfluorooctane sulfonic acid)/PFOA.

3.2.1.2 Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative

The type of consequences to Earth Resources are unchanged from the consequences described in the 2018 EIS, but quantities and areas have changed somewhat. The quantity of excess material excavated from the project area that would require disposal would decrease from approximately 15 mcy to 12 mcy (Table 1-1-, row 1). The 2 mcy disposal area off the end of RW 24 (Figure 1-2) would not be used, instead all disposal would occur within the runway extension excavation limits or within the limits of the JBER Gravel Pit Expansion area. The area affected by grading would increase from approximately 557 acres to 642 acres. This increase in acreage would be caused primarily by the northward expansion of the excavation limits to accommodate the Airlifter Road design and the westward expansion of the excavation limits to optimize the ground improvements design.

USACE identified presence of PFOS (perfluorooctane sulfonic acid)/PFOA within the prism of soil that would be excavated for the proposed project during the design investigation. Additional information regarding PFOS/PFOA can be found in section 3.3 of the SEA.

3.2.1.3 Environmental Consequences: No Action Alternative

The selection of the No Action Alternative would not incur impacts to earth resources because the no action alternative does not include any construction activities or other measures with the potential to impact earth resources. Additional information regarding the consequences of the no action alternative on earth resources can be found in section 4.5.1 of the 2018 EIS.

3.2.2 Water Resources

Water Resources include the ground water, surface water, drinking water, and stormwater of JBER.

3.2.2.1 Affected Environment


Water Resources are discussed in section 3.5.2 of the 2018 EIS. After the preparation of the 2018 EIS, geotechnical investigations were conducted to further understand the subsurface characteristics of the wetland complex east of Fish Lake and surrounding drainage area (USACE 2021). The wetland complex is within a west to east trending low-lying depression where the surrounding topography hydraulically isolates the wetland complex. There are no specific inlets or outlets connecting the depressional complex to other waters. The water balance for this system is in by sheet flow from the surrounding drainage area and out by evapotranspiration and percolation (groundwater recharge). Additionally, subsurface conditions encountered during geotechnical investigations indicate that water within the wetland complex is hydraulically contained by underlying low permeability soil. These conditions create a perched wetland complex that at the location of the ground improvement alignment consists of organic-rich surficial soils (e.g., peat and organic silt) or silt with sand ranging from approximately 1-foot thick at borehole AP-4886 to approximately 15 feet at borehole AP-4890 (Figure 3-2, USACE 2021). The surficial soil is underlain by silty sand and gravel with a silt content that appears high enough (15-59 percent, with an average of 32

percent) to minimize ground flow from the wetland complex and is the reason water in the wetland complex is perched.

Perched groundwater was typically encountered east of Fish Lake at a depth of 1 to 2.5 feet below grade in the low-relief relatively flat areas of the wetland complex (boreholes AP-4889, 4888, 4891, 4897, 4900). Groundwater at the edge or outside of the low relief area (AP4887 and 4891) was encountered at a depth of 20 feet below ground surface (AP-4887, 4890), or not encountered at all to the depth drilled (AP 4886, 4898, 4895, 4896) (Figure 3-2).

Water level in the wetland complex is maintained based on a water balance between the rate and amount of water that recharges and discharges from this perched and isolated wetland system. Precipitation falling within the wetland's drainage area and surrounding drainage basin is the predominant source of recharge since the regional groundwater table exists at a depth that is well below the base of wetland complex. Precipitation that falls on the surrounding drainage area recharges the wetlands as either overland flow (stormwater or snow melt runoff) or as subsurface flow (shallow perched groundwater) after it percolates into the ground. Water leaves the wetlands and drainage area by evaporation and evapotranspiration and groundwater movement. The rate and amount of groundwater that flows from the wetland complex is unknown, but it is likely relatively low due to the low permeability of the underlying soils.

Figure 3-2. Geotechnical Borehole Locations



3.2.2.2 Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative

The runway expansion project has potential to impact the volume and/or rate of recharge to the wetland complex by changing the catchment area size and slopes after construction. Alternatively, it could also temporarily lower water levels in the wetland complex during construction when the wetland's surficial soil east of the ground improvement feature is excavated and replaced with locally derived fill excavated from other project areas.

The purpose of the ground improvement feature is to maintain water levels in the wetland complex including Triangle Lake and Fish Lake during and after construction of the runway extension. Details regarding the construction of the ground improvements can be found in section 2.5.1. While the ground improvement feature would effectively reduce or prevent the drainage of the wetlands and lakes and preserve water levels during construction, changes to the existing topography within the drainage basin or local watershed catchment area could potentially have a longer-term impact to the water levels in the wetland complex. The pre-construction catchment area is estimated to cover 135.3 acres and the runway extension

project would reduce the catchment area to approximately 96.6 acres, reducing the contributing area by 38.7 acres (approximately 29 percent).

Implementation of the Preferred Alternative would reduce the size of the catchment area that recharges the wetland complex, which could potentially reduce the runoff quantities to the wetlands. The construction of the runway extension would cause the loss of 16.7 acres out of 38.2 acres of wetlands in the Fish and Triangle Lake complex, an approximately 44 percent reduction in the areal demand for runoff. Because the post-construction reduction in wetland area is greater than the proportional reduction in drainage area, the net hydrologic impact of modifying the drainage area is expected to supply surplus water to the wetland complex. The Preferred Alternative includes the construction of a culvert at the existing water surface elevation of the lakes to redirect excess water to the stormwater drainage system, preventing changes to the area and duration of inundation.

Because precipitation and associated runoff appear to be the main recharge mechanism for the wetland complex, a detailed runoff analysis considering pre- and post-construction site conditions could be exercised to confirm and further quantify the expected change in recharge and potential impacts to water levels. A detailed runoff analysis has not been conducted, and the data are not available; however, based on the analysis above, the Air Force expects the impacts to water resources to be minimal due to the implementation of ground improvements to stabilize hydrology, installation of a culvert to shunt excess runoff, and that the reduction in wetland area is disproportionately larger than the reduction in catchment area.

3.2.2.3 Alternative Environmental Consequences: No Action Alternative

The selection of the no action alternative would not incur impacts to water resources because the no action alternative does not include any construction activities or other measures with the potential to impact water resources. Additional information regarding the consequences of the no action alternative on water resources can be found in section 4.5.1 of the 2018 EIS.

3.2.3 Wetlands

Wetlands are among the most productive ecosystems in the world and are a source of substantial biodiversity (EPA 2021). Wetlands are those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions” (33 CFR Part 328.3[b]).

3.2.3.1 Affected Environment

Detailed descriptions of the wetlands on JBER and the ROI can be found in the *2018 JBER Installation Natural Resources Management Plan* (INRMP), section 3.5.3 of the 2018 EIS, and the 2020 Wetland Delineation Report (available upon request).

The current JBER wetland inventory includes about 7,387 acres of wetlands, which cover approximately 10 percent of the area within the installation boundary (AFCEC 2021c, JBER 2018). JBER's wetlands are comprised of thirteen types according to the current "GEODATA_Wetlands_A" dataset. JBER wetland types and acreage are shown in Table 3-2 and a map depicting the distribution of JBER's wetlands is shown in Figure 3-3. These wetlands were characterized in the 2018 EIS based on a slightly older dataset which has since been updated, accounting for the differences in acreage between the two analyses. For accuracy, the SEA uses the current geospatial dataset, unless specified.

The 2018 EIS wetland analysis was based primarily upon wetland mapping developed by the interpretation of vegetation signatures in high altitude imagery with collateral remote data and few of the mapped polygons had been the subject of field work; meaning the dataset included an inherent margin of error. The 2018 EIS directed that a field-based wetland delineation would be required during the final design phase of the project, in order to determine regulatory jurisdiction and calculate appropriate compensatory mitigation. That field-based study was conducted in July 2020 (USACE 2020). The 2020 wetland delineation confirmed the size and shape of wetlands in the project area and updated the Air Force wetland database with field-based data. The wetland mapping used to calculate wetland impacts for the 2018 EIS compared to the current wetland mapping is shown in Figure 3-4. The delineation resulted in minor alterations to the areal extent of several wetlands, updated the vegetation classification of several wetland polygons, determined that at least one small polygon was not a wetland, and added one wetland area, not previously documented.

Wetlands in the ROI belong to the "palustrine" system described in the *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States* (Cowardin et al. 1979) and include palustrine emergent (herbaceous), palustrine scrub-shrub, palustrine forested, palustrine unconsolidated bottom (ponds), and palustrine aquatic bed (vegetated ponds). Needle-leaved evergreen scrub-shrub wetlands were dominated by dwarfed black spruce (*Picea mariana*) and found on depressional margins. Freshwater emergent/scrub-shrub wetlands, inundated from breakup through June, were dominated by leatherleaf (*Chamaedaphne calyculata*), sedges (*Carex utriculata* and *Eriophorum angustifolium*). Freshwater emergent wetlands were dominated by bluejoint grasses (*Calamagrostis canadensis*) and marsh five-finger (*Comarum palustris*). Some wetland communities may also be described as mixed classes, e.g., *palustrine scrub-shrub/emergent* when the dominant vegetation of multiple types are represented in the same community. The ecology of wetlands within the ROI are described in section 3.5.3 of the 2018 EIS. A comprehensive field delineation of the ROI wetlands was conducted in July 2020 and details are described in the Wetland Delineation Report (USACE 2020). Cowardin et al. provides detailed descriptions of the relationship between "Wetland Type" (i.e., freshwater emergent, freshwater forested, freshwater shrub, etc) and "Wetland Class" (i.e., PSS, PSS1, PEM, etc) depicted in the tables and figures within this section.

The jurisdictional determination requested from USACE Regulatory authority resulted in a determination that the wetlands, including Fish and Triangle Lakes, do not have a surface water connection to any traditional navigable waters (TNW), and therefore were not considered Waters of the U.S (WOTUS), under the prevailing legal definition at the time of

the request. A CWA Section 404 Permit issued by USACE Regulatory is not required, because there are no jurisdictional wetlands in the project area. A copy of the Approved Jurisdictional Determination can be found in Appendix B.

