

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL
ASSESSMENT FOR THE TRANSITION FROM C-2A TO CMV-22B AIRCRAFT AT
FLEET LOGISTICS CENTERS - NAVAL AIR STATION NORTH ISLAND,
CALIFORNIA AND NAVAL STATION NORFOLK, VIRGINIA**

Pursuant to Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations Parts 1500-1508) implementing the National Environmental Policy Act, U.S. Department of the Navy (Navy) Regulations (32 Code of Federal Regulations part 775), and the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations Instruction 5090.1D, the Navy gives notice that an Environmental Assessment (EA) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) have been prepared, and an Environmental Impact Statement is not required for the transition from C-2A to CMV-22B ("Navy V-22") aircraft at fleet logistics centers - Naval Air Station (NAS) North Island and Naval Station (NS) Norfolk. NAS North Island is part of the consortium of Naval Base Coronado (NBC) installations.

Purpose and Need: The purpose of the Proposed Action is to provide the logistics support community the facilities and functions needed to support the replacement of the fixed-wing C-2A aircraft with the Navy V-22 tilt-rotor aircraft to meet operational requirements and enhance the logistics support mission. The Proposed Action is needed to support the Navy's national defense requirements under Title 10 United States Code Section 5062 as the older C-2A aircraft has reached the end of its service life. Increasing maintenance requirements limit the use of the aging C-2A for the aircraft carrier on-board delivery mission. The Proposed Action would provide the facilities needed to efficiently transition the C-2A to the Navy V-22 aircraft without interruption of the time critical logistics support mission for carrier strike groups at sea.

Proposed Action: The Navy proposes to provide facilities and functions to support the replacement of C-2A aircraft with the Navy V-22 Osprey at existing West and East Coast logistics support centers NAS North Island, California and NS Norfolk, Virginia. Under the Proposed Action, the Navy plans to replace 27 legacy C-2A aircraft operated by existing logistics support squadrons with 38 Navy V-22 aircraft operated by fleet logistics support multi-mission squadrons; establish a Navy V-22 training squadron to train pilots and aircrews, and a maintenance school for maintenance personnel; construct, renovate, and maintain

facilities to accommodate Navy V-22 squadron aircraft, aircraft maintenance, and personnel; and conduct Navy V-22 flight training operations.

The increased number of aircraft under the Proposed Action is needed because the current inventory of C-2A aircraft is not sufficient to meet the mission requirements. Changes in personnel loading under the Proposed Action would be influenced by the location of the training squadron, maintenance school, and maintenance personnel.

The Proposed Action would be implemented over a 10-year period beginning in 2018 with facility renovations and some personnel actions at NAS North Island and NS Norfolk. Eventually, the Navy V-22 training squadron and maintenance school would be established, either at NAS North Island or NS Norfolk, to fully support Navy training requirements. The transition is expected to be complete in the 2028 timeframe.

Alternatives Analyzed: The Navy considered three alternatives: The No Action Alternative and two action alternatives (Alternative 1 and Alternative 2).

No Action Alternative. Under the No Action Alternative, the Navy would not provide facilities and functions to support the replacement of the C-2A aircraft with the Navy V-22 at existing West and East Coast logistics support centers that service aircraft carriers. The carrier on-board mission would continue to be performed by the fleet logistics support squadrons at NAS North Island and NS Norfolk using the C-2A aircraft. Additionally, C-2A naval aviators and aircrews would continue to be trained to join the fleet operational squadrons at NS Norfolk by the existing fleet training squadron. However, the existing C-2A aircraft have reached the end of their service life. Increasing maintenance requirements limit the use of the aging C-2A for the aircraft carrier on-board delivery mission, which would prevent the Navy from supporting its forward deployed forces effectively. The No Action Alternative would not meet the purpose and need for the Proposed Action; however, the conditions associated with the No Action Alternative serve as reference points for describing and quantifying the potential impacts associated with the action alternatives. Baseline conditions for facilities and infrastructure, the number of aircraft, the number of personnel, and resource areas are represented by the most recent available data as of the date of EA preparation. Baseline conditions for the number of aircraft

operations are best represented by the average of the last full five years of actual operational data for NAS North Island and NS Norfolk from 2011 to 2015.

