FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

FOURTH-GENERATION REGIONAL REALIGNMENT – DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB

Pursuant to provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Title 42 *United States Code* (USC) § 4321 et seq.; Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations at 40 *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) Parts 1500–1508; and 32 CFR Part 989, *Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP),* the United States (US) Air Force (Air Force) prepared the attached Environmental Assessment (EA) to address the potential environmental consequences associated with relocation of a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller training, and Guardian Angel operations to Davis-Monthan Air Force Base (AFB), Arizona. In addition, the EA evaluated the assignment of two Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Cessna 182 aircraft and the transfer of one RC-26B aircraft from the Morris Air National Guard Base (ANGB) located at the Tucson International Airport (Arizona).

Purpose and Need

Davis-Monthan Restructure

The purpose of moving the fourth-generation (4th Gen) A-10 and HH-60 aircraft squadrons from Nellis AFB is to free up Base and range capacity at the Nevada Test and Training Range necessary to test and train warfighters in fifth-generation (5th Gen) aircraft and allow personnel recovery units to take advantage of the synergy provided by co-locating with other rescue units. The Proposed Action would improve 5th Gen and beyond test, training, and tactics development capabilities at Nellis AFB to keep pace with Air Force mission requirements, evolving technology, and enemy capabilities. Nellis AFB has reached maximum capacity and space must be freed up to beddown 5th Gen missions.

The action to reassign the 4th Gen mission is needed because the current mission sets assigned to Nellis AFB and the Air Force Weapons Center are outpacing the ability to expand resources and capacity. The infrastructure available at Nellis AFB does not meet current or future mission needs and is operating at or beyond capacity.

Although this EA analyzed impacts associated with relocation of the 66th Weapons Squadron (66 WPS) (seven A-10C aircraft) and the A-10 portion of the 422nd Test and Evaluation Squadron (422 TES) (four A-10C aircraft) from Nellis AFB to Davis-Monthan AFB, the current Air Force plan is to divest those 11 A-10C aircraft and associated personnel in place at Nellis AFB. This EA also analyzed impacts associated with relocation of the 66th Rescue Squadron (66 RQS), which is assigned 14 HH-60W helicopters, from Nellis AFB to Davis-Monthan AFB. However, the 66 RQS was recently inactivated and the current Air Force plan is to redistribute the helicopters and personnel that had been assigned to this unit to other locations.

Beddown Civil Air Patrol Cessna 182

The purpose of the beddown of the CAP Cessna 182 is to provide better training and to increase operations missions that the CAP conducts in support of the Air Force.

The Air Force partnership with the CAP encompasses a variety of mission sets that directly benefit the Air Force. The beddown of CAP aircraft at Davis-Monthan AFB is needed to improve communications, interaction between the CAP and Air Force, and execution of a number of these missions.

Relocate RC-26B Operations

The purpose of the relocation of RC-26B operations is to create space for a potential increase in F-16 training based at the 162nd Wing (162 WG) at the Morris ANGB and to consolidate 214 Attack Group assets and operations in a common location.

The Air National Guard anticipates a large-scale increase in international F-16 training based at the 162 WG at Morris ANGB. A single RC-26B aircraft needs to be relocated to make room for F-16-specific ramp realignments and improvements that are incompatible with continued RC-26 operations. In 2017,

responsibility for the RC-26 organization was transferred from the 162nd Operations Group at Morris ANGB to the 214th Attack Group (214 ATKG), a subordinate unit to the 162 WG that is a tenant on Davis-Monthan AFB. Relocating the RC-26 aircraft and associated manpower to Davis-Monthan AFB in existing Total Force Training Center facilities would also serve to consolidate 214 ATKG assets and operations in a common location.

Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives

The Air Force is proposing to relocate the following 4th Gen missions from Nellis AFB, Nevada, to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona:

- 66 WPS
- A-10 Operational Test portion of the 422 TES
- 66 RQS
- 58 RQS
- 34 WPS
- 88 TES

In order to create capacity at Davis-Monthan AFB to accept the aforementioned missions, the Air Force proposes to take the following actions with units already stationed at Davis-Monthan AFB:

- Inactivate the 354th Fighter Squadron (354 FS) and retire assigned A-10C aircraft.
- Downsize the 357 FS and retire some of its A-10 aircraft.

The A-10 Operational Test portion of the 422 TES would transition in 2024. The HH-60 Weapons Instructor Course and Test and combat-coded units, to include the 88 TES, 66 RQS, 58 RQS, 79 RGS, 55 RGS, and the 34 WPS, would move beginning in 2025.

There are several other proposed actions at Davis-Monthan AFB unrelated to the movements described above that are occurring on approximately the same timelines and are therefore included in this analysis. These actions consist of assignment of two CAP Cessna 182 aircraft and the transfer of one RC-26B aircraft from the Morris ANGB located at the Tucson International Airport (Arizona).

Under the Proposed Action, day sorties would change from a total of 11,739 to 11,906, an increase of 167 sorties. Night sorties would change from a total of 2,272 to 3,206, an increase of 934 sorties. The Proposed Action also would involve construction of five facilities. The primary special use airspace (SUA) to be utilized by the 355 WG would be the Barry M. Goldwater Range. The Tombstone, Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci and Ruby/Fuzzy Military Operations Areas (MOAs) would also be utilized for training.

No Action Alternative

Analysis of the No Action Alternative provides a benchmark, enabling decision-makers to compare the magnitude of the potential environmental effects of the Proposed Action. NEPA requires an EA to analyze the No Action Alternative. No action means that an action would not take place at this time, and the resulting environmental effects from taking no action would be compared with the effects of deciding to move forward with the proposed activity. No action for this EA reflects the status quo, where no additional aircraft assets would be transferred to, retired from, or reallocated at Davis-Monthan AFB.

Summary of Findings

Potentially affected environmental resources were identified through communications with state and federal agencies and review of past environmental documentation. Specific environmental resources with the potential for environmental consequences include airspace management and use; noise; safety; air quality; biological, water, and cultural resources; geology and soils; land use; socioeconomics; environmental

justice and protection of children; hazardous materials and wastes, toxic substances, and contaminated sites; and infrastructure, transportation, and utilities.

Airspace Management and Use

The Proposed Action would result in an increase in airfield operations from 39,122 to an estimated 42,997 total airfield operations. The increase of 3,875 operations, or 9 percent, would be due to the addition of Base-assigned aircraft. Operations would still require air traffic control services by Davis-Monthan Tower and Tucson Approach for departure, pattern work, and arrival services.

Aircraft would continue to operate within the existing SUA but would increase SUA utilization by 10.9 percent, or 1,101 total annual sorties. Since scheduling deconfliction is already being done within the 355 WG, an increase of 1,101 annual SUA operations would not be expected to cause a significant impact. Additionally, these aircraft would be spread across all the various SUA, which would reduce airspace saturation. Therefore, no significant airspace impacts would be expected to occur with implementation of Proposed Action.

Noise

A total of 1,101 acres would be exposed to a Day-Night Average Sound Level of 65 decibels (dB DNL) or greater, 117 of those acres would be located outside the Installation boundary. Under the Proposed Action, there would be an overall decrease of acreage outside of the Installation boundary exposed to 65 dB DNL. Approximately 7 additional acres on Installation would be newly exposed to noise levels of 75 dB DNL

Under the Proposed Action, A-10 operations within the SUA would increase by approximately 2 percent and HH-60 operations within the airspace would increase by approximately 31 percent. A 2-percent increase in A-10 operations corresponds to an imperceptible increase to noise under the airspaces. A 31percent increase in HH-60 operations corresponds to approximately a 2-dB Onset-Rate Adjusted DNL increase to noise under the airspaces. However, other aircraft using these airspaces also contributes to the overall noise level. HH-60 aircraft are among the least loud of the aircraft using these airspaces, so the increase in noise level due to the increase in HH-60 operations likely would be imperceptible against the background of noise from other jet aircraft (e.g., F-16, F-35) operations within the airspaces.

The noise level increases that would occur due to the Proposed Action would be expected to be minor to imperceptible.

Safety

Negligible, temporary, adverse impacts on ground safety would be expected under the Proposed Action. Davis-Monthan AFB would require new construction, which could expose personnel to risks from heavy equipment operation, hazardous materials, and potentially noisy and confined environments. To minimize health and safety risks, contractors would be required to maintain site-specific health and safety programs that follow all applicable regulations. Davis-Monthan AFB personnel would review these programs prior to work beginning to ensure contractors take appropriate measures to reduce the potential health and safety risks. Current operational processes and procedures would continue.

No facilities/activities with explosive safety quantity-distance arcs at Davis-Monthan AFB would be impacted with implementation of the Proposed Action, including the Munitions Storage Area, the Explosive Ordnance Demolition area, the alert hangar and apron, combat aircraft parking areas, hot cargo pad, aircraft explosives cargo area, the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Group's Explosive Ordnance Disposal area, and the ammunition shipping/inspection/storage facilities. Therefore, no impacts to explosives safety would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

No changes to existing accident potential zones or clean zones would be required with implementation of the Proposed Action. The number of sorties would increase minimally; therefore, implementation of the Proposed Action would not increase the safety risk to these or other off Base areas. Davis-Monthan AFB would continue to work with communities and developers to apply the Air Installations Compatible Use

Zones guidelines. Therefore, no impacts to ground safety would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

Air Quality

No significant effects to air quality would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action. The estimated total annual emissions of the Proposed Action would not exceed the *de minimis* or Prevention of Significant Deterioration permitting thresholds for any criteria pollutant or precursor. The proposed net changes in criteria pollutants and/or precursors would be less than the indicator of significance threshold of 100 tons per year for all of the pollutants. Therefore, it is unlikely these increases would cause significant impacts.

While emissions for all pollutants would increase with implementation of the Proposed Alternative, the net changes would be less than the *de minimis* thresholds in all of the counties in which low-altitude flight and operations would occur. Because the emissions associated with the Proposed Action would be below the General Conformity *de minimis* thresholds, the requirements of the General Conformity Rule are not applicable, as documented in the detailed air conformity analysis performed for this EA and available in the Project Administrative Record.

Biological Resources

The areas designated for construction activities under the Proposed Action have limited suitable habitat for wildlife. The developed portion of Davis-Monthan AFB, in which the projects proposed would be located, supports relatively common wildlife species such as small mammals. No federally listed threatened or endangered species have been observed on Davis-Monthan AFB, nor does critical habitat exist within Davis-Monthan AFB. On 23 March 2023, the Air Force initiated consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) under Section 7 of the *Endangered Species Act of 1973*, as amended (16 USC § 1536) and implementing regulations (50 CFR Part 402) for the Proposed Action using the USFWS's Information for Planning and Consultation tool. The Air Force determined that the Proposed Action would have "no effect" on threatened and endangered species or designated critical habitat. While not necessary, the USFWS has not commented or concurred on the Air Force's determination of "no effect."

Impacts to biological resources occurring under the SUA that would be utilized under the Proposed Action could result from overflights and associated noise, the use of munitions and flares, and bird-aircraft collisions. No sonic booms would occur due to the type of aircraft included as part of Proposed Action. Wildlife, especially avian species, utilizing the surrounding undeveloped areas underneath the SUA for foraging and breeding would normally be sensitive to increased noise impacts from military aircraft. Although there is variability in responses across species, many birds and wildlife have the ability to habituate to noise and movement from military aircraft (Grubb et al., 2013), and military aircraft operations have been ongoing at Davis-Monthan AFB for decades and are now part of the natural noise environment.

Under the Proposed Action, chaff and flares would be used over the Barry M. Goldwater Range and Ruby Fuzzy MOAs. To minimize the potential for flares to ignite vegetation, flares would be employed at an altitude that prevents the flares from impacting the ground or structures. Chaff and flares would be used in compliance with the 355 WG Inflight Guide and with existing usage. Impacts would be negligible.

Water Resources

Approximately 7 acres of soil would be disturbed during construction activities under the Proposed Action. Construction activities would take place on previously disturbed land adjacent to existing buildings and infrastructure. No activities associated with the Proposed Action would occur within or intersect any surface waters. However, these activities would have the potential to increase erosion and sedimentation of nearby surface waters during construction and for a brief period after due to temporary disturbance of soils.

As the Proposed Action would have the potential to disturb up to 7 acres of ground surface, Davis-Monthan AFB would be required to obtain a Construction Activity General Permit (CGP) under its 2016 General Permit with the Arizona Department of Air Quality (ADEQ), which regulates the Base's stormwater outfalls.

This permit requires various controls and best management practices (BMPs) to reduce impacts on surface water through pollution prevention and includes sedimentation and erosion controls, soil stabilization, and pollutant management. These BMPs would be implemented to prevent sediments and other pollutants from potentially entering nearby surface waters via Davis-Monthan AFB's stormwater conveyance system. Therefore, impacts to surface water resources on Davis-Monthan AFB from ground-disturbing activities associated with the Proposed Action would be anticipated to be short-term and minor.

Under the Proposed Action, 391,000 square feet of new, impervious surface area would be added to the Base as a result of the construction of new facilities. This increase in impervious surface area would be anticipated to result in a minor, long-term increase in stormwater runoff at Davis-Monthan AFB.

Construction-related activities would create the potential for contaminants, mainly fuel, to leach or discharge to the Tucson Basin Aquifer. The Air Force contractor would follow BMPs designed to prevent polluted stormwater runoff, as well as BMPs to manage pollution prevention outlined in the ADEQ CGP, to minimize the potential of chemicals entering the aquifer. Therefore, the Proposed Action would be anticipated to have negligible, short-term, and indirect impacts on groundwater.

Geology and Soils

The Proposed Action would involve the construction of five projects and disturb a total of 391,000 square feet of soil. Construction occurring under the Proposed Action would involve earthwork, including excavation, backfilling, and compacting of soils or fill materials on and immediately adjacent to the project sites. These activities would expose soils and increase their susceptibility to water and wind erosion. Inclement weather (e.g., rain or wind) would have the potential to increase the probability and severity of these potential effects.

<u>Geology</u> – The underlying geology of the area would not change under the Proposed Action. No direct or indirect impacts to geology would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

<u>Topography</u> – None of the projects under the Proposed Action would occur in areas that necessitate largescale alteration of topography to accommodate construction. Any alteration of ground surfaces would be limited to basic construction activities such as compacting and excavating to prepare the ground for the siting of a structure. After placing and compacting reuse or fill soils, superficial soils would be graded to conform to local topography to maintain efficient drainage. Therefore, short-term, negligible impacts to topography would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

<u>Soils</u> – All construction projects implemented under the Proposed Action would involve soil-disturbing activities in areas consisting of Mohave soils and urban land, which is well drained and has a moderate potential for erosion (see **Figure 3-5** in the EA) (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021). Slopes within the areas proposed for construction range from 1 to 8 percent, with a medium runoff potential. All project sites under the Proposed Action are generally suitable for development. However, the Air Force would validate soil conditions at each site prior to construction to address any limiting factors by management or design.

Under the Proposed Action, potential adverse effects on soils, including soil loss, contamination, and structural alteration, would be managed at an individual project level. When implementation of a project would disturb 1 or more acre of land, the construction contractor would obtain and comply with a CGP under the ADEQ-administered Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AZPDES) program (see **Section 3.9** in the EA). The CGP would require the preparation and implementation of a site-specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan prior to construction, including BMPs and erosion and sediment control requirements (ADEQ, 2021). Implementation of BMPs would minimize impacts to soil resources, and projects would be designed and implemented in accordance with United Facilities Criteria 3-210-10 (as amended 2016) and Section 438 of the Energy Information Security Act (see **Section 3.9.3.2** of the EA) to minimize impacts to soil resources. With proper implementation of BMPs and adherence to relevant permitting, adverse impacts to soils resulting from the Proposed Action would be anticipated to be short-term and minor.

Land Use

No significant adverse effects to land use would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action. Under the Proposed Action, construction of new facilities would occur within the existing boundaries of the Installation. Proposed construction locations would be on land designated as either open space or aircraft maintenance operations. Proposed construction that would occur on land designated open space would be sited along the existing flight line and adjacent to other existing facilities. New construction activities would continue to be designed to meet the land use needs of the Base.

Under the Proposed Action, there would be an overall decrease of 7 acres in the total area exposed to noise levels of 65 dB DNL or greater outside of the Installation boundary. Existing land use under the Proposed Action would remain generally unchanged. No impacts to land use on Base or outside of the boundary of the Installation would be anticipated.

Socioeconomics

No significant effects to socioeconomics would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives. The 646 additional military, contract, and civilian personnel would represent a 4.6-percent increase in the total persons permanently assigned to and working at Davis-Monthan AFB, where approximately 14,000 military and civilian personnel are currently employed. A 4.6-percent increase would not have an impact on the availability of employment in the region; personnel relocating would already be employed by the Air Force and would not compete for currently available positions that could be filled by the local workforce. However, it is possible that military dependents could join the local workforce.