Table 3-2. JBER Wetland Types, Acreage, and Proportion

Wetland Type	Acreage	Percent JBER Wetland Acreage
Estuarine Emergent	2043.11	27.66%
Estuarine Shrub	77.73	1.05%
Estuarine Forested	12.74	0.17%
Freshwater Emergent	256.30	3.47%
Freshwater Scrub-Shrub	2615.65	35.41%
Freshwater Forested/Scrub-Shrub	31.75	0.43%
Freshwater Forested	1932.08	26.15%
Freshwater Pond	174.91	2.37%
Freshwater Riverine	2.12	0.03%
Freshwater Riverine Emergent	10.46	0.14%
Freshwater Riverine Forested Shrub	1.36	0.02%
Freshwater Riverine Forested	129.32	1.75%
Freshwater Riverine Shrub	100.01	1.35%
Total	7387.54	100.00%

Figure 3-3. JBER Wetlands (AFCEC 2021c)





Figure 3-4. 2018 Wetland Mapping in Contrast to Current Wetland Mapping



Wetlands lie within watersheds, defined concentrically by their Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC). Wetlands in the ROI lie within the Sixmile Creek Outlet (HUC 19020401080803) and Ship Creek Outlet (HUC 19020401040402) sub-watersheds, which cover 1,989.4 acres and 3,396.5 acres respectively.

The Sixmile Creek sub-watershed (Figure 3-5) is relatively undeveloped (compared to the urbanized areas to the south) and is host to one paved secondary road and a small number of gravel roads, a small grass airstrip/floatplane base on the shore of Sixmile Lake, and minor filling for building construction. Sixmile Lake, which lies north of the ROI, is a large waterbody that supports many populations of waterbirds and waterfowl, and an anadromous fishery that has been recognized for its role in supporting primary constituent elements (food) for the recovery of Cook Inlet beluga whale. The natural hydrologic integrity of the area remains largely undeveloped; however, the natural watercourse of Sixmile Creek was dramatically altered in the 1950s, when the western portion of the watercourse was impounded to create the lake used by float planes.

The majority of the Ship Creek Outlet sub-watershed (Figure 3-6) has been heavily developed since the 1940s for military-industrial purposes such as the airfield, aircraft hangars, support infrastructure, military family housing, and government offices. Nearly all the remaining wetlands are clustered remnants in the northern end of the sub-watershed. These wetlands, (particularly the Fish and Triangle Lake complex) are the largest concentration remaining in the sub-watershed. Many of the hydrologic functions of wetlands have been nearly entirely replaced with constructed stormwater infrastructure in the form of above-ground ditches and detention areas as well as underground storm sewer infrastructure. Natural soil properties have been replaced by development of the Elmendorf cantonment and airfield (turf). Species formerly occupying wetlands in the Ship Creek Outlet sub-watershed are driven northward toward undeveloped range training areas, including within the adjacent Sixmile Creek sub-watershed. Wetland acreages within the two sub-watersheds, are shown by class in Table 3-3 and Table 3-4.

Wetlands within the ROI fall into two distinctive groups. The first is the Fish and Triangle Lake Complex, which lies wholly within the Ship Creek Outlet sub-watershed. This is a large and highly interconnected matrix of floating bog, and scrub-shrub wetlands within which Fish and Triangle Lakes lie. The second group is comprised of hydrologically isolated depressional wetlands of various sizes that occur throughout the Elmendorf Moraine and in both Sixmile Creek and Ship Creek Outlet sub-watersheds.

Table 3-3. Wetland Acreage by Class in the Sixmile Creek Outlet Sub-watershed

Wetland Type	Code	Acreage
Palustrine Emergent	PEM	15.5
Palustrine Emergent/Scrub-Shrub	PEM/PSS	3.2
Palustrine Forested	PFO	139.2
Palustrine Scrub-Shrub	PSS	81.9
Palustrine Scrub-Shrub/Emergent	PSS/PEM	20.9
Palustrine Unconsolidated Bottom	PUB	7.3
Total		267.9

Figure 3-5. Sixmile Creek Outlet Sub-watershed Wetlands





Table 3-4. Wetland Acreage by Class in the Ship Creek Outlet Sub-watershed

Wetland Class	Code	Acreage
Palustrine Aquatic Bed	PAB	2.5
Palustrine Emergent	PEM	8.6
Palustrine Emergent/Scrub-Shrub	PEM/PSS	25.2
Palustrine Forested	PFO	7.2
Palustrine Scrub-Shrub	PSS	21.3
Palustrine Scrub-Shrub/Forested	PSS/PFO	0.6
Palustrine Unconsolidated Bottom	PUB	7.3
Total		72.6

Figure 3-6. Ship Creek Outlet Sub-watershed Wetlands



Wetlands perform many different functions based on their size, position in the watershed, hydrologic regime, vegetation type, support to plant and wildlife populations, accessibility by

the public, and other factors. Functional assessments can be used to quantify wetland functions for planning purposes. Regionally, the Anchorage Wetland Assessment Method (AWAM) was developed to evaluate critical functions of wetlands (Appendix D in Dean 2011).

Functions of the Fish and Triangle Lake complex are high, particularly due to the diversity and size of the system. The regularly inundated wetlands are typically underlain with thick peat deposits which function to store water and stabilize the hydrology of the lake and wetland complex. The anaerobic condition of the regularly inundated wetlands slows decomposition, which provides geochemical cycling functions through the sequestration of carbon. Buffer wetlands around the lakes perform hydrologic functions by slowing and capturing water coming off the hillside and filtering before water enters the lakes. The diversity of wetland and vegetation community types found in this specific complex are unique, especially within the Ship Creek Outlet sub-watershed, because large contiguous complexes have otherwise been filled or fragmented. Wildlife, including birds, mammals, and even some amphibians, use the complex habitat created by the diversity in topography, vegetation, and hydrology. Wildlife functions include nesting and breeding habitat, as well as safety and cover adjacent to the openness of the lakes, where wildlife feed.

Functions served by other depressional wetlands in the ROI vary widely, based, primarily, on size, hydrology, and accessibility. The 6.2-acre freshwater emergent wetland in the northeastern corner of the project area performs many of the same functions as the regularly inundated wetlands around Fish and Triangle Lake (hydrology, geochemical cycling, habitat), but is much less accessible due to its location away from roads. Palustrine emergent wetlands generally presented a thick peat layer, though scrub-shrub wetlands occurred over mineral soils. Due to the isolation, size, and adjacent land disturbance around many of these depressions, hydrologic functions are marginal, though even very small or highly altered depressions perform some water storage functions due to the presence of deep organic soils. Unvegetated soil surrounding these depressional wetlands can allow erosion to deposit sediment into the wetlands, and the removal of natural vegetation can alter the water balance of the soils by reducing the local evapotranspiration potential. Very small, hydrologically-isolated depressional emergent wetlands are unlikely to perform substantial functions in support of wildlife, especially waterfowl because they are rarely inundated, but other wildlife (AMBI 2020), including waterbirds, make use of areas for nesting and staging during migration.

Wetlands can also be characterized by their relative ecological value (REV), which has been developed for use in calculating compensatory mitigation credits using the Anchorage Debit-Credit Methodology (ADCM). The ADCM contains four REV classes with REV1 wetlands being the highest ecologic value and REV4 wetlands being the lowest ecologic value. The REV ranking system is primarily based on landform and hydrologic factors; large, natural wetlands that are frequently inundated are considered more valuable than small, unnatural wetlands that are rarely inundated.


REV1 wetlands in the ROI are regularly inundated, minimally fragmented, complex, and natural. REV 2 wetlands are rarely or never inundated, but naturally occurring and typically

larger in size. The REV3 wetlands in the ROI are rarely inundated, small and remote. REV4 wetlands in the ROI are rarely or never inundated, small and remote, and non-naturalized as a result of disturbance such as adjacent land clearing. The REV classification system does not consider specific factors like connectivity, habitat function, social value, or species occurrence when determining which ecological value class. ADCM calculations were completed, assigning REV classes for wetlands in the ROI to support potential mitigation opportunities. The REV class of wetlands in the ROI is shown in Figure 3-7. Region of Influence (ROI) Wetlands by Relative Ecological Value (REV) Class.

The Fish and Triangle Lake Complex holds the majority of REV 1 wetlands in the ROI and all of the REV 2 wetlands. REV2 wetlands include those adjacent to the lakes, which are situated in the transitional area between open water and uplands, though are rarely or never inundated themselves.

Among the other depressional wetlands in the ROI, one 6.2-acre freshwater wetland in the northeastern corner of the project area was classified as REV1, due to its size and the persistence of open water well into the growing season. Most of the remaining depressional wetlands in the ROI are classified as REV3 wetlands; lacking persistent inundation and most having been affected by adjacent land clearing. REV3 wetlands do appear to function naturally, despite the nearby alteration. This area also contains all the REV4 wetlands, classified due to their size, lack of inundation, and degradation due to adjacent land clearing activities.

Figure 3-7. Region of Influence (ROI) Wetlands by Relative Ecological Value (REV) Class



3.2.3.2 Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative

The 2018 EIS described wetland impacts totaling 27.9 acres; of which 10.6 acres were freshwater emergent and 17.3 percent acres were freshwater shrub. The final design of the runway extension as proposed here would impact 38.5 acres, representing approximately 0.2 percent more JBER wetlands of the affected classes than were described in the 2018 EIS. A detailed description of the reconciliation processes the Air Force performed to compare 2018 EIS wetland acreages with respect to the more detailed wetland data available in 2021 is included in section 3.2.3.1. Acres and percent impacts by wetland class for the originally proposed project compared to the currently Preferred Alternative are shown in Table 3-5.

The increase in wetland impacts from the Preferred Alternative with respect to the wetland impacts for the originally selected Alternative F described in the 2018 EIS is attributable to

the development of the Preferred Alternative from conceptual to fully designed. The 2018 EIS was based on a design requirements analysis prepared on the behalf of the Air Force, incorporating Air Force, Federal Aviation Administration, and Unified Facility Criteria, which have been updated since the original analysis in 2016. A design requirements analysis was also prepared prior to the wetland delineation, geotechnical investigation, and topographic surveys refining the final project scope. Specific changes that effected wetland resources are the design of the Airlifter Drive reroute and ground improvements necessary to protect the hydrology of Fish and Triangle Lakes, thus minimizing the overall impact to water resources. Figure 3-8 depicts the wetland impacts of the Preferred Alternative in contrast to the impacts described in the 2018 EIS.