Alternative 1. Under Alternative 1, the Navy would provide facilities and functions to support the replacement of the existing C-2A with the Navy V-22 at NAS North Island and NS Norfolk. The Navy V-22 training squadron and maintenance school would be established at NAS North Island. The Navy would begin to transition the C-2A to the Navy V-22 in 2020 when the first aircraft are expected to arrive at NAS North Island. For the next several years, there would be a mix of C-2A and Navy V-22 aircraft and personnel, until the transition from the C-2A to the Navy V-22 is complete in the 2028 timeframe.

Total fleet logistics support squadron aircraft at NAS North Island would increase from 10 to 23 compared to the No Action Alternative. At NS Norfolk, total fleet logistics support squadron aircraft would decrease from 17 aircraft to 15 aircraft compared to the No Action Alternative.

Under Alternative 1, there would be an increase of 341 personnel at NAS North Island compared to the No Action Alternative, whereas NS Norfolk would experience a reduction of 126 personnel. Alternative 1 would include construction and/or renovation of facilities at NAS North Island and NS Norfolk that would include aircraft hangars, parking aprons, taxiways, helipads, wash racks, and pilot and maintenance training facilities. Pilot training facilities would include installation of flight simulators called flight training devices. Two of the five Navy V-22 training squadron aircraft would also require hangar space at NAS North Island under Alternative 1. Hangar space construction and pavement renovation would total approximately 156,000 square feet and 35 acres, respectively, at NAS North Island and 62,000 square feet and 24 acres at NS Norfolk. At NAS North Island, 26 existing buildings would be demolished for construction of new facilities, and the interiors of three existing NAS North Island buildings outside the project area would be partially renovated.

The Navy anticipates a total of approximately 16,000 annual airfield operations by Navy V-22 aircraft at NAS North Island under Alternative 1, which represents an increase of 11,500 from No Action Alternative C-2A operations. Total annual aircraft operations at NAS North Island would increase from 79,800 to 91,300, a 14 percent increase. The resulting total projected

operations for Alternative 1 are well within recent historical averages at NAS North Island. The anticipated number of operations have been flown before, and this increase will have minimal impacts to the noise contours, which are driven by jet aircraft operations. Additionally, the Navy anticipates a total of approximately 7,000 annual Navy V-22 airfield operations at NS Norfolk, which is consistent with current C-2A operations at NS Norfolk.

Under Alternative 1, Navy V-22 flight training would require the use of secondary training airfields in the regional vicinity of NAS North Island and NS Norfolk. Secondary airfield training requirements would be distributed among six West Coast and six East Coast airfields. The Department of the Air Force participated as a cooperating agency in preparation of the EA for those actions that would occur at Joint Base Langley-Eustis Felker Army Airfield (Felker AAF). Felker AAF is an airfield and training area assigned under Joint Base Langley-Eustis in Virginia, and is one of several East Coast secondary training airfields identified to support future Navy V-22 training. Proposed annual operations at secondary airfields would be similar to existing operations and would represent a small percentage increase over operations that have already been analyzed under NEPA. The Navy V-22 operations would be expected to have negligible environmental impacts to the airspace and airfield environments. Under Alternative 1, air emissions would not appreciably increase over existing operations at the secondary airfields, and air emissions impacts would be negligible. Therefore, environmental and operational impacts associated with Navy V-22 use of secondary training airfields would not be significant and were not evaluated further in this EA.

Alternative 2. Under Alternative 2, the Navy would provide facilities and functions to support the replacement of the existing C-2A with the Navy V-22 at NAS North Island and NS Norfolk. The Navy V-22 training squadron and maintenance school would be established at NS Norfolk. The Navy would begin to transition the C-2A to the Navy V-22 in 2020 when the first aircraft are expected to arrive at NAS North Island. For the next several years, there would be a mix of C-2A and Navy V-22 aircraft and personnel, until the transition from the C-2A to the Navy V-22 is complete in the 2028 timeframe.