The construction of new facilities would result in a temporary increase of 20–50 construction personnel, depending on the number of projects occurring simultaneously; any temporary increase would have a negligible beneficial impact on the socioeconomic condition on the region. Because there would be no permanent increase in military, contract, or civilian personnel, there would be no need for additional housing. Therefore, no adverse impacts on employment, housing, or educational resources would occur under the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Environmental Justice and the Protection of Children

No significant effects to environmental justice populations and protection of children would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action. Impacts to residents living outside Davis-Monthan AFB would not occur because the proposed activities are wholly contained within the Base. Under the Proposed Action, there would be an overall decrease of acreage outside of the Installation boundary exposed to 65 dB DNL. No off-Base schools or childcare facilities would be exposed to DNL of 65 dB or greater at Davis-Monthan AFB. Additionally, no hospitals, parks, or libraries would be exposed to DNL of 65 dB or greater. Therefore, there would be no disproportionate impacts to minority, low-income, or youth populations.

Cultural Resources

No significant effects to cultural resources would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action. Compliance with Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act*, as amended (54 USC § 300101) and implementing regulations (36 CFR Part 800) was accomplished through coordinating with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). The SHPO concurred that the Proposed Action would have "no adverse effect" on cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE).

<u>Archaeological Sites</u> – Under the Proposed Action, five new buildings including two helicopter simulators, would be constructed on the Installation. The two helicopter simulators would be constructed to the east and west of Building 4382. The 58 RQS facility would be constructed just east of Building 4868, and the two 88 TES buildings would be constructed northeast of the runway. There are archaeological sites located within the 800-meter indirect APE for all the proposed new construction. These sites are not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and all construction would occur on land that has been disturbed from past and ongoing mission activities.

<u>Historic Architectural Properties</u> – No demolition or renovation activities would be implemented under the Proposed Action. No buildings listed or eligible for listing on the NRHP are located within the direct or indirect APE for the Proposed Action; the construction of the five proposed facilities on the Installation would not be expected to have an impact on historic properties.

No impacts to historic properties under the SUA would be expected. No supersonic flights would be included as part of the Proposed Action and the increase in overall noise would be negligible.

<u>Traditional Cultural Properties</u> – No sacred sites, human remains, associated grave goods, unassociated grave goods, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony have been identified on Davis-Monthan AFB. The Proposed Action would not impact archaeological sites, historic properties, or Native American resources.

The Proposed Action would not be expected to result in impacts on traditional cultural properties (TCPs). Mount Graham, located within the Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci MOAs is a TCP according to the Apache Tribes of Arizona, and the Air Force would continue to avoid overflights of this resource.

Hazardous Materials and Wastes, Toxic Substances, and Contaminated Sites

No significant effects to hazardous materials (HAZMAT) and wastes would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives.

Implementation of the Proposed Action at Davis-Monthan AFB would not add any new HAZMAT that would exceed the Base's current hazardous waste processes. Existing procedures for the centralized management of the storage, distribution, use, reuse, recycling, and disposal of HAZMAT through the Base Hazardous Materials Storage Facility are adequate to accommodate the changes anticipated under the Proposed Action. Construction waste would only be generated from the new construction projects; no demolition or renovation activities are proposed. No construction activities would occur within identified Environmental Restoration Program sites; therefore, there would be no impacts to those sites.

Infrastructure, Transportation, and Utilities

No significant adverse effects to infrastructure, transportation, or utilities would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action Alternatives.

<u>Transportation</u> – Under the Proposed Action, personnel on the Installation would increase. Increased truck traffic and construction workers commuting to the Installation during periods of construction would be expected to cause temporary increases in demand and increased congestion on local roads. At project sites, temporary lane closures would be expected during construction activities. The on-Base transportation network is sufficient to handle the existing traffic volume.

<u>Electricity and Natural Gas</u> – The Proposed Action would have no long-term impacts to either the electrical or natural gas supply systems. Any potential short-term disruptions to electrical or natural gas service within project areas during construction activities would be mitigated during project planning.

<u>Potable Water Supply</u> – Short-term, negligible, and adverse impacts on the potable water supply system would be expected to occur during construction while existing water lines are connected to new buildings. Long-term, adverse impacts would not be expected to occur as changes in demand would be minimal, and the potable water supply system has the capacity to meet new demands.

<u>Solid Waste</u> – Short-term, minor, and adverse impacts on solid waste management would have the potential to occur due to construction projects under the Proposed Action. Based on US Environmental Protection Agency guidance on estimating solid waste from construction, the 291,000 square feet of new construction would generate 4.39 pounds per square foot of debris. This equates to approximately 1.3 million pounds of solid waste created as a result of the Proposed Action. Contractors would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations for the collection and disposal of solid waste generated under the

Agency guidance on estimating solid waste from construction, the 291,000 square feet of new construction would generate 4.39 pounds per square foot of debris. This equates to approximately 1.3 million pounds of solid waste created as a result of the Proposed Action. Contractors would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations for the collection and disposal of solid waste generated under the Proposed Action, and all solid waste generated would be collected and transported off Base for disposal or recycling in accordance with Air Force Manual 32-7002, *Environmental Compliance and Pollution Prevention*.

<u>Sanitary and Stormwater</u> – Short-term, negligible, and adverse impacts on the sanitary sewer and wastewater treatment systems would have the potential to occur during construction while existing lines are connected to new buildings. Although the operation of the new buildings would increase the demand on the sanitary sewer and wastewater treatment systems in the short-term and adverse impacts to the sanitary sewer and wastewater treatment systems in the long-term would not be expected, as the current systems have the capacity required to meet new demands.

Cumulative Impacts

The EA considered cumulative impacts that could result from the incremental impact of the Proposed Action when added to other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions on or near Davis-Monthan AFB or associated SUA.

Under the Proposed Action, reasonably foreseeable development plans and projects within and around the Tucson area would be subject to regulation under the AZPDES permitting program. Depending on the nature and size of development, regulatory compliance measures would be in place to prevent or minimize potential effects on or from geological resources.

When considered in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Davis-Monthan AFB, no significant cumulative effects would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

Mitigation

The EA analysis concluded that the Proposed Action would not result in significant environmental impacts. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required. BMPs are described and recommended in the EA where applicable.

Conclusion

Finding of No Significant Impact. After review of the EA prepared in accordance with the requirements of NEPA, CEQ regulations, and 32 CFR Part 989, and which is hereby incorporated by reference, I have determined that the Proposed Action would not have a significant impact on the quality of the human or natural environment. Accordingly, an Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared. This decision was made after considering all submitted information, including a review of agency comments submitted during the 30-day public comment period, and considering a full range of practical alternatives that meet project requirements and are within the legal authority of the US Air Force.

SCOTT C. MILLS, Colonel, USAF Commander, 355 Wing

8 Apr 2024

FINAL CONCLUSIÓN DE IMPACTO NO SIGNIFICATIVO (FONSI)

REALINEAMIENTO REGIONAL DE CUARTA GENERACIÓN - AFB DAVIS-MONTHAN

De conformidad con las disposiciones de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), Título 42 *del Código de los Estados Unidos* (USC) § 4321 y ss.; la normativa del Consejo de Calidad Medioambiental (CEQ), Consejo de Normas de Calidad Ambiental, el título 40 del *Código de Regulaciones Federales* (CFR), §§ 1500–1508; y 32 CFR § 989 del *Proceso de Análisis de Impacto Ambiental de la Fuerza Aérea (EIAP)*, la Fuerza Aérea (Air Force) de los Estados Unidos (US) preparó el borrador adjunto de Evaluación Ambiental (EA) para abordar las posibles consecuencias ambientales asociadas a la reubicación de una serie de aeronaves y misiones A-10, aeronaves y misiones HH-60, entrenamiento de Controladores Conjuntos de Ataque Terminal (Joint Terminal Attack Controller) y operaciones de Ángeles de la Guarda a Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona. Además, la EA evaluó la asignación de dos aeronaves Cessna 182 de la Patrulla Aérea Civil (CAP) y el traslado de una aeronave RC-26B desde la Base de la Guardia Nacional Aérea de Morris (ANGB) situada en el Aeropuerto Internacional de Tucson (Arizona).

Objetivo y Necesidad

Reestructuración de Davis-Monthan

El objetivo de trasladar los escuadrones de aviones A-10 y HH-60 de cuarta generación (4th Gen) desde la base aérea de Nellis es liberar capacidad de la Base y del Campo de Pruebas y Entrenamiento de Nevada necesaria para probar y entrenar a los combatientes en aviones de quinta generación (5th Gen) y permitir que las unidades de recuperación de personal aprovechen la sinergia que proporciona la ubicación conjunta con otras unidades de rescate. La acción propuesta mejoraría las capacidades de desarrollo de pruebas, entrenamiento y tácticas de 5ª generación y posteriores en la base aérea de Nellis para mantener el ritmo de los requisitos de las misiones de la Fuerza Aérea, la evolución de la tecnología y las capacidades del enemigo. Nellis AFB ha alcanzado su capacidad máxima y es necesario liberar espacio para acoger misiones de 5ª Generación.

La acción de reasignar la misión de 4ª Generación es necesaria porque los conjuntos de misiones actuales asignados a la base aérea de Nellis y al Centro de Armamento de la Fuerza Aérea están superando la capacidad de ampliar los recursos y la capacidad. La infraestructura disponible en Nellis AFB no satisface las necesidades actuales o futuras de la misión y está funcionando al límite de su capacidad o por encima de ella.

Establecimiento y Operación del Cessna 182 de la Patrulla Aérea Civil

El objetivo del establecimiento y operación del Cessna 182 de la Patrulla Aérea Civil (CAP, por sus siglas en inglés) es proporcionar un mejor entrenamiento y aumentar las misiones de operaciones que la CAP lleva a cabo en apoyo de la Fuerza Aérea.

La asociación de la Fuerza Aérea con la CAP abarca una serie de misiones que benefician directamente a la Fuerza Aérea. La permanencia de los aviones de la CAP en Davis-Monthan AFB es necesaria para mejorar las comunicaciones, la interacción entre la CAP y la Fuerza Aérea y la ejecución de varias de estas misiones.

Reubicar las Pperaciones de RC-26B

El objetivo de la reubicación de las operaciones de RC-26B es crear espacio para un posible aumento del entrenamiento de F-16 con base en el Ala 162 (162 WG) en el Morris ANGB y consolidar los activos y operaciones del Grupo de Ataque 214 en una ubicación común.

La ANG prevé un aumento a gran escala del entrenamiento internacional de F-16 con base en el 162 WG de Morris ANGB. Es necesario reubicar un solo avión RC-26B para hacer sitio a los reajustes y mejoras de la rampa específicos de los F-16 que son incompatibles con la continuación de las operaciones de los RC-26. En 2017, la responsabilidad de la organización RC-26 se transfirió del 162º Grupo de Operaciones

en Morris ANGB al 214º Grupo de Ataque (214 ATKG), una unidad subordinada al 162 WG que es inquilino en Davis-Monthan AFB. La reubicación de la aeronave RC-26 y del personal asociado en la base Davis-Monthan, en las actuales instalaciones del Centro de Entrenamiento de la Fuerza Total, también serviría para consolidar los 214 activos y operaciones del ATKG en una ubicación común.

Descripción de la Acción Propuesta y Alternativas

La Fuerza Aérea propone trasladar las siguientes misiones de 4ª Generación de Nellis AFB, Nevada, a Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona:

- 66º Escuadrón de Armamento (66 WPS)
- Parte de Pruebas Operativas (OT) A-10 del 422º Escuadrón de Pruebas y Evaluación (422 TES)
- 66° Escuadrón de Rescate (66 RQS)
- 58° Escuadrón de Rescate (58 RQS)
- 34º Escuadrón de Armamento (34 WPS)
- 88º Escuadrón de Pruebas y Evaluación (88 TES)

Con el fin de crear capacidad en Davis-Monthan AFB para aceptar las misiones mencionadas, la Fuerza Aérea propone tomar las siguientes medidas con las unidades ya estacionadas en Davis-Monthan AFB:

- Desactivar el 354º Escuadrón de Cazas (354 FS) y retirar los aviones A-10C asignados.
- Reducir el tamaño del 357° Escuadrón de Cazas (357 FS) y retirar algunos de sus aviones A-10.

La parte del A-10 OT del 422 TES pasaría a ser transitoria en 2024. El Curso de Instructor de Armas y Pruebas del HH-60 y las unidades con código de combate, que incluyen el 88 TES, 66 RQS, 58 RQS, 79° Escuadrón de Generación de Rescate (RGS), 55 RGS y el 34 WPS, se trasladarían a partir de 2025.

Existen otras acciones propuestas en la base Davis-Monthan AFB no relacionadas con los movimientos descritos anteriormente que se están produciendo aproximadamente en los mismos plazos y, por lo tanto, se incluyen en este análisis. Estas acciones consisten en la asignación de dos aeronaves CAP Cessna 182 y la transferencia de una aeronave RC-26B del Morris ANGB ubicado en el Aeropuerto Internacional de Tucson (Arizona).

Con la Acción Propuesta, las salidas diarias pasarían de un total de 11,739 a 11,906, lo que supone un aumento de 167 salidas. Las salidas nocturnas pasarían de un total de 2,272 a 3,206, un aumento de 934 salidas. La Acción Propuesta también implicaría la construcción de cinco instalaciones. El principal espacio aéreo de uso especial (SUA) que utilizaría el 355 WG sería el Barry M. Goldwater Range. Las Zonas de Operaciones Militares (MOA) de Tombstone, Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci y Ruby/Fuzzy también se utilizarían para el entrenamiento.

Alternativa de No Acción

El análisis de la Alternativa de No Acción proporciona un punto de referencia que permite a los responsables de la toma de decisiones comparar la magnitud de los posibles efectos ambientales de la Acción Propuesta. La NEPA exige que la EA analice la Alternativa de No Acción. No actuar significa que una acción no tendría lugar en este momento, y los efectos medioambientales resultantes de no actuar se compararían con los efectos de decidir seguir adelante con la actividad propuesta. Ninguna acción para este EA refleja el status quo, en el que no se transferirían, retirarían ni reasignarían activos aeronáuticos adicionales en la Base Davis-Monthan.

Resumen de los Resultados

Los recursos ambientales potencialmente afectados se identificaron mediante comunicaciones con organismos estatales y federales y el examen de la documentación medioambiental anterior. Entre los

recursos ambientales específicos con posibles consecuencias ambientales se incluyen la gestión y el uso del espacio aéreo; el ruido; la seguridad; la calidad del aire; los recursos biológicos, hídricos y culturales; la geología y los suelos; el uso del suelo; la socioeconomía; la justicia ambiental y la protección de los niños; los materiales y residuos peligrosos, las sustancias tóxicas y los lugares contaminados; y las infraestructuras, el transporte y los servicios públicos.

Gestión y Uso del Espacio Aéreo

La Acción Propuesta daría lugar a un aumento de las operaciones de aeródromo de 39,122 a un total estimado de 42,997 operaciones de aeródromo. El aumento de 3,875 operaciones, un 9%, se debería a la incorporación de aeronaves asignadas a la Base. Las operaciones seguirían requiriendo los servicios de control de tráfico aéreo de la Torre Davis-Monthan y de Tucson Approach para los servicios de salida, patrón y llegada.

Las aeronaves seguirían operando dentro del SUA existente, pero aumentaría la utilización del SUA en un 10.9%, o 1,101 salidas anuales totales. Dado que la desconflicción de la programación ya se realiza en el GT 355, no se espera que un aumento de 1,101 operaciones SUA anuales cause un impacto significativo. Además, estas aeronaves se repartirían entre los distintos SUA, lo que reduciría la saturación del espacio aéreo. Por lo tanto, no se espera que se produzcan impactos significativos en el espacio aéreo con la implementación de la Acción Propuesta.