Airlifter Drive needed to be designed to allow the maximum practicable speed limit, which was determined to be 40 miles per hour (mph). The original design for Airlifter Road was intended to minimize impacts to the wetland in the northeast corner of the road course. However, this resulted in the northeast turn being excessively abrupt and the shoulder excessively steep, which was impracticable since the roadway is used by emergency response vehicles and is a designated munitions route. The design of the turn radius in the vicinity of the large wetland (wetland #598) in the northeastern corner of Airlifter Drive resulted in a substantially larger excavation in this area and an associated increase in impacts from approximately 0.6 acres to 6.2 acres with respect to the acreage of wetland impacts presented in the 2018 EIS.


Additional geotechnical investigation in 2021 was undertaken to further understand the subsurface environment in the project area necessary to effectively design the ground improvements to minimize the potential effects to the hydrology between the Fish and Triangle Lakes complex and the airfield. The results of the investigation required that the alignment of the ground improvements be shifted approximately 430 feet west; thus, increasing the area of wetlands that would be impacted by approximately 7.2 acres with respect to the acreage of wetland impacts presented in the 2018 EIS.

The wetland impacts resultant of the changes to the Preferred Alternative are shown in Table 3-5.

Table 3-5. 2018 EIS Wetland Impacts for 2018 EIS Selected Alternative F Compared to the Preferred Alternative. () = % of Total Mapped Wetlands on JBER*

Wetland Type	Wetland Class Area at JBER (Acres)	2018 EIS Alt. F Acres	Delineated 2018 EIS Acres	Delineated 2018 EIS % Wetland Class Area*	Preferred Alternative Acres	Preferred Alternative % Wetland Class Area*
Freshwater Emergent Wetland (PEM)	256.3	10.6	9.1	3.56%	14.5	5.67%
Freshwater Forested Wetland (PFO)	1932.1	0	4.5	0.23%	4.5	0.23%
Freshwater Pond (PUB)	174.9	0	0.4	0.21%	0.4	0.21%
Freshwater Shrub Wetland (PSS)	2615.6	17.3	11.6	0.45%	19.1	0.73%
Subtotal	4978.9	27.9	25.7	0.52%	38.5	0.77%

Figure 3-8. 2018 EIS Wetland Impacts in Contrast to Preferred Alternative Wetland Impacts



The Preferred Alternative would include construction of ground improvements to stabilize the Fish and Triangle Lake hydrology. The project would fill 38.5 acres of freshwater wetlands, mostly in the Ship Creek Outlet sub-watershed. These would be permanent, direct impacts caused by the excavation and/or backfilling of wetlands in the footprint. All direct wetland impacts would be attributable to the construction of the runway and Airlifter Drive reroute; there are no wetlands in the proposed borrow or disposal areas and wetlands outside of the excavation limits would not be filled. Indirect effect to wetlands proximal to the excavation limits could occur as the watershed around those wetlands would be modified to satisfy grading and drainage requirements. Direct wetland impacts associated with the Preferred Alternative are shown in Figure 3-9.

Freshwater scrub-shrub wetlands would be the class most impacted by the Preferred Alternative with 19.1 acres of impacts, but they are also the most common wetland class on JBER, and the project would only incur the loss of 0.73 percent of like wetlands. The majority (16.4 acres) of the freshwater scrub-shrub wetlands that would be affected by the Preferred Alternative are in the eastern end of the Fish and Triangle Lake wetland complex. These wetlands are composed of two freshwater scrub-shrub sub-classes; needle-leaved

evergreen and broad-leaved evergreen/emergent mosaic. The remaining freshwater scrub-shrub wetlands that would be impacted by the Preferred Alternative are surrounded by previous disturbance near the center of the project area (2.5 acres) or surround a small emergent wetland in the southeastern corner of the footprint (0.2 acres).

Freshwater emergent wetlands would have the highest proportion of impacts with respect to intraclass acreage since the 14.5 acres of impacts associated with the Preferred Alternative would cause the loss of 5.67 percent of JBER's freshwater emergent wetlands. The freshwater emergent wetland impacts are generally located in the isolated wetland communities in the northern and eastern reaches of the project area, with the single largest area of impact (6.2 acres) coming from the northeastern-most wetland in the project area. This wetland is a broad-leaved shrub/emergent mosaic inundated from breakup through June dominated by leatherleaf and sedges. A single medium sized (2.7 acres), rarely inundated wetland in the north-central part of the project area dominated by bluejoint is the largest emergent wetland impacted. The remaining emergent wetland area (5.6 acres) is made up of several small-medium (0.2 to 1.5 acres each), rarely-inundated wetlands scattered throughout the project area.

The single freshwater forested wetland (PFO) that would be lost due to the construction of the Preferred Alternative is a 4.5-acre wetland in the southeastern reach of the project area. This community was dominated by black spruce large enough to be considered trees rather than saplings. The wetland is rarely inundated and on the edge of a previously cleared area.

The single freshwater pond that would be lost to the construction of the Preferred Alternative is a 0.4-acre inclusion in the northeastern corner of the Fish and Triangle Lake wetland complex. This wetland is persistent and natural, and it is part of the additional area of wetland impacts caused by the westward expansion of the excavation limits.

Indirect effects to the wetlands west of the project footprint could occur as a result of the disturbance including from watershed alteration and conversion of the vegetation community inside the excavation limits. Indirect hydrologic effects could result in a more erratic hydrograph in Fish and Triangle Lakes and the remaining associated complex. A reduction in the water storage capacity of the Fish and Triangle Lake complex could result in a temporary increase of the water table elevation.

The vegetation community would be converted from forest/woodland to urban/anthropogenically modified landscaping to conform with the JBER INRMP for managing the newly expanded airfield and adjacent clear zone. The trees and shrubs that currently grow on the east edge of the Fish and Triangle Lake wetland complex slow and filter precipitation runoff. If the project were constructed, the runoff would arrive at the edge of the wetlands faster and more turbid. The presence of additional sediments could alter the vegetation community in the wetlands over time by changing the characteristics of the soil. It could also eventually convert some of the wetlands to uplands if enough sediment is deposited to meaningfully increase the elevation.

Impacts to hydrology would be minimized by constructing the finished grade within the excavation limits west of Airlifter Drive to direct surface flows towards the Fish and Triangle

Lake wetland complex. The current grading design includes two topographic features that would help to diversify the landscape as well as provide some interception to runoff as it moves westward from the airfield toward the lakes. Topsoil in the area east of the ground improvements would be sourced from the topsoil and organics in the cleared overburden and vegetation to be planted would include native grasses and non-fruit bearing shrubs and trees in accordance with the BASH Management Plan. While the natural vegetation would be converted from forest to open woodland, the capacity for interception and infiltration of surface runoff toward the lakes would be sufficient to prevent significant sedimentation. The abundance and absorptive capacity of peatlands surrounding the lake would help normalize recharge into the lakes, though some fluctuation in the hydrograph would still be likely, especially during major storm and the spring freshet. Wetland communities that could experience indirect impacts from the construction of the Preferred Alternative are shown in Figure 3-11.

Wetlands that would be impacted by the Preferred Alternative are of REV classes 1, 2, 3, and 4 according to the ADCM ranking system. Acreage of wetland impacts by REV class is shown in Table 3-6 and Table 3-7 and on Figure 3-10 and Figure 3-11. The Air Force would purchase adequate wetland mitigation credits to offset unavoidable wetland impacts, consistent with the general wetland mitigation objectives described in the 2018 EIS.

Figure 3-9. Preferred Alternative Wetland Type Direct Impacts by Wetland Type




Table 3-6. Preferred Alternative Direct Wetland Impacts by REV class

REV Class	Acres	Number of Wetland Polygons
REV 1	18.98	4
REV 2	3.94	3
REV 3	13.74	16
REV 4	1.86	4
Total	38.52	27

Figure 3-10. Preferred Alternative Direct Wetland Impacts to Relative Ecological Value Class





Table 3-7. Preferred Alternative Indirect Wetland Impacts by REV Class

REV Class	Acres	Number of Wetland Polygons
REV 1	19.18	4
REV 2	7.15	5
REV 3	0.92	4
REV 4	0.00	0
Total	27.25	13

Figure 3-11. Preferred Alternative Indirect Wetland Impacts by REV Class



3.2.3.3 Environmental Consequences: No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not incur wetland impacts because it does not involve construction or any other actions with the potential to cause wetland impacts.

3.3 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND HAZARDOUS WASTE

Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste is discussed in sections 3.6 and 4.6 of the 2018 EIS. An emerging environmental issue at many Air Force installations is the past release of per- and polyfluoroalkylated substances (PFAS). The discovery of soils containing PFAS and other volatile organic compounds during the final runway design process is the new information associated with this resource area.

PFAS are a large class of human-made chemical compounds, used since the 1950s in products such as non-stick cookware, stain-resistant fabrics, and firefighting foams. The Air Force began using a firefighting agent called Aqueous Film Forming Foam (AFFF) in 1970, which contained two of the many PFAS compounds:

- Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA), and
- Perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS;)

AFFF is highly efficient at extinguishing petroleum-based fires, and has been widely used by the firefighting industry, including at military and commercial airports. However, the PFAS components of AFFF are water-soluble, and have been known to infiltrate to and enter the groundwater when released outdoors. Growing evidence of the toxicity of PFAS and its persistence in the environment led to the curtailment of its manufacture and use. The Air Force began a comprehensive evaluation process in 2010 to identify locations at active and closed installations where PFOA/PFOS may have been released. Air Force stocks of AFFF are being replaced with a short-chain PFAS alternative. The use of remaining AFFF is limited to actual firefighting; water alone is now used for fire training exercises (AFCEC 2021a, AFCEC 2021b).

EPA has designated PFAS an “emerging contaminant” under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), but has not promulgated a cleanup standard. The Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) promulgated cleanup levels for PFOS and PFOA in 2016. Current ADEC regulations (ADEC 2021) include risk-based soil and groundwater cleanup levels for PFOS and PFOA, shown in Table 3-8.