Total fleet logistics support squadron aircraft at NAS North Island would increase from 10 to 18 compared to the No Action

Alternative. At NS Norfolk, total fleet logistics support squadron aircraft would increase from 17 aircraft to 20 aircraft compared to the No Action Alternative.

Under Alternative 2, there would be an increase of 161 personnel at NAS North Island compared to the No Action Alternative, and NS Norfolk would experience an increase of 54 personnel. Alternative 2 would include construction and/or renovation of facilities at NAS North Island and NS Norfolk that would include aircraft hangars, parking aprons, taxiways, helipads, wash racks, and pilot and maintenance training facilities. Pilot training facilities would include installation of flight training devices. Two of the five Navy V-22 training squadron aircraft would also require hangar space at NS Norfolk under Alternative 2. Hangar space construction and pavement renovation would total approximately 102,200 square feet and 24 acres, respectively, at NAS North Island and approximately 96,100 square feet and 36 acres at NS Norfolk. At NAS North Island, 17 existing buildings would be demolished for construction of new facilities, and the interiors of three existing NAS North Island buildings outside the project area would be partially renovated.

The Navy anticipates a total of approximately 10,300 annual airfield operations by Navy V-22 aircraft at NAS North Island under Alternative 2, which represents an increase of 5,800 from No Action Alternative C-2A operations. Total aircraft operations at NAS North Island would increase from 79,800 to 85,600, a 7 percent increase. This level of operations at NAS North Island is consistent with recent historical operations. Additionally, the Navy anticipates a total of approximately 12,700 annual Navy V-22 airfield operations at NS Norfolk, which represents an increase of 5,700 operations from No Action Alternative C-2A operations. Total annual flight operations of all aircraft at NS Norfolk would increase from 66,900 under the No Action Alternative to 72,600, an 8.5 percent increase in operations at NS Norfolk. At both NAS North Island and NS Norfolk, this increase in annual flight operations will have minimal impacts to the noise contours.

Under Alternative 2, Navy V-22 flight training would require the use of secondary training airfields in the regional vicinity of NAS North Island and NS Norfolk. Secondary airfield training requirements would be distributed among six West Coast and six East Coast airfields. Proposed annual operations at secondary airfields would be similar to existing operations and would

represent a small percentage of the operations that have already been analyzed under NEPA. The Navy V-22 operations would be expected to have negligible environmental impacts to the airspace and airfield environments. Under Alternative 2, air emissions would not appreciably increase over existing operations at the secondary airfields, and air emissions impacts would be negligible. Therefore, environmental and operational impacts associated with Navy V-22 use of secondary training airfields would not be significant and were not evaluated further in this EA.

Alternatives Considered but not Carried Forward for Detailed Analysis: The Navy considered several other alternatives, but did not carry them forward for detailed analysis in the EA because they did not meet the purpose and need for the Proposed Action or satisfy the important elements considered during the course of developing a range of action alternatives. In developing the proposed range of alternatives that meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action, the Navy carefully reviewed these important considerations:

- Colocation with fleet logistics centers that service aircraft carriers
- Maximum reuse of existing facilities and support
- Colocation of Navy V-22 training squadron with fleet logistic support squadrons

Alternatives considered but not carried forward for detailed analysis included the following:

- The establishment of new home bases for the fleet logistic support aircraft in locations where there is no existing fleet logistics center
- Single siting of Navy V-22 squadrons
- Establishment of a Training Squadron and Maintenance School at both West and East Coast locations
- Establishment of a Training Squadron and Maintenance School at neither West nor East Coast location

Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures Associated with the Proposed Action: The following is a summary of the environmental consequences of the Proposed Action.