Ruido

Un total de 1,101 acres estarían expuestos a un Nivel Sonoro Medio Día-Noche de 65 decibelios (dB DNL) o superior, 117 de esos acres estarían situados fuera de los límites de la Instalación. Con la Acción Propuesta, se produciría una disminución global de la superficie en acres fuera de los límites de la instalación expuesta a 65 dB DNL. Aproximadamente 7 acres adicionales en la Instalación estarían expuestos por primera vez a niveles de ruido de 75 dB DNL

Con la Acción Propuesta, las operaciones de A-10 dentro del SUA aumentarían aproximadamente un 2% y las operaciones de HH-60 dentro del espacio aéreo aumentarían aproximadamente un 31%. Un aumento del 2% de las operaciones de los A-10 corresponde a un aumento imperceptible del ruido bajo los espacios aéreos. Un aumento del 31% en las operaciones del HH-60 corresponde aproximadamente a un aumento del DNL ajustado a la tasa de inicio de 2 dB en el ruido bajo los espacios aéreos. Sin embargo, otras aeronaves que utilizan estos espacios aéreos también contribuyen al nivel general de ruido. Los aviones HH-60 se encuentran entre los menos ruidosos de los aviones que utilizan estos espacios aéreos, por lo que el aumento del nivel de ruido debido al aumento de las operaciones de HH-60 probablemente sería imperceptible frente al ruido de fondo de las operaciones de otros aviones a reacción (por ejemplo, F-16, F-35) dentro de los espacios aéreos.

El aumento del nivel de ruido que se produciría debido a la Acción Propuesta sería de menor importancia a imperceptible.

Protección

En el marco de la Acción Propuesta, se prevén efectos adversos insignificantes y temporales sobre la seguridad en tierra. Davis-Monthan AFB requeriría nuevas construcciones, que podrían exponer al personal a riesgos derivados del funcionamiento de equipos pesados, materiales peligrosos y entornos potencialmente ruidosos y confinados. Para minimizar los riesgos para la salud y la seguridad, los contratistas deberán mantener programas de salud y seguridad específicos para cada emplazamiento que cumplan toda la normativa aplicable. El personal de Davis-Monthan AFB revisaría estos programas antes del inicio de los trabajos para garantizar que los contratistas toman las medidas adecuadas para reducir los posibles riesgos para la salud y la seguridad. Se mantendrían los procesos y procedimientos operativos actuales.

Ninguna instalación/actividad con arcos de distancia de cantidad de seguridad de explosivos en la base Davis-Monthan AFB se vería afectada por la ejecución de la Acción Propuesta, incluida el Área de

Almacenamiento de Municiones, el Área de Demolición de Artefactos Explosivos, el hangar y la plataforma de alerta, las áreas de estacionamiento de aeronaves de combate, la plataforma de carga en caliente, el área de carga de explosivos de aeronaves, el área de eliminación de Artefactos Explosivos del Grupo de Mantenimiento y Regeneración Aeroespacial y las instalaciones de envío/inspección/almacenamiento de municiones. Por lo tanto, no se prevé que la ejecución de la Acción Propuesta afecte a la seguridad de los explosivos.

No sería necesario modificar las zonas potenciales de accidente ni las zonas limpias existentes con la ejecución de la Acción Propuesta. El número de salidas aumentaría mínimamente; por lo tanto, la ejecución de la Acción Propuesta no aumentaría el riesgo para la seguridad de estas u otras zonas fuera de la Base. Davis-Monthan AFB seguiría trabajando con las comunidades y los promotores para aplicar las directrices de las Zonas de Uso Compatible de las Instalaciones Aéreas. Por lo tanto, no se prevé que la ejecución de la Acción Propuesta afecte a la seguridad en tierra.

Calidad del Aire

No se esperan efectos significativos sobre la calidad del aire como resultado de la ejecución de la Acción Propuesta. Las emisiones anuales totales estimadas de la Acción Propuesta no superarían los umbrales *de minimis* o de permiso de Prevención del Deterioro Significativo para ningún contaminante o precursor de criterios. Los cambios netos propuestos en el criterio de contaminantes y/o precursores serían inferiores al indicador de umbral de significación de 100 toneladas anuales para todos los contaminantes. Por lo tanto, es poco probable que estos aumentos causen impactos significativos.

Aunque las emisiones de todos los contaminantes aumentarían con la aplicación de la Alternativa Propuesta, los cambios netos serían inferiores a los umbrales *de minimis* en todos los condados en los que se realizarían vuelos y operaciones a baja altitud. Dado que las emisiones asociadas a la acción propuesta estarían por debajo de los umbrales *de minimis* de conformidad general, no son aplicables los requisitos de la Norma de Conformidad General, como se documenta en el análisis detallado de conformidad del aire realizado para esta EA y disponible en el Registro Administrativo del Proyecto.

Recursos Biológicos

Las zonas designadas para las actividades de construcción en el marco de la Acción Propuesta tienen un hábitat adecuado limitado para la vida silvestre. La parte urbanizada de Davis-Monthan AFB, en la que se ubicarían los proyectos propuestos, alberga especies de fauna relativamente comunes, como pequeños mamíferos. No se han observado en la base Davis-Monthan AFB especies amenazadas o en peligro de extinción incluidas en la lista federal, ni existe hábitat crítico dentro de la base Davis-Monthan AFB. El 23 de marzo de 2023, la Fuerza Aérea inició consultas con el USFWS en virtud de la Sección 7 de la Ley de Especies en Peligro de Extinción de 1973, según enmendada (16 USC § 1536) (ESA) y las regulaciones de implementación (50 CFR Parte 402) para la Acción Propuesta utilizando la herramienta de Información para la Planificación y Consulta (IPaC) del USFWS La Fuerza Aérea determinó que la Acción Propuesta no tendría "ningún efecto" sobre las especies amenazadas y en peligro de extinción o el hábitat crítico designado. Si bien no es necesario, el USFWS no ha comentado ni está de acuerdo con la determinación de la Fuerza Aérea de "no tener efecto".

Los impactos sobre los recursos biológicos presentes en el SUA que se utilizaría en el marco de la Acción Propuesta podrían derivarse de los sobrevuelos y el ruido asociado, el uso de municiones y bengalas y las colisiones entre aves y aeronaves. No se producirían estampidos sónicos debido a la Acción Propuesta. La fauna silvestre, especialmente las especies aviares, que utilizan las zonas no urbanizadas circundantes bajo el SUA para alimentarse y reproducirse serían normalmente sensibles al aumento del impacto acústico de las aeronaves militares. Aunque existe variabilidad en las respuestas de las distintas especies, muchas aves y animales silvestres tienen la capacidad de habituarse al ruido y al movimiento de las aeronaves militares (Grubb et al., 2013), y las operaciones de las aeronaves militares se han llevado a cabo en la base Davis-Monthan AFB durante décadas y ahora forman parte del entorno acústico natural.

En el marco de la Acción Propuesta, se utilizarían chaff (tiras reflectantes) y bengalas sobre los MOA Barry M. Goldwater Range y Ruby Fuzzy. Para minimizar la posibilidad de que las bengalas incendien la vegetación, se emplearían a una altitud que impida que impacten contra el suelo o las estructuras. El chaff y las bengalas se utilizarán de conformidad con la Guía de Vuelo 355 WG. El uso de chaff y antorchas sería coherente con el uso existente, y los impactos serían insignificantes.

Recursos Hídricos

Aproximadamente 7 acres de suelo serían perturbados durante las actividades de construcción bajo la Acción Propuesta. Las actividades de construcción tendrían lugar en terrenos previamente alterados adyacentes a edificios e infraestructuras existentes. No se realizaría ninguna actividad relacionada con la Acción Propuesta dentro de las aguas superficiales ni en su intersección. Sin embargo, estas actividades podrían aumentar la erosión y la sedimentación de las aguas superficiales cercanas durante la construcción y durante un breve período posterior debido a la alteración temporal de los suelos.

Dado que la Acción Propuesta podría alterar hasta 7 acres de superficie terrestre, la base Davis-Monthan AFB tendría que obtener un Permiso General para Actividades de Construcción (CGP) en virtud de su Permiso General de 2016 con el Departamento de Calidad del Aire de Arizona (ADEQ), que regula los emisarios de aguas pluviales de la base. Este permiso exige diversos controles y mejores prácticas de gerencia (MTG) para reducir el impacto en las aguas superficiales mediante la prevención de la contaminación e incluye controles de la sedimentación y la erosión, la estabilización del suelo y manejo de los contaminantes. Estas BMP se implementarían para evitar que los sedimentos y otros contaminantes entren potencialmente en las aguas superficiales cercanas a través del sistema de transporte de aguas pluviales de la base Davis-Monthan AFB. Por lo tanto, se prevé que los impactos en los recursos hídricos superficiales de la base Davis-Monthan derivados de las actividades de alteración del suelo asociadas a la Acción Propuesta sean de corta duración y menores.

En virtud de la Acción Propuesta, se añadirían 391,000 pies cuadrados de nueva superficie impermeable a la Base como resultado de la construcción de nuevas instalaciones. Se prevé que este aumento de la superficie impermeable provoque un aumento menor a largo plazo de la escorrentía de aguas pluviales en la base Davis-Monthan.

Las actividades relacionadas con la construcción crearían la posibilidad de que los contaminantes, principalmente el combustible, se filtraran o vertieran en el acuífero de la cuenca de Tucson. El contratista de la Fuerza Aérea seguiría las BMP diseñadas para evitar la escorrentía de aguas pluviales contaminadas, así como las BMP para manejar la prevención de la contaminación descritas en la CGP de la ADEQ, para minimizar el potencial de entrada de sustancias químicas en el acuífero. Por lo tanto, se prevé que la acción propuesta tenga un impacto indirecto insignificante a corto plazo sobre las aguas subterráneas.

Geología y Suelos

La Acción Propuesta implicaría la construcción de cinco proyectos y alteraría un total de 391,000 pies cuadrados de suelo. Las obras de construcción que se realicen en el marco de la Acción Propuesta implicarían movimientos de tierras, incluida la excavación, el relleno y la compactación de suelos o materiales de relleno en los emplazamientos del proyecto e inmediatamente adyacentes. Estas actividades expondrían los suelos y aumentarían su susceptibilidad a la erosión hídrica y eólica. Las inclemencias meteorológicas (por ejemplo, lluvia o viento) podrían aumentar la probabilidad y la gravedad de estos posibles efectos.

<u>Geología</u> - La geología subyacente de la zona no cambiaría con la Acción Propuesta. No se prevé ningún impacto directo o indirecto sobre la geología con la ejecución de la Acción Propuesta.

<u>Topografía</u> - Ninguno de los proyectos de la Acción Propuesta se llevaría a cabo en zonas que requirieran una alteración a gran escala de la topografía para acomodar la construcción. Cualquier alteración de la superficie del suelo se limitaría a actividades básicas de construcción como la compactación y la

excavación para preparar el terreno para el emplazamiento de una estructura. Después de colocar y compactar los suelos de reutilización o relleno, los suelos superficiales se nivelarían para ajustarse a la topografía local y mantener un drenaje eficaz. Por lo tanto, se prevé que la ejecución de la Acción Propuesta tenga un impacto insignificante a corto plazo sobre la topografía.

<u>Suelos</u> - Todos los proyectos de construcción implementados bajo la Acción Propuesta implicarían actividades de perturbación del suelo en áreas que consisten en suelos Mohave y tierra urbana, que está bien drenada y tiene un potencial moderado de erosión (ver **Figura 3-5** en la EA) (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021). Las pendientes en las zonas propuestas para la construcción oscilan entre el 1% y el 8%, con un potencial de escorrentía medio. Todos los emplazamientos del proyecto en el marco de la acción propuesta son, en general, aptos para el desarrollo; no obstante, la Fuerza Aérea validaría las condiciones del suelo en cada emplazamiento antes de la construcción para abordar cualquier factor limitante mediante la gestión o el diseño.

En el marco de la Acción Propuesta, los posibles efectos adversos sobre los suelos, incluida la pérdida de suelo, la contaminación y la alteración estructural, se manejarían a nivel de proyecto individual. Cuando la ejecución de un proyecto altere 1 acre o más de terreno, el contratista de la construcción obtendrá y cumplirá una CGP en virtud del programa del Sistema de Eliminación de Descargas Contaminantes de Arizona (AZPDES) administrado por la ADEQ (véase **el apartado 3.9** de la EA). El CGP exigiría la preparación y aplicación de un Plan de Prevención de la Contaminación de las Aguas Pluviales específico para el emplazamiento antes de la construcción, incluidos los requisitos de BMP y de control de la erosión y los sedimentos (ADEQ, 2021). La implementación de las BMP minimizaría los impactos en los recursos del suelo, y los proyectos se diseñarían e implementarían de acuerdo con los Criterios de Instalaciones Unidas 3-210-10 (modificados en 2016) y la Sección 438 de la Ley de Seguridad de la Información Energética (véase **la Sección 3.9.3.2** de la EA) para minimizar los impactos en los recursos del suelo. Con la aplicación adecuada de las BMP y el cumplimiento de los permisos pertinentes, se prevé que los impactos adversos en los suelos resultantes de la Acción Propuesta sean menores y a corto plazo.

Uso del Suelo

No se esperan efectos adversos significativos sobre el uso del suelo como resultado de la ejecución de la Acción Propuesta. En el marco de la Acción Propuesta, la construcción de nuevas instalaciones tendría lugar dentro de los límites actuales de la Instalación. Los lugares de construcción propuestos estarían en terrenos designados como espacios abiertos u operaciones de mantenimiento de aeronaves. La construcción propuesta que tendría lugar en terreno designado espacio abierto se situaría a lo largo de la línea de vuelo existente y junto a otras instalaciones existentes. Las nuevas actividades de construcción seguirían diseñándose para satisfacer las necesidades de uso del suelo de la Base.

Con la Acción Propuesta, se produciría una disminución global de 7 acres en la superficie total expuesta a niveles de ruido de 65 dB DNL o superiores fuera de los límites de la instalación. El uso actual del suelo con la Acción Propuesta permanecería en general sin cambios. No se prevé ningún impacto sobre el uso del suelo en la Base o fuera de los límites de la Instalación.

Socioeconomía

No se esperan efectos significativos sobre la socioeconomía como resultado de la aplicación de las Alternativas de Acción Propuestas. Los 646 miembros adicionales del personal militar, por contrato y civil representarían un aumento del 4,6% del total de personas asignadas permanentemente y que trabajan en la base Davis-Monthan, donde actualmente trabajan unos 14,000 militares y civiles. Un aumento del 4,6% no repercutiría en la disponibilidad de empleo en la región; el personal que se trasladará ya estaría empleado por la Fuerza Aérea y no competiría por los puestos actualmente disponibles que podrían ser cubiertos por la mano de obra local; sin embargo, es posible que los dependientes de los militares se puedan incorporar a la mano de obra local.

La construcción de nuevas instalaciones daría lugar a un aumento temporal de entre 20 y 50 trabajadores de la construcción, en función del número de proyectos que se realicen simultáneamente; este aumento

temporal tendría un impacto beneficioso insignificante en las condiciones socioeconómicas de la región. Dado que no se produciría un aumento permanente del personal militar, contratado o civil, no habría necesidad de viviendas adicionales. Por lo tanto, no se produciría ningún impacto adverso sobre el empleo, la vivienda o los recursos educativos con las alternativas de acción propuestas.

Justicia Ambiental y Protección de la Infancia

No se esperan efectos significativos para las poblaciones de justicia ambiental y la protección de los niños como resultado de la implementación de la Acción Propuesta. No se producirían impactos sobre los residentes que viven fuera de la Base Davis-Monthan porque las actividades propuestas están totalmente contenidas dentro de la Base. Con la Acción Propuesta, se produciría una disminución global de la superficie en acres fuera de los límites de la instalación expuesta a 65 dB DNL. Ninguna escuela o guardería fuera de la base estaría expuesta a un DNL de 65 dB o superior en la base Davis-Monthan. Además, ningún hospital, parque o biblioteca estaría expuesto a un DNL de 65 dB o superior. Por lo tanto, no habría impactos desproporcionados en las poblaciones minoritarias, de bajos ingresos o jóvenes.

Recursos Culturales

No se esperan efectos significativos sobre los recursos culturales como resultado de la implementación de la Acción Propuesta. El cumplimiento de la Sección 106 de la Ley de Preservación Histórica Nacional, según enmendada (54 USC § 300101) (NHPA) y las regulaciones de implementación (36 CFR Parte 800) se logró a través de la coordinación con la Oficina de Preservación Histórica del Estado de Arizona (SHPO). La SHPO coincidió en que la Acción Propuesta no tendría "ningún efecto adverso" sobre los recursos culturales dentro del Área de Efectos Potenciales (APE).

<u>Yacimientos Arqueológicos</u> - En el marco de la Acción Propuesta, se construirían en la Instalación cinco edificios nuevos, incluidos dos simuladores de helicópteros. Los dos simuladores de helicóptero se construirían al este y al oeste del edificio 4382. La instalación 58 RQS se construiría justo al este del edificio 4868, y los dos edificios 88 TES se construirían al noreste de la pista. Hay yacimientos arqueológicos situados dentro del APE indirecta de 800 metros para todas las nuevas construcciones propuestas. Estos lugares no reúnen los requisitos para ser incluidos en el Registro Nacional de Lugares Históricos (NRHP), y toda la construcción se realizaría en terrenos que han sido perturbados por actividades pasadas y actuales de la misión.