Table 3-8. State of Alaska Soil and Groundwater Cleanup Levels for PFOS and PFOA

Compound	Soil Human Health Cleanup Level (mg/kg) ¹	Soil Migration-to-Groundwater Cleanup Level (mg/kg) ²	Groundwater Human Health Cleanup Level (µg/l) ³
PFOS – Perfluorooctane sulfonate ⁴	1.6	0.0030	0.4
PFOA – Perfluorooctanoic acid	1.6	0.0017	0.4

1. for “Under 40-Inch Zone”, Table B1 of ADEC 2021.

2. Table B1 of ADEC 2021.

3. Table C of ADEC 2021.

4. Referred to as “Perfluorooctanesulfonic Acid (PFOS)” in ADEC 2021.

3.3.1 Affected Environment


The purpose of the Preferred Alternative does not include remedial action, but the discovery of chemically impacted soils during the design process requires the Air Force work with regulatory agencies to develop a suitable management strategy for chemically impacted excavation soils. Chemically impacted soils are described under the Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste section of the SEA to align with the organization of the 2018 EIS.

Brice Engineering, LLC (Brice) was contracted to investigate suspected chemically impacted soils near potential PFAS source areas in the vicinity of runway extension project site (Brice 2021). Soil samples were collected from 33 borings in April and May 2021. The soil samples were analyzed for PFAS, along with volatile organic compounds (VOCs; e.g., chlorinated solvents) and fuel-related chemicals. The results of the analyses were screened against relevant State of Alaska soil cleanup levels (ADEC 2021). Concentrations of PFOA and PFOS, along with other chemical products such as fuels and solvents, were detected above soil cleanup levels in soil samples from 18 borings (Figure 3-12).

The chemically impacted soil excavated from the project site during project construction will be segregated from clean soil and subject to specific management and remediation requirements, which are still in development by state and federal regulatory agencies. In accordance with the EPA's PFAS Strategic Roadmap (https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2021-10/pfas-roadmap_final-508.pdf) for addressing PFAS, the EPA will create and update PFAS regulations in upcoming years to include issuing updated guidance on destroying and disposing of certain PFAS and PFAS-containing materials by fall of 2023. There may be additional or increased compliance requirements to address any PFAS regulation changes during project work. The Air Force will act in accordance with directives from ADEC and/or EPA as regulation changes occur. More stringent cleanup levels and testing requirements for additional PFAS chemicals are anticipated to occur during the construction phases of this project, which could potentially impact the volume of soil needed to be excavated and managed for remediation and

mitigation of PFAS impacted soils. USAF coordination with ADEC regarding the delineation and management of impacted soils is ongoing.

Figure 3-12. Draft Schematic of Soil Analytical Results from the May-June 2021 Environmental Investigation (Brice 2021).



3.3.2 Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative

The Preferred Alternative would require excavation of approximately 12 mcu. Of the total quantity of soil to excavated, the quantity of chemically impacted soil that would be disturbed is estimated to be approximately 92,270 cubic yards (cy).

Since specific management and remediation requirements have not yet been defined for PFAS by state and/or federal agencies, the Air Force is working with regulatory agencies to explore options for the disposition of PFAS-impacted soil generated by the construction project that will be protective of human health and the environment and consistent with applicable laws and regulations. The Air Force's preliminary management strategy would seek to minimize the quantity of chemically impacted soil that must be transported from the project area, thus reducing the potential impact to other areas.


Pending the outcome of the Air Force's coordination with regulatory agencies, the chemically impacted soil could be relocated into a confined depression where similarly chemically impacted soils also exist (Figure 3-13). This material would be placed on a liner to inhibit migration of chemicals of concern into deeper soil strata and groundwater. The chemically impacted soil surface would be graded, covered in clean topsoil, and seeded with grasses to stabilize the area. Following construction, any impacted soils left in place could be managed as part of ERP Site SS152P (Airlifter Road PFAS). Any excess PFAS impacted soil could be stockpiled separately in a confined corner area just south of Airlifter Drive and east of Airdrop Avenue. This stockpile would also be covered and stabilized to prevent introduction into stormwater. Other necessary mitigation measures to minimize the incidental translocation of chemically impacted soils during construction may be included in a Soil Management Plan, if required.

Another potential outcome of the Air Force's coordination with regulatory agencies could involve the removal of chemically impacted soils from the project area for offsite management or disposal in an appropriately designated landfill, most likely in the contiguous United States.

3.3.3 Environmental Consequences: No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the proposed construction of the extended Runway 16/34 would not occur. The potential environmental risks inherent in disturbing, transporting, and stockpiling chemically impacted soil would not occur. The chemically impacted soils would remain onsite, in-situ; unless the Air Force elects to act on the information developed during the design of the Preferred Alternative and establish an ERP site to be managed in accordance with applicable regulations.

Figure 3-13. Proposed Redistribution of Chemically Impacted Soil



3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Biological resources include the vegetation, fish and wildlife, and special-status species in the ROI.

3.4.1 Vegetation

Vegetation refers to the plants (including trees, shrubs, grasses, herbs, and forbs) present in the ROI.

3.4.1.1 Affected Environment

Vegetation is discussed in section 3.7.1 of the 2018 EIS. There have been no substantive changes to information regarding vegetation of the affected environment.

3.4.1.2 Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative

Changes to the Preferred Alternative occurred during the design process that would increase the area affected by the project to accommodate the Airlifter Drive design and optimal alignment for the ground improvements. The expanded grading limits would increase the impacts to vegetation described in the 2018 EIS by enlarging the area that would be converted from natural to human modified land cover. Selected tree removal was included in the design to remove flight path obstacles from the post construction glide slope.

Some impacts to vegetation in the ROI have been described and accounted for in previous Air Force NEPA documents. The Western Disposal Area was included in the 2017 North Hill Removal EA (Air Force 2017) and the Eastern Gravel/Disposal sites are part of the area assessed in the 2008 Expansion of the Elmendorf Air Force Base (AFB) Gravel Pit EA (Air Force 2008), so the vegetation section of the SEA focuses on the changes to the excavation and grading limits for the runway extension and reroute of Airlifter Drive.

Section 4.7.2 of the 2018 EIS describes acreages of impacts according to natural land cover type. The 2018 EIS descriptions of vegetation impacts were based on contemporaneous land cover mapping and a revised comparison of the vegetation impacts associated with the Preferred Alternative based on current land cover mapping is shown in Table 3-9. The 9 mcy and 3 mcy disposal areas were combined into the "Gravel/Disposal Area" row to align with the current design and allow appropriate comparisons. The "2 mcy Spoil Disposal Area" has been removed from the design, and the "West Disposal Area" has been added since the 2018 EIS. The largest increase in acres affected (67.8 acres) would occur in the "Human Modified" land cover class due to the southward expansion of the grading limits within the airfield. The substantial increase in "Upland" land cover class impacts (62.5 acres) would be mostly attributable to the revised grading limits in the northern part of the project area.

Selective tree clearing was not described in the 2018 EIS. Selective tree clearing would be conducted outside of the excavation limits to remove trees that are tall enough to approach the imaginary surface that defines the lower limits of the navigational airspace. Selective tree clearing is a minimally invasive technique of felling individual trees with timbering equipment

or by hand. Access to the areas subject to selective tree clearing would be from the excavation, existing roads and trails, or contractor access trails.


The trees in the ROI that could be tall enough to approach the imaginary surface are predominantly black cottonwood but could include white spruce or paper birch. Approximately 41 acres of upland forests north of the excavation limits could be impacted by the selective tree clearing, while about 8.5 acres and 5.4 acres on the eastern and western edges, respectively, of the excavation limits would be subject to selective tree clearing. Minor vegetation clearing along contractor access trails may also be required to widen the trails enough for minimum equipment clearances. Preferred Alternative vegetation impacts by land cover is shown in Figure 3-14.

The land cover types that would be impacted by the Preferred Alternative are abundant in the region and are not known to be important for the life histories of any special status species. The Preferred Alternative would have minor impacts to vegetation.

Table 3-9. Preferred Alternative Vegetation Impacts Compared to 2018 EIS

Runway 16/34 Extension Disturbance	Human Modified		Lowland		Roads/Paved		Upland	
	2018 EIS	Preferred Alternative	2018 EIS	Preferred Alternative	2018 EIS	Preferred Alternative	2018 EIS	Preferred Alternative
Staging Area	6.4	0.0	3.8	4.3	0.2	0.0	49.5	35.0
Grading Limit	180.4	269.9	33.4	46.5	19.6	37.2	243.5	302.8
2 mcy Spoil Disposal Area	36.8	-	12.0	-	5.6	-	14.9	-
Gravel/Disposal Site	41.8	52.5	71.5	72.4	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.3
West Disposal Area	-	10.7	-	1.4	-	0.6	-	32.3
2018 EIS Total	265.3	-	120.7	-	30.3	-	307.9	-
Preferred Alternative Total	-	333.1	-	124.6	-	42.8	-	370.4

Figure 3-14. Vegetation Impacts by Land Cover Type



3.4.1.3 Environmental Consequences: No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not impact vegetation because it would not involve construction. The vegetation around the airfield would continue to be managed in accordance with the INRMP, BASH plan, and other applicable Air Force guidance documents.

3.4.2 Fish and Wildlife

Fish and wildlife are the terrestrial and aquatic species of the ROI.

3.4.2.1 Affected Environment

Fish and wildlife are discussed in section 3.7.2 of the 2018 EIS, but the EIS did not mention the presence of stocked fish (rainbow trout and char) in Fish and Triangle Lake.

3.4.2.2 Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative

Minor increases to the fish and wildlife consequences described in section 4.7.2 of the 2018 EIS would be caused by the expansion of the excavation limits and vegetation impacts described in section 3.4.1 of the SEA. The habitats impacted by the Preferred Alternative would be the same types of habitats described in the 2018 EIS.

The acoustic impact of operational changes on fish and wildlife were described in the 2018 EIS. Changes and new information relevant to the environmental concerns of the Preferred Alternative would not affect the description of noise impacts on wildlife presented in the 2018 EIS.

3.4.2.3 Environmental Consequences: No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would present the same impacts to fish and wildlife as described in section 4.7.1 of the 2018 EIS.