Airfields and Airspace: Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 would result in an increase of 14 percent and 7 percent in total

airfield operations at NAS North Island, respectively. The increase would be well within recent historical operations levels in the last 15 years at NAS North Island and would not be significant. At NS Norfolk under Alternative 1, annual airfield operations of Navy V-22 would be about the same as C-2A operations under the No Action Alternative. Therefore, Alternative 1 would have no impact to airfields and airspace at NS Norfolk. Alternative 2 would increase annual airfield operations at NS Norfolk by approximately 8.5 percent. For both NAS North Island and NS Norfolk, the potential increase would not impact civilian aircraft or other users in the vicinity, as existing standard operating procedures and course rules would continue to apply to minimize safety risks. Navy V-22 usage of associated airspace would be consistent with current operations, and there would be no direct or indirect impact to airspace. Under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 at NAS North Island and NS Norfolk, transit flights to secondary airfields would be dispersed throughout the available airspace, and would have negligible impacts to airspace. No changes to airspace would be required for Alternative 1 or Alternative 2. Navy V-22 transits would occur at altitudes exceeding 3,000 feet above ground level. Navy V-22 operations would be managed in accordance with existing procedures, FAA regulations, and established local approach and departure patterns at each airfield to avoid conflicts and minimize safety risks.

Noise: Under the Proposed Action, no significant impacts from noise would occur. Construction and operations under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 would not result in a perceptible change to noise at NAS North Island or NS Norfolk. None of the alternatives would result in a perceptible change in the Department of Defense's primary noise metric, Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) at NAS North Island or Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) at NS Norfolk. Noise levels for the alternatives would be nearly indistinguishable from the baseline. Supplemental noise analysis was conducted to determine the loudest noise events and probability of sleep disturbance at specific locations. Results of supplemental noise metric analysis showed that at 13 points of interest (POIs) in the NAS North Island community and 18 POIs in the NS Norfolk community, the change in noise exposure in either community under Alternative 1 or 2 would be mostly imperceptible. The alternatives would have no impact to the Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) Programs at NAS North Island or NS Norfolk. The loudest Sound Exposure Level from Navy V-22 operations would not exceed 110 dB at any of the POIs.

Therefore, vibration effects from Navy V-22 operations would be expected to be minor. The Navy would continue to implement noise abatement procedures published in the 2013 NBC Instruction 3710.7V for NAS North Island and in the 2009 AICUZ Study at NS Norfolk.

Public Health and Safety: With implementation of the Proposed Action, the Navy would continue to meet the primary goal of the AICUZ Programs at NAS North Island and NS Norfolk, which is to protect the public's health, safety, and welfare through collaboration with the local communities. Alternative 1 would slightly increase the number of air operations at NAS North Island, compared to the No Action Alternative, and Alternative 2 would slightly increase the number of air operations at NAS North Island and NS Norfolk. However, this would not change each installation's ability to comply with military airfield safety procedures for aircraft arrival and departure flight tracks and for operations surrounding the airfields.

The operation of the Navy V-22 would not change airfield habitat or its attractiveness to birds and other wildlife; therefore, the alternatives would not impact the bird/animal aircraft strike hazard (BASH) programs at NAS North Island or NS Norfolk.

Air Quality: Total air pollutant emissions associated with construction activities under the Proposed Action at NAS North Island and NS Norfolk, even if all construction activities were to occur in one year and not two, would be well below the applicable annual significance thresholds.

The Navy has determined that the potential emissions of the Proposed Action at NAS North Island would not cause or contribute to a violation of any National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) or California Ambient Air Quality Standards. Emissions would be below the applicable General Conformity *de minimis* thresholds. NS Norfolk is in the City of Norfolk, which is within the Hampton Roads Intrastate Air Quality Control Region (AQCR). The Hampton Roads AQCR is in attainment of all NAAQS; therefore, the Proposed Action does not require a General Conformity evaluation. The net increase in emissions from the replacement of existing C-2A aircraft operations with the proposed Navy V-22 operations at NAS North Island or NS Norfolk under Alternatives 1 and 2 would not exceed any Prevention of Significant Deterioration thresholds. Emissions increases to the global inventory of greenhouse gases under Alternatives 1 or 2 would produce a negligible contribution to future climate change.