<u>Propiedades Arquitectónicas Históricas</u> - No se realizarían actividades de demolición o renovación en el marco de la Acción Propuesta. En el APE directo o indirecto de la acción propuesta no se encuentra ningún edificio incluido o que reúna los requisitos para ser incluido en el NRHP; no se espera que la construcción de las cinco instalaciones propuestas en la instalación tenga un impacto en las propiedades históricas.

No se prevén impactos en los bienes históricos en el marco del SUA. No se incluirían vuelos supersónicos como parte de la Acción Propuesta y el aumento del ruido global sería insignificante.

<u>Bienes Culturales Tradicionales</u> - No se han identificado sitios sagrados, restos humanos, tumbas asociadas, tumbas no asociadas, objetos sagrados ni objetos de patrimonio cultural en la base Davis-Monthan. La Acción Propuesta no afectaría a yacimientos arqueológicos, propiedades históricas o recursos de los Nativos Americanos.

No es de esperar que la Acción Propuesta provoque impactos en los bienes culturales tradicionales (PCT). El Monte Graham, situado dentro de los MOA de Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci es un TCP según las Tribus Apache de Arizona, y la Fuerza Aérea seguiría evitando los sobrevuelos de este recurso.

Materiales y Residuos Peligrosos, Sustancias Tóxicas y Lugares Contaminados

No se esperan efectos significativos sobre los materiales peligrosos (HAZMAT) y los residuos como resultado de la implementación de las Alternativas de Acción Propuestas.

La implantación de la Acción Propuesta en la Base Davis-Monthan no añadiría ninguna nueva HAZMAT que excediera los procesos actuales de residuos peligrosos de la Base. Los procedimientos existentes para el manejo centralizado del almacenamiento, distribución, uso, reutilización, reciclaje y eliminación de HAZMAT a través del Almacén de Materiales Peligrosos de la Base son adecuados para acomodar los cambios previstos bajo la Acción Propuesta. Los residuos de la construcción sólo se generarían a partir de los nuevos proyectos de construcción; no se proponen actividades de demolición o renovación. No se llevarían a cabo actividades de construcción dentro de los lugares identificados en el Programa de Restauración Ambiental; por lo tanto, no habría impactos en esos lugares.

Infraestructuras, Transporte y Servicios Públicos

No se esperan efectos adversos significativos para la infraestructura, el transporte o los servicios públicos como resultado de la implementación de las Alternativas de Acción Propuestas.

<u>Transporte</u> - Con la Acción Propuesta, aumentaría el personal en la Instalación. El aumento del tráfico de camiones y de trabajadores de la construcción que se desplazan a la Instalación durante los periodos de construcción provocaría un aumento temporal de la demanda y una mayor congestión en las carreteras locales. En los emplazamientos del proyecto, sería previsible el cierre temporal de carriles durante las actividades de construcción. La red de transporte de la Base es suficiente para soportar el volumen de tráfico existente.

<u>Electricidad y Gas Natural</u> - La Acción Propuesta no tendría repercusiones a largo plazo en los sistemas de suministro eléctrico o de gas natural. Cualquier posible interrupción a corto plazo del servicio eléctrico o de gas natural en las zonas del proyecto durante las actividades de construcción se mitigaría durante la planificación del proyecto.

<u>Suministro de Agua Potable</u> - A corto plazo, los impactos adversos insignificantes en el sistema de suministro de agua potable se espera que se produzcan durante la construcción, mientras que las líneas de agua existentes están conectados a los nuevos edificios. No se prevén efectos adversos a largo plazo, ya que los cambios en la demanda serían mínimos y el sistema de abastecimiento de agua potable tiene capacidad para satisfacer nuevas demandas.

<u>Residuos Sólidos</u> - A corto plazo, los impactos adversos menores en el manejo de residuos sólidos tendrían el potencial de ocurrir debido a los proyectos de construcción bajo la Acción Propuesta. Según las directrices de la Agencia de Protección del Medio Ambiente de EE.UU. para calcular los residuos sólidos de la construcción, los 291,000 pies cuadrados de nueva construcción generarían 4.39 libras por pie cuadrado de escombros. Esto equivale a aproximadamente 1.3 millones de libras de residuos sólidos creados como resultado de la Acción Propuesta. Los contratistas estarían obligados a cumplir la normativa federal, estatal y local para la recogida y eliminación de los residuos sólidos generados en el marco de la Acción Propuesta, y todos los residuos sólidos generados se recogerían y transportarían fuera de la Base para su eliminación o reciclaje de conformidad con el Manual 32-7002 de la Fuerza Aérea, *Cumplimiento de la Normativa Ambiental y Prevención de la Contaminación*.

<u>Saneamiento y Aguas Pluviales</u> - Durante la construcción podría producirse un impacto adverso insignificante a corto plazo en los sistemas de alcantarillado sanitario y de tratamiento de aguas residuales, mientras se conectan las líneas existentes a los nuevos edificios. Aunque el funcionamiento de los nuevos edificios aumentaría la demanda de los sistemas de alcantarillado sanitario y tratamiento de aguas residuales a corto plazo, no se esperarían impactos adversos en los sistemas de alcantarillado sanitario y tratamiento de aguas residuales a largo plazo, ya que los sistemas actuales tienen la capacidad necesaria para satisfacer las nuevas demandas.

Impactos Acumulados

La EA consideró los impactos acumulativos que podrían resultar del impacto incremental de la Acción Propuesta cuando se suman a otras tendencias ambientales pasadas, presentes o razonablemente previsibles y acciones planificadas en o cerca de Davis-Monthan AFB o SUA asociado.

Bajo la Acción Propuesta, los planes y proyectos de desarrollo razonablemente previsibles dentro y alrededor del área de Tucson también estarían sujetos a regulación bajo el programa de permisos AZPDES. Dependiendo de la naturaleza y el tamaño del desarrollo, se establecerían medidas de cumplimiento normativo para prevenir o minimizar los efectos potenciales sobre o de los recursos geológicos.

Si se consideran conjuntamente con otras tendencias ambientales pasadas, presentes y razonablemente previsibles y con las acciones planificadas en la base Davis-Monthan AFB, no se prevé que se produzcan efectos acumulativos significativos con la ejecución de la Acción Propuesta.

<u>Mitigación</u>

El análisis de la EA llegó a la conclusión de que la Acción Propuesta no tendría impactos ambientales significativos; por lo tanto, no se requieren medidas de mitigación. Las BMP se describen y recomiendan en la EA cuando procede.

Conclusión

Declaración de Impacto No Significativo. Tras revisar la EA preparada de conformidad con los requisitos de la NEPA, la normativa CEQ y 32 CFR Parte 989, y que se incorpora por la presente por referencia, he determinado que la Acción propuesta no tendría un impacto significativo en la calidad del entorno humano o natural. Por consiguiente, no se elaborará una Declaración de Impacto Ambiental. Esta decisión se tomó después de considerar toda la información presentada, incluida una revisión de los comentarios de las agencias presentados durante el período de comentarios públicos de 30 días, y de considerar una gama completa de alternativas prácticas que cumplen los requisitos del proyecto y están dentro de la autoridad legal de la Fuerza Aérea de los EE.UU.

TBD

FECHA

This page intentionally left blank

Final Environmental Assessment Fourth-Generation Missions Regional Realignment Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona

March 2024



United States Air Force 355th Wing Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona



PRIVACY ADVISORY

This Environmental Assessment (EA) is provided for public comment in accordance with the *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA), the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508), and 32 CFR Part 989, *Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP)*.

The EIAP provides an opportunity for public input on Air Force decision-making, allows the public to offer inputs on alternative ways for the Air Force to accomplish what it is proposing, and solicits comments on the Air Force's analysis of environmental effects.

Public commenting allows the Air Force to make better, informed decisions. Letters or other written or oral comments provided may be published in the EA. Providing personal information is voluntary. Any personal information provided will be used only to identify your desire to make a statement during the public comment portion of any public meetings or hearings or to fulfill requests for copies of the EA or associated documents. Private addresses will be compiled to develop a mailing list for those requesting copies of the EA; however, only the names of the individuals making comments and specific comments will be disclosed. Personal home addresses and phone numbers will not be published in the EA.

COMPLIANCE

This document has been certified that it does not exceed 75 pages, not including appendices as defined in 40 CFR 1501.5(f). As defined in 40 CFR 1508.1(v), a "page" means 500 words and does not include maps, diagrams, graphs, tables, and other means of graphically displaying quantitative or geospatial information

ACCESSIBILITY NOTICE

This document is compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. This allows assistive technology to be used to obtain the available information from the document. Due to the nature of graphics, figures, tables, and images occurring in the document, accessibility is limited to a descriptive title for each item.

COVER SHEET Final Environmental Assessment for Fourth-Generation Missions Regional Realignment Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona

- a. Responsible Agency: United States Air Force
- b. Location: Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona
- c. Designation: Final Environmental Assessment
- d. *Point-of-Contact:* Kevin Wakefield, EIAP Program Manager, 3775 South Fifth Street, Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ 85707-3012, <u>kevin.wakefield.1@us.af.mil</u>

Abstract:

The Air Force is proposing to relocate the following fourth-generation missions from Nellis AFB, Nevada, to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona:

- 66th Weapons Squadron (66 WPS)
- A-10 Operational Test (OT) portion of the 422nd Test and Evaluation Squadron (422 TES)
- 66th Rescue Squadron (66 RQS)
- 58th Rescue Squadron (58 RQS)
- 34th Weapons Squadron (34 WPS)
- 88th Test and Evaluation Squadron (88 TES)

In order to create capacity at Davis-Monthan AFB to accept the aforementioned missions, the Air Force proposes to take the following actions with units already stationed at Davis-Monthan AFB:

- Inactivate the 354th Fighter Squadron (354 FS) and retire assigned A-10C aircraft.
- Downsize the 357th Fighter Squadron (357 FS) and retire some of their A-10 aircraft.

The A-10 OT portion of the 422 TES would transition in 2024. The HH-60 Weapons Instructor Course and Test and combat-coded units, to include the 88 TES, 66 RQS, 58 RQS, 79th Rescue Generation Squadron (RGS), 55 RGS, and the 34 WPS, would move beginning in 2025.

There are several other proposed actions at Davis-Monthan AFB unrelated to the movements described above that are occurring on approximately the same timelines and are therefore included in this analysis. These actions consist of assignment of two Civil Air Patrol Cessna 182 aircraft and the transfer of one RC-26B aircraft from the Morris Air National Guard Base located at the Tucson International Airport (Arizona).

Under the Proposed Action, day sorties would change from a total of 11,739 to 11,906, an increase of 167 sorties. Night sorties would change from a total of 2,272 to 3,206, an increase of 934 sorties. The Proposed Action also would involve construction of five facilities. The primary special use airspace to be utilized by the 355 WG would be the Barry M. Goldwater Range. The Tombstone, Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci and Ruby/Fuzzy Military Operations Areas also would be utilized for training.

This page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

СНА	PTER	R 1	PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION	1-1
	1.1	Intr	ODUCTION	1-1
	1.2	BAC	(GROUND	1-1
	1.3	Puri	POSE AND NEED FOR THE ACTION	1-3
	1.3	3.1	Davis-Monthan Restructure	1-3
	1.3	3.2	Beddown Civil Air Patrol Cessna 182	1-3
	1.3	3.3	Relocate RC-26B Operations	1-3
	1.4	Sco	PE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS	1-3
	1.5	INTE	RGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION, PUBLIC AND AGENCY PARTICIPATION	1-4
	1.5	5.1	Government to Government Consultation	1-4
	1.5	5.2	Agency Consultations and Coordination	1-5
	1.6	Ρυβι	LIC AND AGENCY REVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT	1-5
	1.7	Appl	ICABLE LAWS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS	1-6
CHA	PTER	2 2	DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES	2-1
	2.1	OVE	RVIEW OF THE PROPOSED ACTION	2-1
	2.2	Pro	POSED ACTION AT DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB	2-3
	2.2	2.1	66th Weapons Squadron	2-3
	2.2	2.2	422nd Test and Evaluation Squadron	2-4
	2.2	2.3	66th Rescue Squadron	2-5
	2.2	2.4	58th Rescue Squadron	2-8
	2.2	2.5	34th Weapons Squadron	2-8
	2.2	2.6	88th Test and Evaluation Squadron	2-8
	2.2	2.7	354th Fighter Squadron	2-9
	2.2	2.8	357th Fighter Squadron	2-9
	2.2	2.9	Beddown Civil Air Patrol Cessna 182	2-9
	2.2	2.10	Relocate RC-26B Operations	2-9
	2.3	AIRS	PACE USE	2-10
	2.3	3.1	Combined Weapons Changes in Special Use Airspace/Ranges	2-10
	2.3	3.2	Combined Defensive Countermeasure Changes in Special Use Airspace/Ranges	2-10
	2.4	Sele	CTION STANDARDS	2-12
	2.4	4.1	66th Weapons Squadron	2-12
	2.4	4.2	422nd Test and Evaluation Squadron	2-12
	2.4	4.3	66th Rescue Squadron	2-13
	2.4	4.4	58th Rescue Squadron	2-13
	2.4	4.5	34th Weapons Squadron	2-13
	2.4	4.6	88th Test and Evaluation Squadron	2-13
	2.5	SCR	EENING OF ALTERNATIVES	2-14
	2.6	ALTE	RNATIVE ACTIONS ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION	2-15
	2.7	Deta	AILED DESCRIPTION OF THE SELECTED ALTERNATIVES	2-15
	2.7	7.1	Preferred Alternative	2-15
	2.7	7.2	No Action Alternative	2-16
	2.8	SUM	MARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	2-16
CHA	PTER	23	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	3-1
	3.1	FRAM	NEWORK FOR ANALYSIS	3-1
	3.2	Reso	DURCES ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS	3-1
	3.3	Reso	DURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS	3-1
	3.4	AIRS	PACE MANAGEMENT AND USE	3-3
	3.4	4.1	Definition of the Resource	3-3
	3.4	4.2	Existing Conditions – Davis-Monthan AFB	3-3
	3.4	4.3	Existing Condition – Special Use Airspace	3-4
	3.4	4.4	Environmental Consequences	3-6
	3.5	Nois	E	3-7
	3.5	5.1	Definition of the Resource	3-7
	3.5	5.2	Existing Conditions- Davis-Monthan AFB	3-8

3.5.3	Existing Conditions – Special Use Airspace	3-10
3.5.4	Environmental Consequences	3-11
3.6 Saf	ETY	3-16
3.6.1	Definition of the Resource	
3.6.2	Existing Conditions	3-16
3.6.3	Environmental Consequences	3-20
3.7 Air	QUALITY	3-21
3.7.1	Definition of the Resource	3-21
3.7.2	Regional Climate	3-25
3.7.3	Existing Conditions – Davis-Monthan AFB	3-25
3.7.4	Existing Conditions – Special Use Airspace	3-26
3.7.5	Environmental Consequences	3-27
3.8 BIOL	OGICAL RESOURCES	3-35
3.8.1	Definition of the Resource	3-35
3.8.2	Existing Conditions – Davis-Monthan AFB	3-37
3.8.3	Existing Conditions – Special Use Airspace	
3.8.4	Environmental Consequences	
3.9 Wat	rer Resources	3-44
3.9.1	Definition of the Resource	3-44
3.9.2	Existing Conditions	
3.9.3	Environmental Consequences	
3.10 GEC	DLOGY AND SOILS	
3.10.1	Definition of the Resource	3-49
3.10.2	Existing Conditions	3-49
3.10.3	Environmental Consequences	
3.11 LAN	D USE	
3.11.1	Definition of Resources	
3.11.2	Existing Conditions.	
3.11.3	Environmental Consequences	
3.12 Soc		
3.12.1	Definition of the Resource	3-55
3 12 2	Existing Conditions	3-55
3 12 3	Environmental Consequences	
3 13 ENV	IRONMENTAL JUSTICE AND PROTECTION OF CHILDREN	3-59
3 1 3 1	Definition of the Resource	3-50
3 13 2	Existing Conditions	3-59
3 1 3 3	Environmental Consequences	3-60
3 14 Cu		3 61
3 14 00	Definition of the Resource	3-61
3117	Existing Conditions Davis-Monthan AEB	3_62
3.14.2	Existing Conditions - Davis-Monthan Ar D	3-64
3.14.3 2 1 1 1	Existing Conditions - Special Ose Airspace	
3.14.4 2.15 UAZ	ADDOUG MATEDIALS AND WASTES TOVIC SUBSTANCES AND CONTAMINATED SITES	3 66
3.13 HAZ	ARDOUS MATERIALS AND WASTES, TOXIC SUBSTAINCES, AND CONTAMINATED SITES	
3.10.1	Evisting Conditions	
3.10.2	Existing Conditions	
3.10.3		
3.10 INFF	ASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORTATION, AND UTILITIES	
3.70.7	Deminium of Resource	
3.76.2	Existing Conditions	
3.76.3		
CHAPIER 4		
4.1 GOV		
CHAPIER 5	KEFERENGES	