3.4.3 Special-Status Species ****SECTION UNDER RECONSTRUCTION****

****THIS SECTION IS CURRENTLY UNDER RECONSTRUCTION AND WILL BE PROVIDED WHEN TECHNICALLY SUFFICIENT**


3.4.3.1 Affected Environment

****THIS SECTION IS CURRENTLY UNDER RECONSTRUCTION AND WILL BE PROVIDED WHEN TECHNICALLY SUFFICIENT**

Table 3-10. Current Sortie Patterns that Produce Sound Levels at Water Surface Greater than 88 dB re 20 μ Pa

F-22 Flight Profile	Noise Levels		Operations Tempo		Powerful Sound Over Water		
	LAmax Just Above Surface (dB re 20 μ Pa)	SPL Just Above Surface	Current Operations		Time Over Water at >88 dB (min)	Current Operations	
			Events/ Average Flying Day	Total Events Per Year		Annual duration Over Water at >88 dB (mins)	Daily Average Duration Over Water @ > 88 dB (mins)
A/B EEEGL 2 Dep on 24	87.4	90.4	0.05	18.80	0.05	0.98	0.00
Mil EEEGL 2 Departure on RW 24	101.1	104.1	1.24	451.21	1.12	504.41	1.38
Mil EEEGL 2 Departure on RW 34	95.1	98.1	11.84	4322.00	0.79	3403.12	9.32
ILS to 06	101.8	104.8	5.48	1998.48	2.27	4529.54	12.41
ALL VFR Approaches (Overhead Break) AND Visual Closed Patterns	90.5	93.5	11.06	4036.90	0.44	1787.68	4.90
Re-entry Pattern (Initial Approach)	91.3	94.3	0.02	7.84	1.11	8.72	0.02
ILS to 16	95.4	98.4	0.00	0.00	1.13	0.00	0.00
VFR Closed	91.5	94.5	0.41	149.07	1.22	181.46	0.50
TOTAL			38.87	14187.85		10415.91	28.54

Figure 3-15. Water Surface Area Affected by F-22 Related In-Air Sound Levels



3.4.3.2 Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative

**** THIS SECTION IS CURRENTLY UNDER RECONSTRUCTION AND WILL BE PROVIDED WHEN TECHNICALLY SUFFICIENT****


**Table 3-11. Preferred Alternative Sortie Pattern Overwater Flight Time for Patterns
Producing Powerful Sound**

F-22 Flight Profile	Noise Levels		Operations Tempo				Powerful Sound Over Water				
	L _A max Just Above Surface (dB re 20 µPa)	SPL Just Above Surface	Preferred Alternative		Current Operations		Time Over Water at >88 dB (min)	Preferred Alternative		Current Operations	
			Events Ave. Flying Day	Total Events Per Year	Events/ Ave. Flying Day	Total Events Per Year		Annual duration Over Water at >88 dB (mins)	Daily Average Duration Over Water @ > 88 dB (mins)	Annual duration Over Water at >88 dB (mins)	Daily Average Duration Over Water @ > 88 dB (mins)
A/B EEEGL 2 Dep on 24	87.4	90.4	0.48	173.41	0.05	18.80	0.05	9.02	0.02	0.98	0.00
Mil EEEGL 2 Dep on RW 24	101.1	104.1	11.40	4161.58	1.24	451.21	1.12	4652.25	12.75	504.41	1.38
Mil EEEGL 2 Dep on RW 34	95.1	98.1	1.28	468.59	11.84	4322.00	0.79	368.96	1.01	3403.12	9.32
ILS to 06	101.8	104.8	0.91	332.84	5.48	1998.48	2.27	754.38	2.07	4529.54	12.41
ALL VFR Approaches (Overhead Break) AND Visual Closed Patterns	90.5	93.5	1.69	617.20	11.06	4036.90	0.44	273.32	0.75	1787.68	4.90
Re-entry Pattern (Initial Approach)	91.3	94.3	0.00	1.20	0.02	7.84	1.11	1.34	0.00	8.72	0.02

Draft Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA) for
Proposal to Improve F-22 Operational Efficiency at Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska

F-22 Flight Profile	Noise Levels		Operations Tempo				Powerful Sound Over Water				
	L _A max Just Above Surface (dB re 20 µPa)	SPL Just Above Surface	Preferred Alternative		Current Operations			Preferred Alternative		Current Operations	
			Events Ave. Flying Day	Total Events Per Year	Events/ Ave. Flying Day	Total Events Per Year		Annual duration Over Water at >88 dB (mins)	Daily Average Duration Over Water @ > 88 dB (mins)	Annual duration Over Water at >88 dB (mins)	Daily Average Duration Over Water @ > 88 dB (mins)
ILS to 16	95.4	98.4	4.56	1665.64	0.00	0.00	1.13	1875.58	5.14	0.00	0.00
VFR Closed	91.5	94.5	0.06	22.80	0.41	149.07	1.22	27.76	0.08	181.46	0.50
TOTAL			22.24	8119.10	38.87	14187.85		7962.61	21.82	10415.91	28.54
CHANGE			-16.63	-6068.75	16.63	6068.75		-2453.29	-6.72	2453.29	6.72

Figure 3-16. Water Surface Area Affected by F-22 Related In-Air Sound Levels Under the Preferred Alternative



3.4.3.3 Environmental Consequences: No Action Alternative

**** THIS SECTION IS CURRENTLY UNDER RECONSTRUCTION AND WILL BE PROVIDED WHEN TECHNICALLY SUFFICIENT ****

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Per 40 CFR § 1508.8, this analysis reviewed the potential effects on cultural resources both directly and indirectly impacted by the proposed F-22 runway extension. The proposed runway extension has the potential to impact historic properties. The Area of Potential Effect (APE) encompasses those areas where direct effects are anticipated to occur; such effects include tree cutting, grading, construction of the runway, and other ground-disturbing activities. Because of its potential to impact historic properties, in 2021 a combined USACE and Air Force team conducted pedestrian surveys of locations within the APE that had not previously been surveyed by archaeologists.

3.5.1 Affected Environment

Section 3.8.1 of the 2018 EIS identifies 26 cultural resources within the original APE. As a result of the final design, the APE was altered and expanded, requiring the completion of additional pedestrian surveys and analysis. According to the Alaska Historic Resources Survey (AHRS) there are 41 known cultural resources within the expanded APE. Of these resources, 24 have been determined to be not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), 15 were destroyed during previous projects, and 2 are eligible for listing (Air Force 2021b). None of the facilities that would be demolished in preparation for the runway expansion (e.g., runway pavement, below-ground 14-inch transit waterline, below-ground primary distribution feeder conduit, in-ground runway lights, runway distance markers, wind cones, dual BAK-12 aircraft arresting systems) are older than 50 years.

Five new cultural resources (ANC-04712, ANC-04713, ANC-04714, ANC-04715, ANC-04716) were discovered during the 2021 pedestrian surveys. Two of these were discovered near Fish and Triangle Lakes and three were discovered in the new excavation areas (Air Force 2021a). USACE provided the Air Force with recommendations on the eligibility of these cultural resources and one previously unevaluated site (ANC-04717). In addition to the new resources, many scattered fighting positions were identified during the surveys. USACE recommended that the fighting positions were not eligible for listing in the NRHP. At the Air Force's request, USACE also re-evaluated one site (ANC-02978) and recommended that it was eligible for listing in the NRHP (Air Force 2021a). The Air Force also evaluated facilities that would be demolished during the project and were more than 50 years old. The Air Force submitted a letter regarding these recommended determinations of eligibility to the Alaska SHPO on 25 October 2021 (Air Force 2021b; see Appendix A). The Air Force received concurrence with the determinations of eligibility from the Alaska SHPO on 17 November 2021 (SHPO 2021; see Appendix A).

3.5.2 Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative

Grading, ground improvements, and fill disposal will destroy 19 resources that are not eligible listing in the NRHP. Selective tree clearing will directly or indirectly affect four ineligible resources. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to affect two NRHP eligible historic properties within the APE. To minimize the Preferred Alternative's potential impact on cultural resources, the runway expansion has been designed to avoid direct impacts on

any historic properties by establishing buffers along the haul roads, placing construction barriers, and occasional monitoring to ensure compliance with the assessment of effect. Per 36 CFR § 800.5(b), the Air Force submitted a letter to the Alaska SHPO and consulting parties on 25 October 2021 stating that the Preferred Alternative would result in “no historic properties affected” for 39 cultural resources and “no adverse effect to historic properties” for two historic properties (Air Force 2021b; see Appendix A). On 17 November 2021, the Air Force received concurrence from the Alaska SHPO on this finding (SHPO 2021; see Appendix A).

3.5.3 Environmental Consequences: No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the additional construction associated would not occur. Operations at the Elmendorf Runway would instead be consistent with the description of Alternative A in the 2018 EIS (Air Force 2018). The potential impacts on cultural resources associated with the No Action alternative would remain consistent with those described in the 2018 EIS.

3.6 LAND USE AND RECREATION

Land Use and Recreation resources are the ongoing and potential uses for a given land area, considering factors of size, land cover, topography, ownership, and other constraints. Land Use and Recreation affected environment is discussed in section 3.9 of the 2018 EIS and the environmental consequences to Land Use and Recreation are discussed in section 4.9 of the 2018 EIS.

3.6.1 Affected Environment

In general, the pre-eminent land use on military installations is military operations, including training. New technology allowing combatants to become more elusive and lethal is constantly developed by the US military and its potential adversaries. JBER and associated airspace is dedicated to training to use those new technologies developed by the US and guard against technologies developed by potential adversaries. Other land uses, including recreation, are subordinate to the needs of the military mission.

In the 2018 EIS, the ROI did not include areas around Fish and Triangle Lakes as it was intended that all effects here would be avoided. In the final design, however, it was determined affects to this area could not be avoided due to inevitable shift in hydrology between the Fish and Triangle Lake Complex and the extended airfield. The ROI includes both semi-improved and unimproved lands. Semi-improved areas include the Fish and Triangle Lake complex and the cleared land directly north of the runway, where periodic maintenance of tall trees is performed for operational reasons in accordance with the BASH Plan. Unimproved lands cover the remainder of the ROI where the forest, shrub, and wetland natural vegetation are allowed to grow unimpeded by maintenance activities per the INRMP (JBER 2018). Unimproved lands on JBER “are comprised of maneuver areas and impact areas” (JBER 2018). A secondary military land use category on unimproved lands is “foot use areas,” which allow for movement-to-contact and land navigation activities (JBER 2018).