Transportation: Implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to local transportation.

Alternatives 1 and 2 would result in a short-term increase in construction delivery trucks and construction worker vehicles at NAS North Island and NS Norfolk, which would have a temporary impact on Coronado and Norfolk roadways. On average, under Alternative 1, approximately five truck trips per work day (Monday through Friday) would travel to NAS North Island, and approximately one truck trip per work day would travel to NS Norfolk, over a construction period of 24 months. Under Alternative 2, approximately four truck trips per work day would travel to NAS North Island and approximately one truck trip per work day would travel to NS Norfolk over a construction period of 24 months.

Under Alternative 1 at NAS North Island, an additional 341 personnel would generate an estimated 340 commuter trips, referred to as average daily traffic (ADT), which is less than 1 percent of existing NAS North Island daily traffic. This increase in ADT was previously accounted for in projected future cumulative projects analyzed by the Navy in a 2008 traffic impact study. Under Alternative 2, an additional 161 personnel would generate an estimated 160 ADT, less than 1 percent of existing NAS North Island daily traffic.

Under Alternative 1 at NS Norfolk, a reduction of 126 personnel would result in an estimated decrease of 125 ADT, less than 1 percent of existing NS Norfolk daily traffic. Under Alternative 2, an increase of 54 personnel would generate an estimated increase of 55 ADT, less than 1 percent of existing NS Norfolk daily traffic. These changes would have a negligible effect on traffic.

Alternatives 1 and 2 would have a minimal impact on the capacity of carpool, vanpool, and other alternative transportation at NAS North Island and NS Norfolk. The Navy continues to work together with the communities and the transportation authorities to plan for the enhancement of the local and regional transportation system to provide residents and military personnel with increased options for transportation.

Biological Resources: Implementation of the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, or Alternative 2 would not result in significant impacts to biological resources at NAS North Island or NS Norfolk.

Alternative 1 would result in an increase in aircraft operations at NAS North Island, and Alternative 2 would increase aircraft operations at NAS North Island and NS Norfolk. The operation increases have the potential to result in an increase in BASH, including takes of migratory birds, as defined by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Aircraft operations would be conducted in accordance with the BASH Plan and the NBC and NS Norfolk Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans (INRMPs), which would minimize the risk of collision impacts to wildlife at NAS North Island and NS Norfolk. Additionally, no attractants would be created under Alternatives 1 or 2 that would increase the concentration of birds at the airfields. Because these operations are military readiness activities and are not expected to result in significant adverse effects on migratory bird populations they are exempt from the take prohibitions of the MBTA.

In accordance with the Department of Defense's (DoD) Memorandum of Understanding with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), to ensure that construction work would avoid impacting birds protected under the MBTA (including Birds of Conservation Concern) at NAS North Island, building demolition work and tree removal would, to the extent feasible, take place outside of the breeding season (non-breeding season is September 1 to February 14). If this work must be conducted during the bird breeding season, a qualified biologist must confirm that no active nest would be impacted by these actions. If an active nest is found in the project area, any nest removal action must be overseen by the NBC Wildlife Biologist. The NBC Wildlife Biologist, in coordination with the qualified biologist, must confirm that there will be no impacts to active nests before construction work could resume. Impacts to MBTA-protected bird species and their active nests would be avoided during construction. The risk of impacts to MBTA species would be expected to remain similar to existing conditions. Therefore, Alternatives 1 and 2 are not anticipated to have significant adverse effects on a population of migratory bird species (including Birds of Conservation Concern) that would result in the need for mitigation and consultation with USFWS.