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Intergovernmental Coordination, Public and Agency Participation **Appendix B:** Air Quality Analysis Resources, Methodologies and Record of Conformity Applicability **Appendix C:** Public Notices

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1	Regional Overview	1-2
Figure 2-1	Proposed Locations of New Construction for the 88 TES, 66 RQS, and 34 WPS	2-6
Figure 2-2	58 RQS and HH-60 Simulator under the Proposed Action	2-7
Figure 2-3	Special Use Airspace Used by Davis-Monthan AFB	2-11
Figure 3-1	Day-Night Average Sound Level – Baseline Conditions	3-9
Figure 3-2	Day-Night Average Sound Level - Proposed Action Comparison	3-13
Figure 3-3	Safety Zones	3-19
Figure 3-4	Floodplain and Water Resources	3-46
Figure 3-5	Soil Units	3-51
Figure 3-6	Land Use	3-54
Figure 3-7	Cultural Resources	3-63

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1.	Total Proposed Aircraft Changes at Davis-Monthan AFB	2-2
Table 2-2.	Davis-Monthan AFB Personnel Changes	2-2
Table 2-3.	Total Sortie Changes at Davis-Monthan AFB ^a	2-3
Table 2-4.	66 WPS A-10 Weapons and Defensive Countermeasure Annual Quantities	2-4
Table 2-5.	66 WPS JTAC Ordnance Quantities	2-4
Table 2-6.	422 TES A-10 Annual Weapons and Defensive Countermeasures Quantities	2-5
Table 2-7.	66 RQS Annual Weapons and Defensive Countermeasures	2-5
Table 2-8.	34 WPS HH-60G Annual Weapons and Defensive Countermeasures	2-8
Table 2-9.	88 TES HH-60W Annual Weapons and Defensive Countermeasures	2-9
Table 2-10.	Comparison of Selection Standards for 4th Gen Missions Realignment	2-15
Table 2-11.	Summary of Potential Environmental Consequences	2-17
Table 3-1.	Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Environmental Trends and Planned	
	Actions	3-2
Table 3-2.	Environmental Resources Analyzed in the Environmental Assessment	3-3
Table 3-3.	Baseline Average Annual Operations (A-10 and HH-60) ^a	3-4
Table 3-4.	Davis-Monthan Special Use Airspace	3-5
Table 3-5.	Baseline Airspace Operations	3-5
Table 3-6.	Proposed Action Average Annual Operations (A-10 and HH-60) ^a	3-6
Table 3-7.	Proposed Action Airspace Operations	3-7
Table 3-8.	Baseline Average Annual Operations (A-10 and HH-60) ^a	3-8
Table 3-9.	Baseline Noise Exposure Acreage	3-10
Table 3-10.	Baseline Points of Interest Noise Exposure	3-10
Table 3-11.	Baseline Airspace Operations	3-11
Table 3-12.	Proposed Action Average Annual Operations	3-12
Table 3-13.	Proposed Action Noise Exposure Acreage	3-12
Table 3-14.	Day-Night Average Sound Level at POIs for Proposed Action	3-14
Table 3-15.	Proposed Action Airspace Operations	3-15
Table 3-16.	Aircraft Class Mishaps	3-18
Table 3-17.	Class A Mishap Rates for Air Force Aircraft	3-18
Table 3-18.	Low-Altitude Training Airspace Locations within Air Quality Control Regions	3-22
Table 3-19.	National Ambient Air Quality Standards	3-23
Table 3-20.	Comparison of Criteria Pollutant Design Values for Pima County to NAAQS	3-26

Table 3-21.	Airspace Attainment Status for Davis-Monthan AFB and Low-Altitude Training	0.07
Table 3-22.	VOC, CO, NOx, SO ₂ , and PM _{2.5} Emission Estimates under the Proposed Action, including Proposed Construction Activities and Aircraft Operations at Davis- Monthan AFB	3-27
Table 3-23.	General Conformity Applicability Emissions Estimates at Davis-Monthan AFB under the Proposed Action including Proposed Demolition/Construction Activities	2 20
Table 2.04	Emission Estimates for Tempstone MOA Law Altitude Activities (ten per veer)	2 21
	Emission Estimates for Tombstone MOA Low Altitude Activities (ton per year)	3-31
Table 3-25.	Emission Estimates for Jackal Low MOA Low-Altitude Activities (ton per year)	3-32
l able 3-26.	Emission Estimates for Morenci Low-Altitude MOA Activities (ton per year)	3-32
Table 3-27.	Emission Estimates for Low-Altitude Fuzzy MOA Activities (ton per year)	3-33
Table 3-28.	Greenhouse Gas Emissions under the Proposed Action	3-34
Table 3-30.	Arizona Species of Greatest Conservation Need with the Potential to Occur	
	within or near Davis-Monthan AFB	3-40
Table 3-31.	Threatened and Endangered Species Associated with the Special Use Airspace	3-42
Table 3-32.	Soil Types Associated with Davis-Monthan AFB	3-50
Table 3-33.	Populations in the ROI, Arizona, and the United States (2010–2019)	3-56
Table 3-34.	Personnel at Davis-Monthan AFB in 2016	3-56
Table 3-35	Housing	3-57
Table 3-36	Total Population and Populations of Concern ^a	3-60
Table 3-37	NRHP-I isted Sites and Native American Reservation Lands Under Training	
	Airchaco	3 64
	Allspace	

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

34 WPS	34th Weapons Squadron
47 FS	47th Fighter Squadron
58 RQS	58th Rescue Squadron
66 RQS	66th Rescue Squadron
66 WPS	66th Weapons Squadron
88 TES	88th Test and Evaluation Squadron
162 WG	162nd Wing
214 ATKG	214th Attack Group
354 FS	354th Fighter Squadron
355 WG	355th Wing
357 FS	357th Fighter Squadron
422 TES	422nd Test and Evaluation Squadron
ACC	Air Combat Command
AFB	Air Force Base
AFRC	Air Force Reserve Command
AFSEC	Air Force Safety Center
AGL	above ground level
Air Force	United States Air Force
AFPD	Air Force Policy Directive
AMU	Aircraft Maintenance Unit
ANG	Air National Guard
ANGB	Air National Guard Base
AP7	accident notential zone
AMARG	Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Group
ARTCC	Air Route Traffic Control Center
AOCR	Air Quality Control Regions
AST	above ground storage tank
ATC	Air Traffic Control
	Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace
	Arizona Came and Eish Department
	Arizona Ballutant Dischargo Elimination System
	Pird/Mildlife Aircraft Strike Hazard
BASIT	Barry M. Caldwater Pango
	best management prostice
	Clean Air Act
	Civil Air Act
	Civil All Falloi
	Council on Environmental Quality
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
	carbon monoxide
CONUS	Continential United States
CSAR	Compat Search and Rescue
	Complined test force
dB	
dBA	A-weighted decidel
	Day-Night Average Sound Level
	United States Department of Defense
	Department of Defense Instruction
DOPAA	Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives
DZ	drop zone

EA	Environmental Assessment
EIAP	Environmental Impact Analysis Process
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EISA	Energy Independence and Security Act
EO	Executive Order
ERP	Environmental Restoration Program
FSA	Endangered Species Act
ESOD	explosive safety quantity-distance
°F	Fahrenheit
FG	Fighter group
	flight test squadron
FLIS	Finding of No Significant Impact
	Finding of No Significant Impact
FIU	Formal Training Unit
FW	Fighter wing
GHG	greennouse gas
HAP	hazardous air pollutants
	hazardous materials
HLZ	helicopter landing zone
I-10	Interstate 10
JTAC	Joint Terminal Attack Controller
LOLA	live ordnance load area
LTO	landing take off cycle
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MGD	million gallons per day
MOA	Military Operations Area
MSA	Munitions Storage Area
MSL	mean sea level
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NOA	Notice of Availability
NO _v	nitrogen dioxide
OT	Operational Test
ΡΔΔ	primary aerospace vehicles authorized
PM ₁₀	particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter
PM ₂ c	particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter
F 1012.5	particulate matter less than of equal to 2.5 microns in diameter
ppm ppm	parts per billion
ppin O D	quentity distance
	Quality-distance
	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RUI	Region of influence
RQS	Rescue Squadron
SARA	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act
	social cost of carbon
SGCN	Species of Greatest Conservation Need
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SUA	Special Use Airspace
SO ₂	sultur dioxide
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
TACAN	Tactical Air Navigation
TCP	Traditional Cultural Property
TES	Test and Evaluation Squadron
TUSD	Tucson Unified School District
UFC	Unified Facilities Criteria

US USCB USEPA USFWS UST VOC	United States United States Code United States Census Bureau United States Environmental Protection Agency United States Fish and Wildlife Service underground storage tank volatile organic compounds Weapons Instructor Course
WIC	Weapons Instructor Course
WPS	Weapons Squadron

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 1 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION

The United States (US) Air Force (Air Force), Air Combat Command (ACC), prepared this Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 *United States Code* [USC] §§ 4321–4317), implemented through the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations of 1978 and amended in 2020 (Title 40 *Code of Federal Regulations* [CFR] Parts 1500–1508 [the September 14, 2020, version of CEQ NEPA rules is being used; 85 FR 43304-43376], as modified by the CEQ NEPA implementing regulation revisions that became effective 20 May 2022), and codified at 32 CFR Part 989, *Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP)*. Other pertinent environmental statutes, regulations, and compliance requirements were also considered during the preparation of this EA and are addressed in relevant sections.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

On 30 June 2021, the Air Force announced plans to make space for a larger than present fighter presence at Nellis Air Force Base (AFB), Nevada, by realigning the Base's close air support and rescue missions to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona. In order to free up capacity to support fifth-generation (5th Gen) aircraft test and training missions at Nellis AFB, the Air Force must relocate some older fourth-generation (4th Gen) force structure.

The Commander, ACC provided the following direction:

- Focus Nellis AFB command on 5th Gen test and training missions.
- Reorient Nellis' capabilities and capacity for future warfighting testing and training by relocating most 4th Gen missions to other locations.
- Provide options for missions dislocated from Nellis AFB.

After consideration of reasonable alternatives discussed in **Sections 2.4** and **2.5** of this EA, the Air Force proposes to relocate a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller (JTAC) training, and Guardian Angel operations to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona.

There are several other proposed actions at Davis-Monthan AFB unrelated to the movements described above that are occurring on approximately the same timelines and are therefore included in this analysis. These actions consist of assignment of two Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Cessna 182 aircraft and FIFTH GENERATION (5TH GEN) AIRCRAFT ARE THE NEWEST WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUCH AS THE F-22 AND F-35 FIGHTERS THAT CONTAIN NEW AND ENHANCED LEVELS OF STEALTH PROFILES, SPEED, MANEUVERABILITY, AND ADVANCED AVIONICS AND ATTACK CAPABILITIES.

the transfer of one RC-26B aircraft from the Morris Air National Guard Base (ANGB) located at the Tucson International Airport (Arizona).

1.2 BACKGROUND

Davis-Monthan AFB is located 5 miles south-southeast of downtown Tucson, Arizona. It was established in 1925 as Davis-Monthan Landing Field (**Figure 1-1**). The host unit for Davis-Monthan AFB is the 355th Wing (355 WG) assigned to ACC's Fifteenth Air Force. The Base is best known as the location of the Air Force Materiel Command's 309th Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Group, which provides critical aerospace maintenance and regeneration capabilities for Joint and Allied/Coalition warfighters in support of global operations and agile combat support for a wide range of military operations.

The 355 WG provides A-10 Thunderbolt II close air support to ground forces worldwide. The 355 WG is also a host unit, providing medical, logistical, mission and operational support to all assigned units. The 355 WG and the 924th Fighter Group, a geographically separated unit of the 944th Fighter Wing, also operate the Formal Training Unit (FTU) for the A-10 aircraft, providing initial and recurrent training to all Air Force A-10 pilots, including those in the Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) and the Air National Guard (ANG).





1.3 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE ACTION

1.3.1 Davis-Monthan Restructure

The purpose of moving the 4th Gen A-10 and HH-60 aircraft squadrons from Nellis AFB is to free up Base and range capacity at the Nevada Test and Training Range necessary to test and train warfighters in 5th Gen aircraft and allow personnel recovery units to take advantage of the synergy provided by co-locating with other rescue units. The Proposed Action would improve 5th Gen and beyond test, training, and tactics development capabilities at Nellis AFB to keep pace with Air Force mission requirements, evolving technology, and enemy capabilities. Nellis AFB has reached maximum capacity and space must be freed up to beddown 5th Gen missions.

The action to reassign the 4th Gen mission is needed because the current mission sets assigned to Nellis AFB and the Air Force Weapons Center are outpacing the ability to expand resources and capacity. The infrastructure available at Nellis AFB does not meet current or future mission needs and is operating at or beyond capacity.

1.3.2 Beddown Civil Air Patrol Cessna 182

The purpose of the beddown of the CAP Cessna 182 is to provide better training and to increase operations missions that the CAP conducts in support of the Air Force.

The Air Force partnership with the CAP encompasses a variety of mission sets that directly benefit the Air Force. The beddown of CAP aircraft at Davis-Monthan AFB is needed to improve communications, interaction between the CAP and Air Force, and execution of a number of these missions.

1.3.3 Relocate RC-26B Operations

The purpose of the relocation of RC-26B operations is to create space for a potential increase in F-16 training based at the 162nd Wing (162 WG) at the Morris ANGB and to consolidate 214 Attack Group assets and operations in a common location. The ANG anticipates a large-scale increase in international F-16 training based at the 162 WG at Morris ANGB. A single RC-26B aircraft needs to be relocated to make room for F-16-specific ramp realignments and improvements that are incompatible with continued RC-26 operations. In 2017, responsibility for the RC-26 organization was transferred from the 162nd Operations Group at Morris ANGB to the 214th Attack Group (214 ATKG), a subordinate unit to the 162 WG that is a tenant on Davis-Monthan AFB. Relocating the RC-26 aircraft and associated manpower to Davis-Monthan AFB in existing Total Force Training Center facilities would also serve to consolidate 214 ATKG assets and operations in a common location.

1.4 SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

This EA analyzes the potential environmental consequences associated with the Proposed Action and Alternatives. The analysis also addresses facility construction, airspace utilization, and an increase in personnel.

This EA has been prepared in accordance with NEPA, CEQ regulations, and the Air Force EIAP. NEPA is the basic national requirement for identifying environmental consequences of federal decisions. NEPA ensures that environmental information, including the anticipated environmental consequences of a proposed action, is available to the public, federal and state agencies, tribal governments, and the decision-maker before decisions are made and before actions are taken.

Consistent with the CEQ regulations, the EA is organized into the following sections:

 Chapter 1, Purpose and Need for Action, includes an introduction and information on the project location, purpose and need statements; scope of environmental analysis; decision to be made; intergovernmental coordination and public and agency participation; and applicable laws and environmental regulations.

- Chapter 2, Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives (DOPAA), includes a description of the Proposed Action, alternative selection standards, screening of alternatives, alternatives eliminated from further consideration, a description of the selected alternatives, summary of potential environmental consequences, and any mitigation and environmental commitments, if required.
- Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, includes a description of the natural and man-made environments within and surrounding Davis-Monthan AFB and the airspace that may be affected by the Proposed Action and Alternatives. This chapter also includes a discussion of direct and indirect impacts.
- Chapter 4, List of Preparers, provides a list of the preparers of this EA.
- Chapter 5, References, contains references for studies, data, and other resources used in the preparation of this EA.
- Appendices, as required, provide relevant correspondence, studies, modeling results, and public review information.

NEPA, which is implemented through the CEQ regulations, requires federal agencies to consider alternatives to the Proposed Action and to analyze potential impacts of alternative actions. Potential impacts of the Proposed Action and Alternatives described in this document will be assessed in accordance with the Air Force EIAP (32 CFR Part 989). To help the public and decision-makers understand the implications of impacts, the impacts will be described in the short and long term, cumulatively, and within context.

1.5 INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION, PUBLIC AND AGENCY PARTICIPATION

The EIAP, in compliance with NEPA guidance, includes public and agency review of information pertinent to a proposed action and alternatives. The Air Force's compliance with the requirement for intergovernmental coordination and agency participation begins with the scoping¹ process (40 CFR § 1501.9). Accordingly, and per Executive Order (EO) 12372, *Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs*, the Air Force notified federal, state, and local agencies and tribal governments with jurisdiction that could potentially be affected by the Proposed Action and Alternatives via written correspondence throughout development of this EA. A mailing list of the recipients of this correspondence as well as a sample of the outgoing letters and all responses are included in **Appendix A**.