Development in the ROI is limited due to noise levels and the potential for accidents involving arriving and departing aircraft. Currently, the undeveloped land north of the airfield is used by military and their families for recreational purposes, such as hiking, hunting, fishing, sightseeing, and wildlife viewing. Much of the land immediately north of the airfield has been recently cleared off to meet invisible clear zone requirements for existing operations. The remaining area north of recent clearing within the ROI is primarily intact in terms of vegetation community composition.

Fish and Triangle Lakes include accessibility developments, including docks, parking, and boardwalks, to provide year-round recreational fishing opportunities to eligible individuals. These opportunities are considered particularly valuable for junior servicemembers who may lack the means of accessing recreational fishing off-base. Fish and Triangle Lake are stocked by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG) as part of their Department of Sport Fish, Region II Statewide Stocking Plan. According to JBER's recreational fishing reports, Fish and Triangle Lakes accounted for a cumulative 17 percent of all recreational fishing on JBER in 2020 and 12.7 percent in 2019 (Brandt 2020, Brandt 2021).

3.6.2 Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative

Implementation of the Preferred Alternative would have beneficial impacts on the military training land use of the ROI by improving training opportunities for F-22 pilots, as described in section 1.1.2 of the 2018 EIS.

The Preferred Alternative would expand area within the grading limits beyond the area described in the 2018 EIS. This increase in area would have minor negative impacts on recreational values in the ROI by converting the existing unimproved grounds inside the excavation limits to semi-improved grounds, part of which would lie within the airfield perimeter fence and be restricted to authorized personnel. The area within the excavation limits would be graded to comply with the drainage design and managed for operational reasons, so there would no longer be hiking or wildlife viewing opportunities within this area. Additionally, the reduction in unimproved grounds would slightly reduce the amount of maneuver areas and impact areas available, including potential foot use areas. However, JBER has nearly 60,000 acres of unimproved grounds and the area that would be converted from unimproved to semi-improved is not particularly rare or valuable for recreational purposes within the context of JBER lands.

The construction of ground improvements to stabilize the hydrology of Fish and Triangle Lakes would ensure adequate depths continue to be available to support fish and the surface area of the lakes is not expected to be affected by the nearby runway extension construction. The existing docks, boardwalks, and parking would continue to operate in their current manner. Recreational fishing values would not be directly impacted by the implementation of the Preferred Alternative.

The results of the ongoing runway extension BASH study could result in flight safety mitigations that would indirectly impact land use. The JBER BASH plan would be updated after the construction of the runway extension is completed and the 2021 BASH survey

report is finalized. Decisions regarding the implementation of specific safety mitigations are the responsibility of the Wing Commander.

3.6.3 Environmental Consequences: No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would continue the operation of the airfield in its current manner. Implementation of the No Action Alternative would negatively impact the military training land use resource because training opportunities would continue to be lost due to inefficient operation of the airfield. Potential adversaries of the Air Force seem to be exponentially increasing in tactical and technical proficiency and are now “near-peer” in terms of capability. Missed training opportunities caused by the selection of the No Action Alternative could allow the diminishment of the Air Force’s competitive advantage.

There would be no construction or changes to the existing noise contours associated with the No Action Alternative, so there would be no impacts to recreation.

3.7 AIR QUALITY

An in-depth description of the Air Quality affected environment can be found in section 3.4 of the 2018 EIS. No changes to the attainment status of JBER or within its vicinity have occurred since publication of the 2018 EIS. The environmental consequences to ambient air quality in and around JBER are presented below based on the increase in the footprint of the 16/34 Runway Extension, which has increased by 400 feet since the ROD for 2018 EIS was signed. A brief discussion to more clearly highlight the long-term emission impacts from the three, stationary emergency generators that would be installed as a part of the proposed action was added here as well. A summary of the calculation methods used to estimate emissions impacts; as well as the data inputs and assumptions made are provided in Appendix C to the SEA.

Air Quality Impact Evaluation and General Conformity Criteria

Ambient air quality impacts must be evaluated based on Environmental Impact Analysis (EIAP) insignificance indicators and on general conformity de minimis levels. These values are compared to the net annual emissions generated as a result of the proposed action to determine their significance. If the net annual emissions are below these criteria the proposed action would be considered insignificant. Likewise, if the annual net emissions exceed these values the proposed action would have a significant impact on the ambient air quality. Emissions were calculated for the following criteria pollutants: CO, PM₁₀, particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter or less (PM_{2.5}), oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), volatile organic compounds (VOC), and sulfur dioxide (SO₂). Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions, expressed as carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_{2e}) were estimated as well.

The EIAP insignificance indicators are provided in Table 3-12. Nonattainment indicators for criteria pollutants for which a nonattainment area could potentially be affected by the proposed action are also provided in Table 3-12.

Table 3-12. Air Quality EIAP Insignificance Indicators

Criteria Pollutant	Pollutant(s) of Concern	Area Classification	First-Level Indicators (tons/year)	Second-Level Indicators (tons/year)
Ozone	VOC and NO _x	Clearly Attainment	100	None
CO	CO	Nonattainment		None
		Clearly Attainment	100	None
SO ₂	SO ₂	Clearly Attainment	100	None
NO _x	NO _x	Clearly Attainment	100	250
Particulate Matter				
PM ₁₀	PM ₁₀	Clearly Attainment	70-100 ^a	None
		Nonattainment	100	250
PM _{2.5}	PM _{2.5}	Clearly Attainment	100	250
Lead	Lead	Clearly Attainment	25	None

a. Range depends on severity of the nonattainment. For the air quality impact assessment, the highest value within the range for PM₁₀ was used since Eagle River is classified as maintenance area.

A general conformity evaluation is required to assess whether the proposed action results in a significant ambient air quality impact. Criteria used to make this determination are defined in Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 93. A proposed action is considered to have a significant ambient air quality impact under general conformity if it results in a net annual change in emissions above the de minimis levels as defined in 40 CFR 93.153(b)(1) and (b)(2). The general conformity de minimis levels for the two criteria pollutants associated with the maintenance areas within the region of influence being assessed are provided in Table 3-13.

Table 3-13. General Conformity De Minimis Values for Criteria Pollutants for Maintenance Areas

Criteria Pollutant	De Minimis Level (tons per year)
CO	100
PM ₁₀	100

Source: 40 CFR 93.153(b)(1) and (2)

Evaluation criteria for assessing the significance of ambient air quality impacts from GHG have not been established; therefore, CO_{2e} emissions were not compared against an Air Quality EIAP insignificance indicator.

Potential air quality permit requirements associated with the installation of the three new emergency generators was evaluated as well. The total, annual emissions increase from the three generators were compared to PSD major modification and minor stationary source permitting thresholds described in Appendix C and summarized in Table 3-15 below.

3.7.1 Affected Environment

The Municipality of Anchorage remains a carbon monoxide (CO) Maintenance Area and Eagle River remains a particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀) Maintenance Area. Consistent with the 2018 EIS, the proposed action is not exempt from a general conformity evaluation since it has the potential to impact the nearby Municipality of Anchorage CO and Eagle River PM₁₀ Maintenance Areas.

The JBER airfield, where the proposed action is set, occurs within JBER Flight Line Title V Major Stationary Source. JBER operates the Flight Line Stationary Source under a DEC Air Quality Operating Permit Number AQ0886TVP03. The JBER Flight Line Stationary Source is classified as a Title V major source since it has the potential to emit (PTE) greater than 100 tons per year of one or more criteria pollutants. It is not a prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) or hazardous air pollutant major stationary source.

3.7.2 Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative

Potential long-term and short-term emissions within region of influence potentially impacted by the Preferred Alternative were calculated and compared to the evaluation criteria presented in Tables 1 and 2. The long-term ambient air quality impacts expected to occur as a result of the Preferred Alternative include change to F-22 Operations and the addition of three new, diesel-fired emergency generators to the JBER Flight Line Title V Major Stationary Source. Construction related activities associated with the Preferred alternative would generate short-term emissions impacts, which would occur over a three-year time span. The revised emission impacts from construction activities assessed under the Preferred Alternative are based on the entire 2,900-foot runway extension rather than just the additional 400 feet added since the ROD was signed for the 2018 EIS.

Long-Term Changes in F-22 Operations

As stated in the 2018 EIS, the Preferred Alternative would include changes in F-22 aircraft departure and arrival patterns potentially impacting operations below 3,000 feet above ground level (AGL) and emissions below 3,000 feet. Emission effects of F-22 operations would occur within the immediate airspace surrounding JBER and the JBER-Elmendorf runways. The potential air quality impacts from the proposed changes in F-22 aircraft operations focuses on emission effects within this domain.

The annual CO and PM₁₀ emissions from the changes to F-22 operations would minimally impact the air quality maintenance areas due to the low strengths and/or substantial distances associated with the emission sources and would result in a decrease in F-22 aircraft emissions compared to existing conditions at JBER as stated in the 2018 EIS. Changes in the operation of ground support equipment (GSE) and similar mobile sources, which operate intermittently within the JBER airfield to support F-22 operations, are expected to be minimal; therefore, emissions for this equipment were not estimated.

Furthermore, implementation of the Preferred Alternative would not contribute to an exceedance of an ambient air quality standard and would produce less than significant air quality impacts due to a decrease in F-22 flight operations below 3,000 AGL as described in the 2018 EIS. The ambient air quality impacts would not change as a result of the change in the runway extension from 2,500 feet assessed in the 2018 EIS to the current 2,900-foot extension. Since the emissions impact from the F-22 operations remain the same the long-term change in emissions from this activity are not summarized within this document. A summary of the emissions impact from the change in F-22 operations can be found in Appendix C.