The Navy has determined that implementing Alternative 1 or 2 at NAS North Island *may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect* the California least tern and the western snowy plover; therefore, the Navy conducted informal consultations with the USFWS. No construction would occur within 300 feet of the NAS North Island California least tern management area (also

referred to as the MAT site), and no heavy construction would occur within 500 feet of the MAT site during the California least tern breeding season. Construction greater than 500 feet from the MAT site that could result in noise or visual impacts to nesting terns (e.g., building demolition, jack hammering) would be conducted outside of the California least tern breeding season to the maximum extent practicable. Western snowy plover nests found on the airfield would be collected for captive-rearing in accordance with the Ongoing Airfield Operations and Management Strategies at NAS North Island Biological Opinion (BO) (FWS-SDG-3908.3, 1 April 2005). Aircraft occasionally strike California least tern and western snowy plovers at the NAS North Island airfield under baseline conditions. Given the overall very low numbers of BASH incidents involving these species over the past 35 years (a total of seven incidents of aircraft striking California least tern and two incidents of aircraft striking western snowy plover) compared to the number of existing aircraft operations, a minor increase in aircraft operations would not be expected to increase take of California least tern or western snowy plover above that already authorized in the Ongoing Airfield Operations and Management Strategies at NAS North Island BO (FWS-SDG-3908.3, 1 April 2005). Continued adherence to the BASH Plan would minimize the risk of collision impacts to wildlife at NAS North Island. The USFWS concurred with the Navy's determination via letter dated March 26, 2018. In its concurrence letter, the USFWS stated, "Based on the site and species information [described in the concurrence letter] and the Navy's commitment to implement the proposed conservation measures, we conclude that all potential impacts of the project on the California least tern and western snowy plover will be avoided or reduced to a level of insignificance warranting our concurrence with the Navy's determination that the project is not likely to adversely affect the California least tern and western snowy plover."

No federally endangered, threatened, or candidate species of flora or fauna are known to be present at NS Norfolk.

Water Resources: Implementation of Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 would not result in significant impacts to water resources at NAS North Island or NS Norfolk. The operation of facilities at NAS North Island and NS Norfolk proposed under Alternatives 1 and 2 would comply with applicable standards and policies for post-construction stormwater management under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007; Navy Low Impact Development standards; Chief of Naval Operation Instruction

4100.5E; Executive Order 13834 -Efficient Federal Operations; the NBC National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit, and the NS Norfolk Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit. Post-construction stormwater management features would be incorporated into the project planning and site design. Non-stormwater discharges from the wash racks would be diverted to the sanitary system. Both alternatives could require dewatering activities during construction because of the shallow depth to groundwater within the project areas. The construction contractor would comply with applicable requirements for discharges. The Navy plans to incorporate appropriate measures to address potential impacts from sea level rise.

Infrastructure: At NAS North Island, Alternative 1 would increase water use by approximately 87,000 gallons per day (98 acre-feet per year) and wastewater collection by 0.053 million gallons per day. Alternative 2 would increase water use by approximately 45,000 gallons per day (50 acre-feet per year) and wastewater collection by 0.025 million gallons per day. This would result in a 1 percent or less increase in water demand for California American Water San Diego County District service area under Alternative 1 or 2; sufficient capacity would be available to accommodate this increase. The existing wastewater system at NAS North Island would adequately handle the increase in wastewater from additional personnel and operational activities. The Navy V-22 wash rack use would increase wastewater sent to oil recovery plant by 3,250 gallons per day under Alternative 1 and by 2,000 gallons per day under Alternative 2, and may exceed the current permitted industrial discharge (26,100 gallons per day). If necessary, the Navy would obtain an increase in the permitted discharge of industrial wastewater. Construction and operations would increase solid waste at NAS North Island. However, the waste flow would be minimized through mandatory recycling practices, and the existing landfill capacity would be able to accommodate the waste. Existing electrical infrastructure and utilities have ample capacity to absorb additional demand of the minor population increase.

At NS Norfolk, Alternative 1 would increase water demand and wastewater collection for the wash rack; this impact would generally be offset by the reduction of 126 personnel. Construction and operations would increase solid waste; area landfills have capacity to accept the additional waste. Existing electrical infrastructure and utilities would adequately handle the demand of proposed facilities.