1.5.1 Government to Government Consultation

The National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (54 USC § 300101, et seq.) (NHPA) and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800 direct federal agencies to consult with Indian tribes when a proposed action or alternatives may have an effect on tribal lands or on properties of religious and cultural significance to a tribe. Consistent with the NHPA, US Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 4710.02, *Interactions with Federally Recognized Tribes*, and Air Force Instruction (AFI) 90-2002, *Interactions with Federally Recognized Tribes*, the Air Force has invited federally recognized tribes that are historically affiliated with lands in the vicinity of the Proposed Action and Alternatives to consult on all proposed undertakings that have a potential to affect properties of cultural, historical, or religious significance to the tribes. The tribal consultation process is distinct from NEPA consultation and requires separate notification to all relevant tribes. The timelines for tribal consultation are also distinct from those of the other consultations. The Davis-Monthan AFB point of contact for Indian tribes is the Base Commander. The point of contact for consultation with the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation is the Davis-Monthan AFB Cultural Resources Manager. A mailing list of the tribal government recipients of this invitation as well as sample of the outgoing tribal government correspondence and all responses received are included in **Appendix A**.

¹ Scoping is a process for determining the extent of issues to be addressed and analyzed in a NEPA document.

1.5.2 Agency Consultations and Coordination

Implementation of the Proposed Action involves coordination with several organizations and agencies. Compliance with Section 7 of the *Endangered Species Act of 1973*, as amended (16 USC § 1536) (ESA) and implementing regulations (50 CFR Part 402) require communication with the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service. On 23 March 2023, the Air Force initiated Section 7 of the ESA consultation for the Proposed Action using the USFWS's Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) tool. Basic information concerning the location and nature of the Proposed Action was input into IPaC to obtain an official species (e.g., migratory birds) with potential to be affected by the Proposed Action. The Air Force accessed the IPaC tool again on 13 February 2024 and obtained an updated list. This information is included in **Appendix A** and incorporated into this EA where applicable. The Air Force determined that the Proposed Action would have "no effect" on threatened and endangered species or designated critical habitat. While not required, to date, the USFWS has not responded to or concurred with the Air Force's "no effect" determination. Correspondence with the USFWS is provided in **Appendix A**.

Compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA (54 USC § 300101) and implementing regulations (36 CFR Part 800) was accomplished through coordination with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). The SHPO's response indicating a finding of "no adverse effect" is provided in **Appendix A**.

The Air Force coordinated with the appropriate state and local government agencies regarding potential effects from the Proposed Action and Alternatives, as follows:

- Air and water quality effects Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ)
- Habitat and species of concern Arizona Game and Fish Department (AZGFD)
- Pima County and the City of Tucson

Finally, notice of the Proposed Action and Alternatives was provided to elected officials that represent the state at the federal and local levels. A sample of agency correspondence and all responses received are included in **Appendix A**.

1.6 PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

The Air Force invited the public and other interested stakeholders to review and comment on the Draft EA. Accordingly, a notice of availability (**Appendix A**) of the Draft EA and Draft FONSI was published in the following local newspapers to commence a 30-day public comment period:

- Arizona Daily Star
- Tucson Weekly

The public comment period of the Draft EA and FONSI concluded on 9 January 2024. During the public comment period, the Draft EA and Draft FONSI were available online for view or download at <u>https://www.dm.af.mil/About-DM/Environmental-Stewardship/</u>. Additionally, printed copies of the Draft EA and Draft FONSI were placed at the following local libraries for review:

- Himmel Park Branch Library, 1035 North Treat Avenue
- Quincie Douglas Library, 1585 East 36th Street

Davis-Monthan AFB received comments on the Draft EA during the public comment period from the White Mountain Apache Tribe and the Arizona SHPO. In its letter dated 23 December 2023, the White Mountain Apache Tribe concurred that the Proposed Action would "not have an adverse effect" on the tribe's cultural heritage resources and/or traditional cultural properties.

In the SHPO's email correspondence dated 9 January 2024, that office concurred that the Proposed Action would have "no adverse effect" on the Area of Potential Effects (APE). The SHPO also made some editorial comments that resulted in minor changes in **Section 3.14**.

Copies of these comments are included in Appendix A.

1.7 APPLICABLE LAWS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS

Other laws and regulations applicable to the Proposed Action include, but are not limited to:

- Clean Water Act (33 USC § 1251 et seq.) (CWA)
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (42 USC § 6901 et seq.) (RCRA)
- Section 438 of the Energy Independence and Security Act (Public Law 110-140) (EISA)
- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 USC § 9601 et seq.) (CERCLA)
- Clean Air Act (42 USC § 7401 et seq., as amended) (CAA)
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 USC §§ 703–712) (MBTA)
- Toxic Substances Control Act (15 USC § 2601 et seq.)
- EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (1994)
- EO 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks (1997), as amended by EO 13296 (2003)
- EO 14096, Revitalizing Our Nation's Commitment to Environmental Justice for All (2023)
CHAPTER 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

2.1 OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The Air Force is proposing to relocate the following 4th Gen missions from Nellis AFB, Nevada, to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona:

- 66th Weapons Squadron (66 WPS)
- A-10 Operational Test (OT) portion of the 422nd Test and Evaluation Squadron (422 TES)
- 66th Rescue Squadron (66 RQS)
- 58th Rescue Squadron (58 RQS)
- 34th Weapons Squadron (34 WPS)
- 88th Test and Evaluation Squadron (88 TES)

In order to create capacity at Davis-Monthan AFB to accept the aforementioned missions, the Air Force proposes to take the following actions with units already stationed at Davis-Monthan AFB:

- Inactivate the 354th Fighter Squadron (354 FS) and retire assigned A-10C aircraft.
- Downsize the 357th Fighter Squadron (357 FS) and retire some of its A-10 aircraft.

The A-10 OT portion of the 422 TES would transition in 2024. The HH-60 Weapons Instructor Course (WIC) and Test and combat-coded units, to include the 88 TES, 66 RQS, 58 RQS, 79th Rescue Generation Squadron (RGS), 55 RGS, and the 34 WPS, would move beginning in 2025.

The Air Force also proposes several unrelated actions that are analyzed in this EA due to overlap in the proposed timing:

- Beddown CAP Cessna 182.
- Relocate RC-26B operations.

Table 2-1 presents the proposed changes to the primary aerospace vehicles authorized (PAA) for each unit. Under the Proposed Action, the net change would be an increase of 3 PAA. **Table 2-2** summarizes the personnel changes from the current level for each unit. Under the Proposed Action, personnel would increase by an estimated additional 646 military, contract, and civilian personnel. **Table 2-3** presents the total changes in sorties at Davis-Monthan AFB. A sortie is defined as a single military aircraft flight from initial takeoff through final landing. Under the Proposed Action, day sorties would change from a total of 11,739 to 11,906, an increase of 167 sorties. Night sorties would change from a total of 2,272 to 3,206, an increase of 934 sorties. The net increase in sorties under the Proposed Action would be 1,101. **Section 2.3** provides a more detailed discussion on the change in sorties within the surrounding airspace.

Unit	Starting Location	A-10C	HH-60W	Cessna 182	RC-26B
66 WPS	Nellis AFB	+7	N/A	N/A	N/A
422 TES	Nellis AFB	+4	N/A	N/A	N/A
66 RQS	Nellis AFB	N/A	+14	N/A	N/A
58 RQS	Nellis AFB	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
34 WPS	Nellis AFB	N/A	+4	N/A	N/A
88 TES	Nellis AFB	N/A	+2	N/A	N/A
354 FS	Davis-Monthan AFB	-18	N/A	N/A	N/A
357 FS	Davis-Monthan AFB	-13	N/A	N/A	N/A
CAP	Davis-Monthan AFB	N/A	N/A	+2	N/A
162 WG	Morris ANGB	N/A	N/A	N/A	+1
	Totals	-20	+20	+2	+1

 Table 2-1.

 Total Proposed Aircraft Changes at Davis-Monthan AFB

AFB = Air Force Base; ANGB = Air National Guard Base; CAP = Civil Air Patrol; FS = Fighter Squadron; N/A = not applicable; RQS = Rescue Squadron; TES = Test and Evaluation Squadron; WG = Wing; WPS = Weapons Squadron

Table 2-2.Davis-Monthan AFB Personnel Changes

Unit/Function	Officer Full-Time	Officer Part-Time	Enlisted Full-Time	Enlisted Part-Time	Civilian	Total Change from Current Levels
66 WPS	10	N/A	N/A	200	2	212
422 TES	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	9
66 RQS	56	N/A	N/A	569	8	633
58 RQS	22	N/A	129	N/A	12	163
34 WPS	13	N/A	N/A	18	2	33
88 TES ^a	20	N/A	37	N/A	31	88
354 FS	-40	N/A	-464	N/A	-1	-505
357 FS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
CAP Cessna 182	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
RC-26B	6	3	N/A	N/A	4	13
Total Change						+646

Notes:

a The total number listed for the 88 TES includes the Det 1, 413 FLTS personnel as they are the other half of the CSAR CTF and will have to be moved and be allowed to complete their HH-60 Developmental Test mission. The first number is 88 TES personnel, the second number is Det 1, 413 FLTS personnel, and the third is the total.

AFB = Air Force Base; CAP = Civil Air Patrol; CSAR = Combat Search and Rescue; CTF = combined test force; FLTS = flight test squadron; FS = Fighter Squadron; RQS = Rescue Squadron; TES = Test and Evaluation Squadron; WPS = Weapons Squadron

Unit	Aircraft Type	Current Day Sorties	Current Night Sorties	Current Total Sorties	Proposed Day Sortie	Proposed Night Sortie	Total Proposed Sorties
Davis-Mont	Davis-Monthan Restructure						
66 WPS	A-10C	N/A	N/A	N/A	861	352	1,213
422 TES	A-10C	N/A	N/A	N/A	400	72	472
66 RQS	HH-60G	N/A	N/A	N/A	550	550	1,100
58 RQS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
34 WPS	HH-60G	N/A	N/A	N/A	224	148	372
88 TES	HH-60G	N/A	N/A	N/A	147	48	195
354 FS	A-10C	3,275	416	3,691	0	0	0
357 FS	A-10C	4,232	928	5,160	4232	928	5160
Subtotals		7,507	1,344	8,851	6,414	2,098	8512
Beddown C	ivil Air Patrol						
CAP	Cessna 182	-	-	-	720	0	720
Relocate RC-26B Operations							
162 WG	RC-26B	-	-	-	540	180	720
Totals		7,507	1,344	8,851	7,674	2,278	9,952
Net Change)	0	0	0	167	934	1,101

 Table 2-3.

 Total Sortie Changes at Davis-Monthan AFB^a

Note:

a DAF anticipates that the number of A-10 sorties would start to decrease at some point over the next couple of years, A-10 divestiture plans have not yet been finalized. Therefore, in order to analyze the most impactful scenario, the current number of sorties flown by the 357 FS are carried forward for analysis.

AFB = Air Force Base; CAP = Civil Air Patrol; FS = Fighter Squadron; N/A = not applicable; RQS = Rescue Squadron; TES = Test and Evaluation Squadron; WG = Wing; WPS = Weapons Squadron

2.2 PROPOSED ACTION AT DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB

This section provides a detailed discussion of proposed activities by squadron at Davis-Monthan AFB, providing information on the change in PAA, the change in personnel, and related construction activities.

2.2.1 66th Weapons Squadron

The 66 WPS teaches graduate-level A-10C pilot and JTAC WICs that provide training and weapons and tactics employment to officers of the Combat Air Forces and Mobility Air Forces.

Aircraft transferring to Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 7 PAA A-10. Personnel transferring to Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 10 officers, 200 enlisted personnel, and 2 civilians for a total of 212 personnel. The 66 WPS would utilize existing 354 FS facilities at Buildings 4800, 4809, and 4810.

The 66 WPS and the 422 TES functions have a number of live weapons requirements. The number of live ordnance load area (LOLA) aircraft parking spaces currently at Davis-Monthan AFB is inadequate to support the increase in live weapons requirements associated with the beddown of the 7 PAA A-10; up to 14 additional LOLA spaces would need to be constructed. The additional LOLA spaces would be near the present LOLA.

The 66 WPS would fly 1,213 A-10C sorties per year with an average duration of 2 hours for each sortie. The training syllabus requires 861 day sorties and 352 night sorties per year to graduate 12 students per year. A night sortie is defined as takeoff or landing before 7:00 am or after 10:00 pm local time. The entire sortie does not need to occur during those hours; any portion of a sortie occurring during those hours counts as a night sortie.

The 66 WPS is responsible for both A-10 and JTAC training. The 66 WPS would utilize air-to-ground munitions and defensive countermeasures during A-10 training and small arms ordnance for JTAC training (Tables 2-4 and 2-5).

Weapon or Defensive Countermeasure	Projected Quantity
30-millimeter target practice/high-explosive aircraft cannon ammo	208,800
2.75-inch rocket target practice/white phosphorous	2,349
Laser rocket	99
Illumination rocket	1,566
Joint direct attack munition	80
Laser-guided bomb	107
Cluster bomb unit	64
Air-to-ground missile	58
BDU-33	1,249
M-206 flares	12,000
RR-170 chaff	12,000

Table 2-4. 66 WPS A-10 Weapons and Defensive Countermeasure Annual Quantities

66 WPS = 66th Weapons Squadron

Table 2-5. 66 WPS JTAC Ordnance Quantities

Ordnance Type	Projected Quantity
5.56-millimeter ball ammunition	16,620
5.56-millimeter tracer ammunition	15,720
5.56-millimeter ultimate training munition	4,860
7.62-millimeter ammunition	11,400
9-millimeter ammunition	16,160
Grenade simulator	44
40-millimeter smoke round	126
Smoke grenade	100

66 WPS = 66th Weapons Squadron; JTAC = Joint Terminal Attack Controller

2.2.2 422nd Test and Evaluation Squadron

The 422 TES performs operational testing of all fighter aircraft and munitions entering and in operational use by ACC. The 422 TES is a subordinate unit of the 53rd Test and Evaluation Group stationed at Nellis AFB. After a new fighter weapons system completes developmental testing, the mission of the 422 TES is to thoroughly vet the new equipment in a combat representative environment. A variety of aircraft are assigned to the 422 TES, to include A-10, F-15C, F-15E, F-16, F-22A and F-35A. The Air Force proposes to relocate the portion of the 422 TES that supports A-10 OT to Davis-Monthan AFB.

Aircraft transferring to Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of four PAA A-10C. Personnel transfers to Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 5 officers and 4 civilians for a total of 9 personnel.

The 422 TES would fly 472 A-10C sorties per year with an average duration of 2 hours for each sortie, including 72 night sorties per year. The 422 TES also would utilize air-to-ground munitions and self-defense countermeasures for A-10 training (Table 2-6).

Weapon or Defensive Countermeasure	Projected Quantity
30-millimeter CTG TP PGU-15A	46,000
30-millimeter cartridge 2 HEI	11,500
30-millimeter CTG HEI PGU-13D	11,500
Illumination rocket	350
Joint direct attack munition	46
Laser-guided bomb	34
Cluster bomb unit	36
Air-to-ground missile	48
Heavy-weight inert bomb	160
BDU-33	450
M-206 flares	3000
RR-170 chaff	900
Chaff RR-188	3000

Table 2-6.422 TES A-10 Annual Weapons and Defensive Countermeasures Quantities

422 TES = 422nd Test and Evaluation Squadron

2.2.3 66th Rescue Squadron

The 66 RQS and the 58 RQS operate jointly as a composite mission. The 66 RQS provides HH-60G aircraft and the 58 RQS provides Guardian Angel pararescue personnel.

The 66 RQS operates the HH-60G Pave Hawk medium-lift Combat Search and Rescue helicopter and provides rapidly deployable, full-spectrum expeditionary personnel recovery vertical lift capabilities to theater commanders worldwide. The 66 RQS tactically employs the HH-60G helicopter and its crew in hostile environments to recover downed aircrew and isolated personnel during day, night, or marginal weather conditions in contested airspace employing skills such as weapons employment, shipboard operations, and aerial refueling. The RQS also conducts military operations including civil search and rescue, disaster relief, international aid, and emergency medical evacuation.

Aircraft transferring to Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 14 PAA HH-60W. Personnel transfers associated with the aircraft would consist of 56 officers, 569 enlisted personnel, and 8 civilians for a total of 633 personnel.