Long-Term Changes in Stationary Source Emissions

Three new, diesel-fired stationary emergency generators would be installed as a direct result of the Preferred Alternative. One of these emergency generators would be installed in association with the Airfield Lighting Vault (ALSF-1) support facility, which was previously identified in 2018 EIS. In addition to the emergency generator associated with the ALSF-1 facility, two new Instrument Landing System (ILS) support facilities would be installed. These ILS support facilities include a new localizer and a new, Glide Slope nav aids. As with the ALSF-1, these new nav aids were referenced in the 2018 EIS, but their emissions were not quantified. The ALSF-1, and the two ILS navigation aids be connected to the local electrical power utility grid; however, due to their critical function, these facilities require emergency back-up power from diesel-fired generators. Table 3-14 summarizes the current specifications for each of the emergency generators that would be installed under the Preferred Alternative. These specifications are based on the final design documents produced for the 16/34 Runway Extension project. The generator that would be installed with the ILS Localizer and Glide Slope have been sized to the same specifications.

Installation of the three emergency generators under the Preferred Alternative would result in a nominal, annual emission increase to the JBER Flight Line Major Stationary Source potential to emit (Table 3-15) and would not trigger permitting. Notification to ADEC prior to installation of the three new, stationary emergency generators, as stipulated in the JBER Flight Line Stationary Source Title V Operation Permit, would be required.

The air quality impacts resulting from the installation of the three emergency generators are considered insignificant and are well below the de minimis thresholds listed in Tables 3-12 and 3-13. Changes to the Flight Line Stationary Source emission inventory would need to be coordinated with ADEC, Division of Air Quality. These changes to the emission inventory

would be accomplished by notifying ADEC as stipulated in the JBER Flight Line Stationary Source Operating Permit.

Table 3-14. Stationary Diesel-fired Emergency Generator Specifications

Unit Description	Generator Parameters		Fuel Consumption Rate (gallons/hour)	Heat Input Rating (MMBtu/hr)
	Generator (kWe)	Engine (bHp)		
ALSF-1 Emergency Generator	450	755	5.29	5.29
ILS Localizer and Glide Slope Emergency Generators	20	34	1.9	0.24

kWe – kilowatt electric of generator

bHp – brake horsepower of the engine

MMBtu/hr – million British thermal units per hour

Table 3-15. Stationary Source Annual Emissions

Emission Description	Unit	Annual Emissions (tons/year) ¹						
		VOC	CO	NOx	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	CO _{2e}
Airfield Lighting Vault Emergency Generator		0.47	1.10	2.01	<0.01	0.06	0.06	176.15
ILS Localizer Emergency Generator		0.02	0.08	0.10	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	9.73
ILS Glide Slope Emergency Generator		0.02	0.08	0.10	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	9.73
Total		0.51	1.25	2.21	<0.01	0.07	0.07	195.61
Permitting Thresholds								
PSD Major Modification:		40	100	40	40	15	10	--
Minor Stationary Source		--	100	10	10	100	10	--

1. Annual emissions from CO_{2e} are in metric tonnes consistent with calculation methods established in 40 CFR 98.

Construction Phase Emissions

The Preferred Alternative would extend RW 16/34 2,900 feet to the north. Consistent with the 2018 FEIS, the following components were assessed for construction phase of the proposed action: (1) excavate terrain to remove topographic barriers, (2) cut and fill operations to create the runway foundation, (3) construct the runway pavements, (4) construct taxiways on both sides of the proposed extension, (5) construct/relocate support features, such as navigational aids (Nav aids), aircraft arrestor systems, signage, and drainage, and (6) relocate the roadway around the north end of the runway extension. The air quality analysis evaluated impact scenarios to extend RW 16/34 by 2,900 feet. JBER assumes that construction activities would require three years to complete, and the above components would occur in the following order:

1. Year 1 – (a) Vegetation Removal - Cut and Fill Operations and (b) Building Demolition.
2. Years 1 and 2 - (a) excavate terrain/cut and fill operations.
3. Year 2 - (a) Runway Overrun - Remove Existing Asphalt, (b) Paved Road - Remove Existing Asphalt, and (c) Install Gravel for Erosion Control.
4. Years 2 and 3 - (a) Install Gravel and Backfill and (b) Construct/Relocate Requisite Support Features Activities.
5. Year 3 – Asphalt and Resurfacing.

Peak annual emissions would occur in construction year two and would include (1) half of excavate terrain/cut and fill operations, (2) runway overrun - remove existing asphalt, (3) paved road - remove existing asphalt, (4) install gravel for erosion control, (5) half of install gravel and backfill, and (6) half of construct/relocate requisite support features activities. The annual and peak construction phase emissions are summarized in Table 3-16. Total emissions generated during each year of construction and at its peak would be de minimis. The ambient air quality impacts from construction phase emissions would be insignificant.

Potential long-term and short-term emissions within region of influence potentially impacted by the Preferred Alternative were calculated and compared to the evaluation criteria presented in Tables 3-12 and 3-13. The long-term ambient air quality impacts expected to occur as a result of the Preferred Alternative include change to F-22 Operations and the addition of three new, diesel-fired emergency generators to the JBER Flight Line Title V Major Stationary Source. Construction related activities associated with the Preferred alternative would generate short-term emissions impacts, which would occur over a three-year time span. The revised emission impacts from construction activities assessed under the Preferred Alternative are based on the entire 2,900-foot runway extension rather than just the additional 400 feet added since the ROD was signed for the 2018 EIS.

Table 3-16. Yearly and Peak Construction Phase Emissions

Year/ Construction Activity	Tons						
	VOC	CO	NOx	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	CO _{2e}
Year 1							
Vegetation Removal - Cut and Fill Operations	0.48	1.54	4.45	0.00	0.19	0.18	953.82
Building Demolition	0.05	0.15	0.47	0.00	0.02	0.02	123.00
Excavate Terrain/Cut and Fill Operations ¹	4.58	16.32	45.30	0.03	9.59	2.55	8,709.53
Year 1 Total:	5.11	18.02	50.21	0.03	9.80	2.76	9,786.34
Year 2							
Excavate Terrain/Cut and Fill Operations ¹	4.58	16.32	45.30	0.03	9.59	2.55	8,709.53
Runway Overrun - Remove Existing Asphalt	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.00	0.02	0.00	7.94
Paved Road - Remove Existing Asphalt	0.03	0.10	0.35	0.00	0.09	0.02	54.99
Install Gravel for Erosion Control	0.05	0.16	0.48	0.00	0.02	0.02	129.68
Install Gravel and Backfill ²	0.22	0.65	1.85	0.00	0.10	0.10	465.51
Construct/ Relocate Requisite Support Features ²	0.08	0.36	0.88	0.00	1.69	0.22	197.74
Year 2 Total Emissions	4.97	17.60	48.90	0.03	11.51	2.92	9,565.39
Year 3							

Install Gravel and Backfill ²	0.22	0.65	1.85	0.00	0.10	0.10	465.51
Construct/Relocate Requisite Support Features ²	0.08	0.36	0.88	0.00	1.69	0.22	197.74
Asphalt and Resurfacing	0.75	2.29	6.71	0.00	4.55	0.81	1,826.11
Year 3 Total Emissions	1.05	3.30	9.44	0.00	6.34	1.13	2,489.37
Peak Annual Emissions	4.97	17.60	48.90	0.03	11.51	2.92	9,565.39

1. Equals half of the total emissions for a given activity occurring in Years 1 and 2

2. Equals half of the total emissions for a given activity occurring in Years 2 and 3

3.7.3 Environmental Consequences: No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would continue the operation of the airfield in its current manner. The support features referenced in the 2018 EIS would not be relocated and no new facilities would be constructed. The net emissions increase associated with the installation of the three emergency generators associated with the above facilities would not occur under the No Action Alternative. No changes to the JBER Flight Line Stationary Source emission inventory and potential to emit would occur if the No Action Alternative was selected.

3.8 OTHER NEPA CONSIDERATIONS

Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions are described in section 5.1 of the 2018 EIS. Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable DoD Actions (cumulative effects) in JBER Region of Influence are discussed in section 5.2 of the 2018 EIS. Other NEPA considerations are described in section 5.3.1 of the 2018 EIS. There are no additional reasonably foreseeable effects than those previously analyzed.

3.8.1 Unavoidable Adverse Effects

This SEA identifies any unavoidable adverse impacts that would result from the implementation of the Preferred Alternative and the significance of the potential impacts to resources and issues. Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations §1508.1 defines effects or impacts as "...changes to the human environment from the proposed action or alternatives that are reasonably foreseeable and have a reasonably close causal relationship to the proposed action...". Effects can be beneficial or detrimental and immediate or removed by time or space.

The extension of RW 16/34 would impact the local project area at JBER. The severity of potential impacts would be limited by regulatory compliance for the protection of the human and natural environment.

Unavoidable short-term adverse impacts associated with implementing the Preferred Alternative would include temporary erosion and sedimentation from soils disturbance, a temporary increase in fugitive dust and air emissions during construction, intermittent noise, and minor alterations to local traffic and airfield operations. However, these effects would be minor, when considered with applicable mitigating measures. Use of environmental controls and implementing controls required in permits and approvals obtained would minimize these potential impacts. Mitigation measures described in the 2018 ROD address these impacts.

Unavoidable, long-term, adverse impacts would occur to up to 38.5 acres of wetlands during RW 16/34 extension. Upland habitat loss associated with the expansion of clearing and grading limits compared to the effects described in the 2018 EIS would also contribute long-term adverse effects. A Finding of No Practicable Alternative was concluded in the 2018 Record of Decision with respect to the necessity to impact wetlands in order to meet the project purpose and need. While the acreage of wetlands impacted has increased from 27.9 acres to 38.5 acres, the types and functions of wetlands to be impacted are similar to those analyzed in the 2018 EIS. Similarly, the overall significance of the effect to wetlands remains the same as was concluded in the Record of Decision. Accordingly, the Air Force proposes to provide mitigation of the unavoidable impacts in the same manner as was determined appropriate previously. The total number and type of mitigation credits to be purchased would be increased proportionally to cover the total acres, wetland types, and functions to be impacted. Credits will be calculated in accordance with the ADCM method, which is a locally established and Federal agency-approved mechanism for calculating wetland mitigation requirements. Determination of mitigation credit purchase will be calculated and executed as part of a final mitigation plan.

The inclusion of the ground improvements in the Preferred Alternative is anticipated to prevent any delayed adverse effects to wetlands and no other delayed effects would be anticipated.