At NS Norfolk under Alternative 2, additional personnel, families, and the wash rack would increase water use in the City of Norfolk, but the increase would not be significant. The existing wastewater system at NS Norfolk would adequately handle the minor increase in wastewater that would result from additional personnel and operational activities. Construction and operations would increase solid waste at NS Norfolk. However, the solid waste flow would be minimized through mandatory recycling practices, and the existing landfill capacity would be able to accommodate the waste. The NS Norfolk electrical infrastructure has ample capacity to absorb the population and facilities operations increase.

Cultural Resources: Pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 implementing regulations, the Navy has determined that no historic properties would be affected at NAS North Island with implementation of any of the alternatives. Therefore, in accordance with Stipulation VIII-B of the NBC Programmatic Agreement, NBC has satisfied its Section 106 responsibilities for the Proposed Action, and no further NHPA Section 106 review is required.

No adverse effect to National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-eligible or NRHP-listed architectural or archaeological resources is anticipated at NS Norfolk. In compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA, the Navy consulted with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, which acts as the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO); federally recognized tribes; and interested parties regarding its determination of effects for the proposed construction and flight operations activities at NS Norfolk. In its Memorandum dated January 3, 2018, the Virginia Department of Historic Resources concurred with the Navy determination that implementation of the Proposed Action at NS Norfolk would not have an adverse effect on historic resources. The Navy will coordinate with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources during the hangar design process at NS Norfolk. It is not expected that undiscovered cultural resources would be found during implementation of the Proposed Action; however, in the unlikely event of an inadvertent discovery of previously unrecorded or unevaluated cultural resources during ground disturbing operations, the Navy would manage these resources in accordance with the NHPA and other federal and state laws, and Navy and DoD regulations and instructions.

Hazardous Materials and Waste: The quantity of hazardous wastes generated from demolishing existing buildings and

construction/renovation activities associated with Alternatives 1 and 2 at NAS North Island and NS Norfolk would be minor and would not be expected to exceed the capacities of existing hazardous waste disposal facilities. The installations have established measures and programs for managing construction activities to ensure they are conducted in compliance with federal and state environmental laws and regulations.

Socioeconomics: There would be both short- and long-term minor beneficial economic impacts from construction activities under both Alternatives 1 and 2 at NAS North Island and NS Norfolk.

For operations at NAS North Island, there would be increases in personnel of 341 under Alternative 1 and 161 under Alternative 2 that would generate minor beneficial economic impacts. At NS Norfolk, under Alternative 1, there would be a decrease of 126 personnel at NS Norfolk and an increase of 54 personnel under Alternative 2. Given the scale of the regional economies and total employment at NAS North Island and NS Norfolk, these levels of loss or gain of jobs would not have significant direct or indirect impacts on local economic resources.

No significant adverse impacts are anticipated from the proposed minor population increases. While new Navy personnel may have to find housing in the community, assuming that all 341 or 161 new personnel at NAS North Island (Alternatives 1 and 2, respectively) seek community housing at the same time in 2020, this would represent 1 percent or less of the San Diego County Central major statistical area (MSA 0) total housing units, and 1 to 2 percent of vacant housing units projected for 2020. These increases would not result in a significant direct or indirect impact.

While 54 new Navy personnel at NS Norfolk may have to find housing in the community under Alternative 2, this would represent less than 1 percent of City of Norfolk housing units and would not result in a significant direct or indirect impact.

Based on the number and capacity of child care centers in proximity to NAS North Island and NS Norfolk, there is assumed to be ample child care capacity for 88 or 44 preschool-aged children (Alternative 1 or Alternative 2, respectively) at NAS North Island, and for 15 preschool-aged children at NS Norfolk (Alternative 2).

The EA analysis determined that environmental impacts that have the potential to effect minority populations or low-income

populations in the NAS North Island and NS Norfolk communities, including safety, noise, socioeconomics, and air emissions, would be negligible. Therefore, Alternatives 1 and 2 would not result in disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations or low-income populations in the NAS North Island or NS Norfolk communities.