The 66 RQS would fly 1,100 A-10C sorties per year, of which approximately 550 would occur at night. The 66 RQS would utilize air-to-ground munitions and self-defense countermeasures for HH-60G training (**Table 2-7**).

Figure 2-1 shows the proposed location of new construction for the 66 RQS on the northern portion of the Base (approximately 100,000 square feet in size). Proposed locations for construction of new helicopter simulator facilities (approximately 13,000 square feet each) are depicted in **Figure 2-2**.

Weapon or Defensive Countermeasure	Projected Quantity
.50-caliber machine gun ammunition up to Armor Piercing Incendiary Tracer	297,000 rounds
7.62-millimeter machine gun ammunition	1,587,600 rounds
Chaff	1,920
Flare	4,000

Table 2-7.66 RQS Annual Weapons and Defensive Countermeasures

66 RQS = 66th Rescue Squadron



FIGURE 2-1 Proposed Locations of New Construction for the 88 TES, 66 RQS, and 34 WPS under the Proposed Action — Sunglow Realignment MILCON

1,000 Feet

Existing Buildings

Ν

Installation Boundary
Proposed Projects

Imagery: ESRI, 2021. Coordinate System: NAD 83 UTM Zone 12N





FIGURE 2-2 58 RQS and HH-60 Simulator under the Proposed Action

Existing BuildingsProposed Projects

Ν

10 Casas Adobes Catalina Foothills Tucson AZ 19 Sahuarita

500 Feet

Imagery: ESRI, 2021. Coordinate System: NAD 83 UTM Zone 12N

2.2.4 58th Rescue Squadron

The 58 RQS Guardian Angel mission is uniquely designed and dedicated to conduct personnel recovery across the full range of military operations and during all phases of joint, coalition, and combined operations. Its most fundamental mission tasks are: (1) to prepare personnel who may be isolated or become missing while participating in US Government-sanctioned military activities (or missions in uncertain or hostile environments), (2) to conduct recovery operations during peacetime and war, and (3) to lead reintegration operations after a recovery.

Personnel transferring to Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 22 officers, 129 enlisted personnel, and 12 civilians for a total of 163 personnel. The 58 RQS would require construction of a new facility (approximately 65,000 square feet) near the south end of the aircraft ramp (see **Figure 2-2**).

The 58 RQS has no assigned aircraft and relies upon the 66 RQS and other units to complete its training.

2.2.5 34th Weapons Squadron

The 34 WPS is assigned to the Air Force Weapons School and provides HH-60G and HC-130J instructional flying for air rescue missions. Aircraft transferring to Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 4 PAA HH-60W; no HC-130J aircraft would be transferred to Davis-Monthan AFB. Personnel transferring to Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 13 officers, 18 enlisted personnel, and 2 civilians for a total of 33 personnel.

The 34 WPS would require additional munitions facilities and munitions support facilities (see **Figure 2-1**). Proposed locations for construction of new helicopter simulator facilities are depicted in **Figure 2-2**.

As shown in **Table 2-3** above, the 34 WPS would fly 372 HH-60G sorties per year, of which 148 would occur at night. The 34 WPS would utilize air-to-ground munitions and self-defense countermeasures for HH-60G and HC-130J training (**Table 2-8**).

Weapon or Defensive Countermeasure	Projected Quantity
.50-caliber machine gun ammunition up to Armor Piercing Incendiary Tracer	198,200 rounds
7.62-millimeter machine gun ammunition	794,800 rounds
HH-60G chaff	4,201
HH-60G flare	2,000
HC-130J chaff	8,400
HC-130J flare	6,720

 Table 2-8.

 34 WPS HH-60G Annual Weapons and Defensive Countermeasures

34 WPS = 34th Weapons Squadron

2.2.6 88th Test and Evaluation Squadron

The 88 TES is part of the Combat Search and Rescue Combined Test Force and is the Air Force's unit responsible for testing, evaluating, and developing tactics for combat, search, and rescue. The 88 TES performs this mission on the HH-60G, HC-130J, and Guardian Angel weapon systems.

Aircraft transferring to Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 2 PAA HH-60W. Personnel transferring to Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 20 officers, 37 enlisted personnel, and 31 civilians for a total of 88 personnel.

The 88 TES would require construction of two new facilities (approximately 100,000 square feet for each building) co-located with new construction for the 66 RQS (see **Figure 2-1** above). The 88 TES would fly 195 HH-60G sorties per year, of which approximately 48 would occur at night. The 88 TES would utilize air-to-ground munitions and self-defense countermeasures for HH-60W training (**Table 2-9**).

Weapon or Defensive Countermeasure	Projected Quantity
.50-caliber machine gun ammunition up to Armor Piercing Incendiary Tracer	59,200 rounds
7.62-mm machine gun ammunition	151,000 rounds
HH-60W chaff	1,300
HH-60W flare	3,307

Table 2-9.88 TES HH-60W Annual Weapons and Defensive Countermeasures

2.2.7 354th Fighter Squadron

The 354 FS is an active-duty operational A-10 squadron stationed at Davis-Monthan AFB. The Air Force proposes to inactivate the 354 FS and retire the A-10s assigned to this unit.

Aircraft transferring to the Aircraft Maintenance and Regeneration Center at Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 18 PAA A-10C. Personnel departing Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 505 positions.

The inactivation of the 354 FS would result in a decrease of 3,691 A-10C sorties per year. Night flying would decrease by 416 sorties.

2.2.8 357th Fighter Squadron

The 357 FS is an active-duty A-10C FTU stationed at Davis-Monthan AFB. The 357 FS has 21 PAA A-10C assigned. The 357 FS would be reduced from 21 PAA A-10C to 8 PAA A-10C, a reduction of 13 PAA A-10C. A total of 13 PAA A-10 aircraft would depart Davis-Monthan AFB under this action.

There are currently 713 personnel associated with the 357 FS at Davis-Monthan AFB. There would be a reduction of approximately 170 personnel associated with the reduction in aircraft.

2.2.9 Beddown Civil Air Patrol Cessna 182

Two Cessna 182 aircraft would beddown and operate from Davis-Monthan AFB; the aircraft would be parked on the North Ramp (see **Figure 2-1**). Operations would support Cadet Orientation Flights for the CAP, Reserve Officer Training Corps, and Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps. The aircraft would also support search and rescue and disaster relief training and operational missions, counter narcotics operations, and low/slow flying intercept training. No new facilities would be constructed for CAP operations under this Proposed Action; however, there might be associated construction in the future, which would be covered under a separate NEPA analysis.

The Cessna 182 aircraft would fly one to three sorties per day, for a maximum of 720 sorties per year (based on three per day for 240 days per year). All sorties would conclude with a single approach to a full-stop landing. Any pattern work for training and proficiency would be accomplished at satellite airfields in the local area.

2.2.10 Relocate RC-26B Operations

One RC-26B aircraft and associated personnel would be relocated from Morris ANGB to Davis-Monthan AFB. The aircraft would be off-station an average of 30 to 90 days per year supporting law enforcement activities, disaster relief, and national requests. Additional manpower would consist of 10 aircrew (6 full-time, 3 part-time), and 4 full-time contract logistics support/maintenance personnel.

No new facilities would be constructed for relocation of RC-26B operations. Personnel would be located at Building 1711 in the Snowbird Compound.

The RC-26B aircraft would average 2 to 3 sorties per day with approximately 720 sorties per year. Approximately 50 sorties would occur at night.

2.3 AIRSPACE USE

The primary airspace utilized by the 355 WG is the Barry M. Goldwater Range (BMGR). The Tombstone, Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci and Ruby/Fuzzy Military Operations Areas (MOAs) are accessible for training within 125 miles of Davis-Monthan AFB (**Figure 2-3**). MOAs consist of airspace of defined vertical and lateral limits established for the purpose of separating certain military training activities from commercial and personal air traffic. Whenever a MOA is being used, nonparticipating flight traffic may be cleared through a MOA if separation can be provided by air traffic control. Otherwise, nonparticipating traffic is rerouted (Federal Aviation Administration [FAA], 2021).

The BMGR was established in 1941 and is located in southwest Arizona along the US-Mexico border. It is located within Maricopa, Pima, and Yuma counties, Arizona, and covers 1,050,000 acres of land and 7,000 square miles of special use airspace (SUA). BMGR supports over 54,000 operations per year. The range offers four manned target complexes, an aerial gunnery range, and three tactical ranges for advanced training scenarios. Electronic combat systems include air combat maneuvering instrumentation for live monitoring and recorded playback debrief, tactical datalink, threat simulation, moving target systems, and a range operations center providing real-time range/airspace access and management.

The total increase in operations under the Proposed Action would be 15,112 sorties flown in the combined airspaces annually (an increase of 1,101 from baseline conditions).

The projected airspace operations also include those flown by other aircraft in support of the 66 WPS A-10C and JTAC WIC. These include operations flown by fixed aircraft to include bombers, electronic warfare and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft. It also includes support operations flown by rotary wing aircraft.

2.3.1 Combined Weapons Changes in Special Use Airspace/Ranges

The Proposed Action also would result in changes to the quantities of ordnance utilized. Ordnance in this case is defined as any air-to-ground munition such as bombs, missiles, rockets, or aircraft-mounted machine guns or cannons. It also includes ground-to-ground munitions such as rifle, pistol, and machine gun ammunition or grenades.

2.3.2 Combined Defensive Countermeasure Changes in Special Use Airspace/Ranges

Defensive countermeasures are defined as expendable devices used to help protect the aircraft from hostile actions. Chaff and flares are the principal defensive countermeasures dispensed by military aircraft to avoid detection or attack by enemy air defense systems.

Chaff is an electronic countermeasure designed to reflect radar waves and obscure aircraft, ships, and other equipment from radar tracking sources. Chaff bundles consist of millions of nonhazardous aluminum-coated glass fibers. When ejected from the aircraft, these fibers disperse widely in the air, forming an electromagnetic screen that temporarily hides the aircraft from radar and forms a radar decoy, allowing the aircraft to defensively maneuver or leave the area.

Flares are a principal defensive countermeasure dispensed by military aircraft to avoid detection or attack by enemy air defense systems. Flares are magnesium pellets ejected from military aircraft and provide high-temperature heat sources that act as decoys for heat-seeking weapons targeting the aircraft. These defensive countermeasures are utilized to keep aircraft from being successfully targeted by, or to help aircraft escape from, weapons such as surface-to-air missiles, air-to-air missiles, and anti-aircraft artillery.

Under the Proposed Action, chaff and flares primarily would be used over the BMGR and Ruby Fuzzy MOAs, similar to existing training. To minimize the potential for flares to ignite vegetation, flares would be employed at an altitude that prevents the flares from impacting the ground or structures. Chaff and flares would be used in compliance with the 355 WG Inflight Guide. The 354 and 357 FS currently use chaff and flare within the BMGR and Ruby Fuzzy MOAs. Under the Davis-Monthan restructure discussed in Sections 1.3.1 and 2.2, the overall usage of chaff and flare would remain consistent with existing levels.



NE **FIGURE 2-3** NV UT Special Use Airspace Used by Davis-Monthan AFB CA NM Barry M. Goldwater Range (BMGR) AZ T) Military Operations Area (MOA) Ν Imagery: ESRI, 2021. 50 Miles 0 Coordinate System: NAD 83 UTM Zone 12N

2.4 SELECTION STANDARDS

NEPA and CEQ regulations mandate the consideration of reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Action. "Reasonable alternatives" are those that also could be utilized to meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. Per the requirements of 32 CFR Part 989, selection standards are used to identify alternatives for meeting the purpose of and need for the Air Force action.

All of the selection standards for the various portions of the Proposed Action can be summarized as:

- 1) Co-location with like mission and/or supporting mission
- 2) Facilities existing or room to build
- 3) Airspace and ranges availability and suitability of SUA and nearby ranges not requiring refueling

More detailed descriptions of selection standards 1 and 2 are provided for each unit below. Selection standard 3 is consistent across all facets of the Proposed Action.

The primary selection standard for the inactivation of the 354 FS and the downsizing of the 357 FS revolves around the retirement of aging A-10s. No other reasonable activity was identified at Davis-Monthan to create capacity both at the Base and the associated airspace.

The primary selection standard for the beddown of the CAP Cessna 182 and for the relocation of the RC-26B operations involves the consolidation of the 214 ATKG and CAP assets and operations in a common location. No other reasonable activity was identified for the beddown of the CAP Cessna 182 and for the relocation of the RC-26B operations.

2.4.1 66th Weapons Squadron

The alternatives to the Proposed Action must meet the following selection standards:

- 1) Co-locate at an existing continental US (CONUS) A-10 location
- 2) Existing and available A-10 and JTAC facilities
 - a. Runway: 8,000-foot minimum
 - b. Hangar: 2 bays for 7 primary aircraft; 12,300 square feet (ft²)
 - c. Office space: eight officers, eight enlisted, two civilian personnel; 3,600 ft²
 - d. Classroom space: 12 students annually (two classes per year with four to six students each), 5,000 ft²

2.4.2 422nd Test and Evaluation Squadron

The alternatives to the Proposed Action must meet the following selection standards:

- 1) Co-locate at an existing CONUS A-10 location
- 2) Existing and available A-10 and JTAC facilities
 - a. Runway: 8,000-foot minimum
 - b. Hangar: 2 bays for 4 primary aircraft
 - c. Office space: five officers, four civilian personnel

2.4.3 66th Rescue Squadron

The alternatives to the Proposed Action must meet the following selection standards:

- 1) Co-locate at an Air Force active-duty CONUS operational HH-60 and HC-130 location
- 2) Existing and available HH-60 facilities
 - a. Hangar: 3 bays for 14 primary aircraft; 30,000 ft²
 - b. Apron to support 14 primary aircraft; 48,000 ft²
 - c. One Squad Ops/Aircraft Maintenance Unit (AMU): Squad Ops, 33,000 ft²; AMU, 32,000 ft²)

2.4.4 58th Rescue Squadron

The alternatives to the Proposed Action must meet the following selection standards:

- 1) Co-locate at an Air Force active-duty CONUS operational HH-60, HC-130, and Guardian Angel location
- 2) Guardian Angel facilities
 - a. Squadron operations facility: 10,667 ft²
 - b. Preservation of the Force and Family space: 10,631 ft²
 - c. Operations support facilities: 71,601 ft²

2.4.5 34th Weapons Squadron

The alternatives to the Proposed Action must meet the following selection standards:

- 1) Co-locate at an Air Force active-duty CONUS operational HH-60, HC-130, and Guardian Angel location
- 2) Have existing and available HH-60 facilities:
 - a. Hangar: one bay for 4 primary aircraft; 6,500 ft²
 - b. Apron to support 4 primary aircraft: 28,000 ft²
 - c. Office space; 6,600 ft²
 - d. Classroom space for 14 students, 28 students annually

2.4.6 88th Test and Evaluation Squadron

The alternatives to the Proposed Action must meet the following selection standards:

- 1) Co-locate at an Air Force active-duty CONUS operational HH-60, HC-130, and Guardian Angel location
- 2) Have existing and available HH-60/Guardian Angel facilities
 - a. Hangar: one bay for 2 primary aircraft; 6,500 ft²
 - b. Apron to support 2 primary aircraft: 19,000 ft²
 - c. Squadron operations facility: 21,100 ft² (classification up to Top Secret with access to sensitive compartmentalized information)
 - d. Operations support facilities: 26,500 ft²
 - e. Preservation of the Force and Family space: 10,000 ft²

2.5 SCREENING OF ALTERNATIVES

All portions of the Proposed Action have similar selection standards. The Air Force Strategic Basing Process initially considered the actions as independent with different potential locations, especially for the 66 WPS.

- 66 WPS enterprise initially considered:
 - Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona
 - Fort Wayne ANGB, Indiana
 - Gowen Field (Boise Air Terminal), Idaho
 - Moody AFB, Georgia
 - Selfridge ANGB, Michigan
 - Warfield ANGB (Martin State Airport), Maryland
 - Whiteman AFB, Missouri
- 66 RQS, 58 RQS, and 34 WPS enterprise considered:
 - Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona
 - Moody AFB, Georgia
- 422 TES and 88 TES enterprise considered:
 - Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona

The 66 WPS enterprise list was essentially open to all CONUS A-10 bases. There were several screening criteria used to further refine the enterprise list, as follows:

- the ability to build up and load live munitions (such as bombs and rockets), which are required on a number of Weapons School sorties;
- a live weapons employment range that is close enough to be used during a typical sortie duration; and
- a location within 350 nautical miles (nm) of Nellis AFB because the Weapons School class has to fly to Nellis AFB airspace so that each class can participate in Large Force exercises. There would not be air refueling support to get these aircraft to Nellis AFB, so the distance was based on what an A-10 could fly in a single, unrefueled sortie duration.