3.8.2 Relationship of Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity

The relationship between short-term uses and enhancement of long-term productivity from implementation of the Preferred Alternative is evaluated from the standpoint of short-term effects and long-term effects. Short-term effects would be those associated with the construction activities to extend RW 16/34. The long-term enhancement of productivity would be those effects associated with improvements to operational efficiency, safety, and training of the runway after implementation of the Preferred Alternative.

The loss of wetlands and habitat represent long-term impacts directly associated with the Preferred Alternative; however, the Air Force has avoided and minimized many of these impacts during the development of the preferred alternative and will mitigate to insignificant those impacts that are not avoided by taking the measures discussed in the prior sections.

The Preferred Alternative represents an enhancement of long-term productivity for aircraft operations at JBER. The negative effects of short-term operational changes during construction activities would be minor compared to the positive benefits from extension of the runway. Immediate and long-term benefits would be realized for operational efficiency and safety after completion of the Preferred Alternative.

3.8.3 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources

This SEA identifies any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources that would be involved in the Preferred Alternative if implemented. An irreversible effect results from the use or destruction of resources (e.g., energy) that cannot be replaced within a reasonable time. An irretrievable effect results from loss of resources (e.g., endangered species) that cannot be restored as a result of the Preferred Alternative.

The short-term irreversible commitments of resources that would occur would include planning and engineering costs, building materials and supplies and their cost, use of energy resources during construction, labor, generation of fugitive dust emissions, and creation of temporary construction noise. The purchase of wetland mitigation credits would be required to offset unavoidable wetland impacts, pursuant to the mitigation for wetland impacts described in the 2018 ROD. The increased maintenance costs associated with an extended runway would represent a minor irretrievable commitment of resources. Additional information regarding the irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources associated with the Preferred Alternative is provided in section 5.3.2 of the 2018 EIS.

Section 4

List of Preparers

This SEA has been prepared under the direction of the Air Force Civil Engineer Center (AFCEC), Air Force, and PACAF, JBER 673d CES.

Name/Organization	Education	Resource Area	Years of Experience
Matt Ferguson/USACE	M.S., Environmental Management	Document preparation, physical resources, safety, land use/recreation, biological resources	5
Chris Floyd/USACE	M.S., Hydrology	Hazardous materials and hazardous waste	29
Jan Dieck/USACE	M.S., Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	Water resources	35
Ranna Wells/USACE	M.A., Anthropology	Cultural resources	10
Michael Salyer/USACE	M.S., Wildlife Biology	Oversight and guidance of SEA development	24
Charlene C. Johnson/ 673d Civil Engineer Squadron	M.S. Biology,	Professional Wetland Scientist (P.W.S.), vegetation ecology, soil, stormwater, and hydrology, EIAP	21
Amy Kearns/673 rd Civil Engineer Squadron	M.S., Natural Resources Management	Air Quality	24

Section 5

References and Resources

- Air Force Civil Engineer Center (AFCEC). 2021a. Department of the Air Force PFAS Snapshot. Online Document, https://www.afcec.af.mil/Portals/17/documents/Environment/Emerging%20contaminants/SNAPS HOT_PFA%20OCT%202021_FINAL.pdf?ver=Tej6ERs7IJIFa8HGM1ainQ%3d%3d.
- AFCEC. 2021b. Department of the Air Force Response to PFAS (PFOS/PFOA) Fact Sheet. Online Document, https://www.afcec.af.mil/Portals/17/documents/Environment/Emerging%20contaminants/PFOS%20PFOA%20Fact%20Sheet%20Final_210528.pdf?ver=8mKrPmAepRLzbOBkElxQqQ%3d%3d.
- AFCEC. 2021c. GeoBase. GEODATA_Wetlands_A. A geospatial dataset. Updated March 2021.
- Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC). 2021. 18 AAC 75, Oil and Other Hazardous Substances Pollution Control, as amended through 24 June 2021.
- Alberta Biodiversity Monitoring Institute. 2020. Moose (*Alces alces*). ABMI Website: abmi.ca/home/data-analytics/biobrowser-home/species-profile?tsn=180703.
- Brandt, Colette. 2020. Recreational Fishing Activity Report on Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson During 2019. 673 CES/CEIEC, Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska.
- Brandt, Colette. 2021. Recreational Fishing Activity Report on Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson During 2020. 673 CES/CEIEC, Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska.
- Brice Engineering, LLC (Brice). 2021. Draft Chemical Data Report: JBE054 N/S Runway Extension Site Investigation, Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska. Contract W911KB-20-D-0002, Task Order No. W911KB-21-F-0029. Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Alaska District. June 2021.
- Cowardin, L. M., V. Carter, F. C. Golet, and E. T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States. Washington, D.C. Office of Biological Services, Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of the Interior.
- Dean, Heather. 2011. Anchorage Debit-Credit Method (ADCM). April 2011.
- Efroymson, R. A., and G. W. II Suter. 2001. Ecological Risk Assessment Framework for Low-Altitude Aircraft Overflights: II. Estimating Effects on Wildlife. *Society for Risk Analysis* 21(2).
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2021. How do Wetlands Function and Why are they Valuable? Online Webpage, <https://www.epa.gov/wetlands/how-do-wetlands-function-and-why-are-they-valuable>.
- Hoang, T. 2013. A Literature Review of the Effects of Aircraft Disturbances on Seabirds, Shorebird and Marine Mammals. Online Document, <http://seabirdprotectionnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Aircraft-disturbance-literature-review.pdf>.

- Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER). 2016. JBER OPLAN 19-3, Environmental Management Plan.
- JBER. 2018. 2018 JBER Installation Natural Resources Management Plan.
- JBER. 2020. JBER Integrated Hazardous Material Plan.
- Sease, J. L. 1992. Status Review: Harbor Seals (*Phoca vitulina*) in Alaska. Alaska Fisheries Science Center Processed Report 92-15, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.
- State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). 2021. Letter to USAF (Margan Grover) from SHPO (Judith Bittner) regarding the North Runway Extension, Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson. 16 November 2021.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2021. Geotechnical Data Report: Runway 16/34 Extension (JBE054). USACE, Alaska District. 8 November 2021.
- USACE. 2020. Wetland Delineation Report: North Runway Extension (JBE054) Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska, POA-2019-00676. USACE, Alaska District. September 2020.
- U.S. Air Force (Air Force). 2008. Final Environmental Assessment for the Expansion of the Elmendorf AFB Gravel Pit. Online Document, <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/ADA634356.pdf>.
- Air Force. 2011. F-22 Plus-Up Environmental Assessment Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska and Finding of No Significant Impact. June 2011. Online Document, <https://www.arlis.org/docs/vol1/C/741983009.pdf>.
- Air Force. 2017. Draft Environmental Assessment for the North Runway Hill Removal Project. United States Air Force Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson. Online Document, <https://www.jber.jb.mil/Portals/144/Services-Resources/environmental/Current-NEPA/Environmental-NorthRunway-HillRemoval-Final-EA.pdf>.
- Air Force. 2018. Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposal to Improve F-22 Operational Efficiency at Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson.
- Air Force. 2021a. Cultural Resources Investigations at the Northern End of the North/South Runway Expansion Project Area, Elmendorf Runway, Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska. Prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Alaska District, Environmental Resources Section for the 673d Air Base Wing Environmental Conservation Program.
- Air Force. 2021b. Letter to SHPO (Judith Bittner) from USAF, 673d CES/CEIEC (Jeanne Dye-Porto) re: Archaeological Survey for North Runway Extension, Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson. 25 October 2021.

Section 6

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

ABW	Air Base Wing
ADCM	Anchorage Debit-Credit Methodology
ADEC	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
ADFG	Alaska Department of Fish and Game
AFB	Air Force Base
AFCEC	Air Force Civil Engineer Center
AFFF	Aqueous Film Forming Foam
AFI	Air Force Instruction
AFPD	Air Force Policy Directive
AHRS	Alaska Historic Resources Survey
AJD	Approved Jurisdictional Determination
ANCSA	Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act
APE	Area of Potential Effect
AT/FP	Antiterrorism/Force Protection
AWAM	Anchorage Wetland Assessment Method
AZ	Airfield Zone
BASH	Bird/ Wildlife Aircraft Strike Hazard
BE	Biological Evaluation
BGEPA	Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act
CEG	Civil Engineers Group
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CIBW	Cook Inlet Beluga Whale
CLZ	Clear Zone
CWA	Clean Water Act
cy	cubic yards

DA	Department of the Army
DAFI	Department of Air Force Instruction
DoD	Department of Defense
DODI	Department of Defense Instruction
DOPAA	Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIAP	Environmental Impact Analysis Process
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EO	Executive Order
ERP	Environmental Restoration Program
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
FONPA	Finding of No Practicable Alternative
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
HQ PACAF	Headquarters Pacific Air Forces
HUC	Hydrologic Unit Code
IBCT	Infantry Brigade Combat Team
ID	Infantry Division
ILS	Instrument Landing System
INRMP	Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan
JBER	Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson
LoC	Letter of Concurrence
mcy	million cubic yards
MFR	Memorandum for Record
mg/kg	milligrams per kilogram
MMPA	Marine Mammal Protection Act
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
mph	miles per hour
MSL	Mean Sea Level
MWR	Morale, Welfare, and Recreation

NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOA	Notice of Availability
NORAD	North American Aerospace Defense Command
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
ODO	Opposite Direction Flight Operations
PEM	Freshwater Emergent Wetland
PFAS	Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substance
PFO	Freshwater Forested Wetland
PFOA	Perfluorooctanoic Acid
PFOS	Perfluorooctane Sulfonic Acid
PL	Public Law
PRD	Protected Resource Division
PUB	Freshwater Pond
RCRA	Resource Conservation Recovery Act
REV	Relative Ecologic Value
ROI	Region of Influence
ROD	Record of Decision
RW	Runway
SBCT	Stryker Brigade Combat Team
SEA	Supplemental Environmental Assessment
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
TNW	Traditional Navigable Waterway
UFC	Unified Facilities Criteria
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USAF	United States Air Force
USC	United States Code
USDA-WS	United States Department of Agriculture-Wildlife Services
UXO	Unexploded Ordnance
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound
WEZ	Wildlife Exclusion Zone

WOTUS	Waters of the United States
WG	Wing
WR	WEZ Remainder
3WG1	3 rd Wing Instruction