Cumulative Impacts: Based on the analysis of each resource potentially impacted by the Proposed Action, implementation of either action alternative combined with the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts at NAS North Island or NS Norfolk.

Coastal Consistency: The Navy has determined that Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 at NAS North Island would have no effect on coastal use or resources of the State of California's coastal zone. The California Coastal Commission concurred with the negative determination via letter dated March 16, 2018. During consultation with the Commission, the Navy reiterated its commitment to continued cooperation with the City of Coronado on planning efforts to monitor and, where feasible and practicable, examine ways to reduce effects of aircraft and traffic on residents, recreation, and wildlife.

The Navy determined that Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 at NS Norfolk may have an effect on a coastal use or resources of the Commonwealth of Virginia's coastal zone and would be consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the applicable enforceable policies of the Virginia Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Program. The Navy consulted with the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ) on this determination. In its letter dated December 14, 2017, VDEQ stated that based on its review of the consistency determination and the comments submitted by agencies administering the enforceable policies of the Virginia CZM Program, VDEQ concurs that the Navy proposal is consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the Virginia CZM Program provided all applicable permits and approvals are obtained.

Public Involvement: A Notice of Availability and Open House Public Meeting for the Draft EA was published in daily newspapers in Virginia (*The Virginian-Pilot*) and California (*The San Diego Union Tribune*, on January 4, 5 and 6, 2018; and in weekly newspapers in California (*Imperial Beach Eagle & Times*, *La Prensa*, and *Coronado Eagle & Journal*) on January 4th, 5th, and

10th, respectively. When a brief government shutdown caused the cancellation and rescheduling of the Coronado public meeting, the Navy republished a Notice of Availability and Rescheduled Open House Public Meeting for the Draft EA in the *San Diego Union Tribune* (January 26, 27 and 28, 2018), the *Coronado Eagle & Journal* (January 31), the *Imperial Beach Eagle & Times* (February 1), and in *La Prensa* (January 26). Public meetings were held at the Mary D. Pretlow Anchor Branch Library in Norfolk, Virginia on January 18, 2018 and the Coronado Community Center in Coronado, California on February 7, 2018 with a combined attendance of 45 persons.

The Draft EA was initially made available for review for 30 days from January 4 to February 5, 2018. After the rescheduling of the Coronado public meeting, the Navy extended the Draft EA review period for three additional weeks through February 26, 2018. The Draft EA was posted on the project website and paper copies were available at four San Diego area libraries and three Hampton Roads area libraries.

Thirty-two comments from individuals, city officials, local organizations, state agencies, and tribes were received on the Draft EA through U.S. mail, project website, email, and at the two public information meetings. Of the 32 comments received, 17 expressed support for the Proposed Action (9 at NS Norfolk and 8 at NAS North Island). Several comments expressed concern about the noise environment and aircraft flight paths in the vicinity of the City of Coronado. Comments also included concerns about safety, air quality, the Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) Program at NAS North Island, land use compatibility, bird species, and traffic in the City of Coronado. Comments received during the public review period were considered in finalizing the EA and comments will also be considered in reaching the final decision about implementing the alternatives.

Finding: Based on analysis presented in the EA, the Navy finds that implementation of either Alternative 1 or 2 of the Proposed Action will not significantly impact the quality of the human or natural environment or generate significant controversy. Therefore, the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement will not be required. The Navy will proceed with the proposed action as described in Alternative 1 and 2; the eventual location of the V-22 training squadron and maintenance school will be determined upon completion of the selection process by the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations.

The EA prepared by the Navy is on file and interested parties may obtain a copy by downloading the EA from the project website: <http://www.aftteis.com/navy-v-22>, or may also be downloaded at: <http://www.public.navy.mil/usff/environmental/Pages/navy-v22.aspx>.

11/1/2018
Date

Elizabeth A. Nashold
Elizabeth Nashold
U.S. Fleet Forces Command