After a series of tabletop surveys and discussions, the enterprise list was screened and pared down to the following preferred and reasonable alternatives; site surveys were then performed.

- 66 WPS, 66 RQS, 58 RQS, and 34 WPS:
 - Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona
 - Moody AFB, Georgia
- 422 TES and 88 TES:
 - Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona

All the ANGB locations did not meet one or all of the enterprise screening criteria. ANG units are usually located on civil airfields and are usually not allowed to build up live munitions or load them up at their location. Only one ANG location, Gowen Field, was possibly close enough to a live range (Utah Test and Training Range). However, students would need to fly to another location, such as Mountain Home AFB, in Idaho, to pick up live munitions to use in the Utah Range, making training impractical. Finally, none of the ANG locations were within the distance criteria of Nellis AFB. Moody AFB and Whiteman AFB were also ruled out for this reason.

Application of the screening criteria to the alternatives is presented in Table 2-10.

			Selection Standards			
Mission	Alternative	Co-location with Like or Supporting Mission	Facilities	Airspace and Ranges		
		(1)	(2)	(3)		
66 WPS	(1) Davis-Monthan AFB	Yes	Yes	Yes		
	(2) Moody AFB	Yes	Yes	No		
66 RQS	(1) Davis-Monthan AFB	Yes	Yes	Yes		
	(2) Moody AFB	Yes	Yes	No		
58 RQS	(1) Davis-Monthan AFB	Yes	Yes	Yes		
	(2) Moody AFB	Yes	Yes	No		
34 WPS	(1) Davis-Monthan AFB	Yes	Yes	Yes		
	(2) Moody AFB	Yes	Yes	No		
422 TES	(1) Davis-Monthan AFB	Yes	Yes	Yes		
88 TES	(1) Davis-Monthan AFB	Yes	Yes	Yes		

 Table 2-10.

 Comparison of Selection Standards for 4th Gen Missions Realignment

AFB= Air Force Base; RQS = Rescue Squadron; TES = Test & Evaluation Squadron; WPS = Weapons Squadron

2.6 ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

Moody AFB was considered and eliminated from further consideration because it would not meet the purpose of and need for the action or the selection standards (refer to **Section 2.4**). Further, Moody AFB does not meet selection standard 3 because it is located more than 350 nm from Nellis AFB. This alternative also lacks representative simulated threats and target complexes in the airspace and ranges accessible to Moody AFB to support WIC syllabus training events.

2.7 DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE SELECTED ALTERNATIVES

NEPA and the CEQ regulations mandate the consideration of reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Action. "Reasonable alternatives" are those that also could be utilized to meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. The NEPA process is intended to support flexible, informed decision-making; the analysis provided by this EA and feedback from the public and other agencies will inform decisions made about whether, when, and how to execute the Proposed Action.

Davis-Monthan AFB Alternative 1 is the Preferred Alternativee (as described in **Section 2.1** of this document). Alternative 1 is the only alternative carried forward for further analysis in this EA. Davis-Monthan AFB is the only alternative located within 350 nm of Nellis AFB, which would avoid in-flight refueling requirements.

2.7.1 Preferred Alternative

The Proposed Action as described in **Section 2.1** and summarized below represents the Air Force's Preferred Alternative. No other alternatives met the purpose of and need for the action or the selection standards.

2.7.1.1 Davis-Monthan Realignment

The Preferred Alternative would relocate the 66 WPS, 422 TES A-10C OT mission, 66 RQS, 58 RQS, 34 WPS, and 88 TES from Nellis AFB to Davis-Monthan AFB. This alternative would also inactivate the 354 FS and downsize the 357 FS. This alternative would result in a decrease of 20 PAA A-10C aircraft and an increase of 18 HH-60G aircraft at Davis-Monthan AFB.

2.7.1.2 Beddown of Civil Air Patrol

The Preferred Alternative would include the beddown of two Cessna 182. The aircraft would be parked on the Base North Ramp. Operations would support Cadet Orientation Flights for the CAP, Reserve Officer Training Corps, and Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps. The aircraft would also support search and rescue and disaster relief training and operational missions, counter narcotics operations, and low/slow flying intercept training.

2.7.1.3 Relocate RC-26B Operations

The Preferred Alternative would include the relocation of one RC-26B aircraft and associated personnel from Morris ANGB to Davis-Monthan AFB. The aircraft would be off-station an average of 30 to 90 days per year supporting law enforcement activities, disaster relief, and national requests. Additional manpower would consist of 10 aircrew (6 full-time, 4 part-time), 1 full-time administrative support staff, and 3 full-time contract logistics support/maintenance personnel.

2.7.2 No Action Alternative

Analysis of the No Action Alternative provides a benchmark, enabling decision-makers to compare the magnitude of the potential environmental effects of the Proposed Action. NEPA requires an EA to analyze the No Action Alternative. No action means that an action would not take place at this time, and the resulting environmental effects from taking no action would be compared with the effects of deciding to move forward with the proposed activity. No action for this EA reflects the status quo, where no additional aircraft assets would be transferred to, retired from, or reallocated at Davis-Monthan AFB.

Under the No Action Alternative, the 4th Gen missions would remain at Nellis AFB, or could be inactivated in place. Even if some missions are inactivated, this would create a capacity issue as 5th Gen missions continue to increase in scope and number.

2.8 SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

The potential impacts associated with the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative are summarized in **Table 2-11**. The summary is based on information discussed in detail in **Chapter 3** of this EA and includes a concise definition of the issues addressed and the potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action and No Action Alternative.

Resource Area	Proposed Action	No Action Alternative
Airspace Management and Use	The Proposed Action would result in minimal impacts to the local airspace environment.	No significant impacts to airspace.
Noise	Compared to current conditions, the Proposed Action would result in a slight reduction of noise off Base.	No significant impacts to noise.
Safety	No significant impacts to ground, explosive, or flight safety.	No significant impacts to ground, explosive, or flight safety.
Air Quality	No significant impacts to regional air quality.	No impacts would occur to regional air quality under the No Action Alternative.
Biological Resources	No significant impacts to biological resources.	No significant impacts to biological resources.
Water Resources	No significant impacts to water resources.	Water resources would not change from current condition, and no impacts to water resources would occur.
Soils	No significant impacts to geological resources.	No impacts to geological resources.
Land Use	No changes to existing land use.	No changes to existing land use.
Socioeconomics	No impacts to population, economic environment, employment, housing, or educational resources.	No change to socioeconomic conditions.
Environmental Justice and Protection of Children	 No disproportionate impact to minority or low-income populations. No disproportionate impacts to children or elderly. 	No change to minority, low- income, or youth populations.
Cultural Resources	 No significant impact to historic buildings or archaeological deposits. No known traditional cultural resources or sacred sites are present. 	Cultural resources would not change from current condition, and no impacts to cultural resources would be anticipated to occur.
Hazardous Materials and Wastes, Toxic Substances, and Contaminated Sites	 No impacts to hazardous waste management. No impacts to asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint management. No impacts from radon. No impacts to contaminated sites. 	No change to hazardous materials and wastes, contaminated sites, and toxic substances.
Infrastructure, Transportation, and Utilities	Minimal impacts to local traffic or utilities.	No impacts to local traffic or utilities.

 Table 2-11.

 Summary of Potential Environmental Consequences

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS

To provide a framework for the analyses in this EA, the Air Force defined a study area specific to each resource or sub-resource area. Referred to as a Region of Influence (ROI), these areas delineate a boundary where possible effects from the considered alternatives would have a reasonable likelihood to occur. Beyond these ROIs, potential adverse effects on resources would not be anticipated. For the purposes of analysis, potential effects are described as follows:

- Beneficial positive effects that improve or enhance resource conditions.
- Negligible adverse effects likely to occur but at levels not readily observable by evaluation.
- **Minor** observable, measurable, tangible adverse effects qualified as below one or more significance threshold(s).
- **Significant** obvious, observable, verifiable adverse effects qualified as above one or more significance threshold(s); not mitigable to below significance.

When relevant to the analyses in this EA, potential effects are further defined as direct or indirect; short- or long-term; and temporary, intermittent, or permanent.

To determine the potential for "significant" effects under the Proposed Action, the Air Force defined impact thresholds to support the analyses in this EA. Based upon the nature of the Proposed Action and the affected environment, both qualitative and quantitative thresholds were used as benchmarks to qualify effects. Further, each resource analysis section (i.e., **Sections 3.4–3.16**) concludes with a cumulative effects analysis considering the Proposed Action in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Davis-Monthan AFB.

Table 3-1 briefly describes the proposed or planned projects identified for consideration of potential cumulative impacts when combined with the Proposed Action at Davis-Monthan AFB and on a regional scale.

3.2 RESOURCES ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS

CEQ regulations state that federal agencies shall "identify and eliminate from detailed study the issues which are not significant, or which have been covered by prior environmental review(s)" (40 CFR § 1501.9). Accordingly, the Air Force considered but eliminated from further analysis visual resources because facility construction would occur entirely within the Installation and be consistent with existing visual landscapes. Additional aircraft operations would be similar to those currently conducted so there would be no change in visual resources associated with aircraft operations.

3.3 RESOURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS

The Air Force considered Davis-Monthan AFB and its environs, as well as the area under the proposed airspace, in determining the ROI for each resource. **Table 3-2** summarizes the environmental resources and their respective ROI(s). As indicated in **Table 3-2**, a number of resource areas would not affect the airspace ROI—water, geology and soils, land use, socioeconomics, hazardous materials and wastes, toxic substances, contaminated sites, infrastructure, transportation, and utilities—and are not described in the baseline airspace ROI description in **Chapter 3** or considered for detailed analysis.

 Table 3-1.

 Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Environmental Trends and Planned Actions

Name	Description	Timeframe	Approximate Distance from Base
Federal Projects			
Permanent Playas Special Use Airspace	Establishment of an SUA in the form of a permanent Playas MOA and Air Traffic Control-Assigned Airspace above Playas, New Mexico.	Activity Ongoing (NEPA review completed)	140 miles from Davis-Monthan AFB
Personal Recovery Training	Personal recovery training for regular Air Force, Army, Navy, and US Marine Corps units; special forces; and other federal and state agencies. The training program involves ground, water, and flight/airspace activities. The Personal Recovery Program is centered out of Davis-Monthan AFB.	Activity Ongoing (NEPA update ongoing)	At Davis-Monthan AFB and Surrounding MOAs
Davis-Monthan Multiple Development Projects EA	Various short-, mid-, and long-term phase area development plan projects at Davis- Monthan AFB, including munitions storage.	Active NEPA (timeframe: 2–5 years)	At Davis-Monthan AFB
492nd Special Operations Wing (SOW) Relocation and Remission at Davis- Monthan AFB	Proposed relocation of the 492 SOW from Hurlburt Field, Florida, to Davis-Monthan AFB and transition from a support wing into a power projection wing. Includes proposed retirement of all A-10 aircraft at Davis- Monthan AFB, including the 357 FS and 47 FS.	Future NEPA (timeframe: 2–5 years)	At Davis-Monthan AFB
Special Use Airspace Optimization	Optimization of 10 existing MOAs used by Aircrews stationed at Davis-Monthan AFB, Luke AFB, and Morris ANGB in Arizona. The MOAs proposed for optimization include Tombstone, Outlaw, Jackal, Reserve, Morenci, Bagdad, Gladden, Sells, Ruby, and Fuzzy.	Active NEPA (timeframe: 3–10 years)	Surrounding MOAs
Non-Federal Projects			
Valencia Crossing Commercial Development	Commercial development of 30 acres (7 lots) at the intersection of Valencia Crossing Drive and Valencia Road.	1–2 years	Approximately 1 mile to Davis- Monthan AFB fence line

AFB = Air Force Base; ANGB = Air National Guard Base; MOA = Military Operations Area; NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act; SOW = Special Operations Wing; SUA = special use airspace

Resource	Region of Influence: Davis-Monthan AFB and Environs	Region of Influence: BMGR, Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci MOAs, Fuzzy, Ruby 1, and Tombstone MOAs and Environs
Airspace Management and Use	✓	1
Noise	✓	1
Safety	✓	✓
Air Quality	✓	✓
Biological Resources	✓	✓
Water Resources	✓	N/A
Geology and Soils	✓	N/A
Land Use	√	N/A
Socioeconomics	✓	N/A
Environmental Justice and Protection of Children	✓	N/A
Cultural Resources	✓	✓
Hazardous Materials and Wastes, Toxic Substances, and Contaminated Sites	4	N/A
Infrastructure, Transportation, and Utilities	✓	N/A

 Table 3-2.

 Environmental Resources Analyzed in the Environmental Assessment

AFB = Air Force Base; BMGR = Barry M. Goldwater Range; MOA = Military Operations Area; N/A = not applicable

3.4 AIRSPACE MANAGEMENT AND USE

3.4.1 Definition of the Resource

This resource includes both airspace management and the use of airspace needed to support airfields and their surrounding airspace, as well as the airspace used for military training and other components of the National Airspace System. Issues associated with the Proposed Action focus on the management and use of that system.

Airspace management is defined as the direction, control, and handling of flight operations in the "navigable airspace" that overlies the geopolitical borders of the US and its territories. "Navigable airspace" is airspace above the minimum altitudes of flight prescribed by regulations under 49 USC Subtitle VII, Part A, and includes airspace needed to ensure safety in the takeoff and landing of aircraft (49 USC § 40102). The FAA is responsible for managing national airspace assets through a variety of regulations and procedures. As necessary, the FAA will coordinate with federal (including the Department of Defense [DoD]), state, and local community aviation entities to determine the best use of these assets. All aircraft are subject to FAA regulations. The regulations are based on the types of flying activity, volume of traffic, hazard potential, national security, and other factors.

There are two categories of airspace or airspace areas: regulatory and non-regulatory. Within these two categories, there are four types of airspace—Controlled, Uncontrolled, Special Use, and Other.

The ROI for the Proposed Action includes airspace in and around Davis-Monthan AFB. The ROI also includes airspace associated with the BMGR and the following MOAs: Tombstone, Outlaw, Jackal, Morenci, Ruby, and Fuzzy (see **Table 3-2**).

3.4.2 Existing Conditions – Davis-Monthan AFB

Davis-Monthan AFB is located in and operates out of Tucson, Arizona. The FAA designation for Davis-Monthan AFB is "KDMA." Davis-Monthan AFB is the ACC's busiest single runway airfield, Runway 12/30, which has a northwest-to-southeast runway configuration. Air traffic controlling agencies responsible for the safe, orderly, and expeditious flow of air traffic include the Davis-Monthan Tower, Tucson Approach Control, and Albuquerque Center. Davis-Monthan AFB airfield management is operational 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, unless coordinated otherwise through the Installation Commander. Davis-Monthan Tower is operational Monday through Friday, 5:00 am–12:00 am (local time), and 8:00 am–5:00 pm (local time) on weekends, holidays, and ACC down days. The FAA operates the approach, departure, and enroute control within the Davis-Monthan AFB terminal airspace. Both the Tucson Terminal Radar Approach Control and Albuquerque Center are continuously open to provide air traffic control (ATC) services.

3.4.2.1 Airspace Designation

Davis-Monthan AFB is surrounded by Class C airspace with an inner-core control altitude from ground surface to 5,500 feet mean sea level (MSL) within a 5-nm radius around the airport. Outer-shelf Class C airspace is 5–10 nm from the center of KDMA, with control altitudes between 4,200 and 6,600 feet MSL. The regulations at 14 CFR § 91.130 require two-way communication with ATC prior to entry into Class C airspace. The Class C airspace that surrounds Davis-Monthan AFB is uniquely tailored to also include the Tucson International Airport. Interstate 10 (I-10) is the dividing line between the Base and Tucson International Airport airspace. Davis-Monthan Tower is responsible for all air traffic northeast of I-10 within 5 nm of the airport (ground surface–5, 500 feet MSL)

The airspace between the Davis-Monthan AFB Class C airspace and the various locations where training activities occur (such as SUA) is generally either Class A (at or above 18,000 feet MSL) or Class E (below 18,000 feet MSL). Operation of military aircraft in these areas is the same as civil aircraft; each area has FAA-published rules for use. Military aircraft outside of SUA follow the National Airspace System just like non-military aircraft and are allowed to operate within the rules of each airspace class. While operating in the Class A and Class E airspace, military aircraft are controlled by the same agencies controlling commercial aircraft, and whether following visual flight rules or instrument flight rules, are offered the same levels of control or advisories as appropriate or required.

3.4.2.2 Air Traffic Count

Air traffic is counted or tallied differently from sorties. As previously mentioned, a sortie is one mission from departure carried through to landing. Traffic count is tallied by the number of departures, landings, and patterns. For example, a single A-10 may sometimes conduct a single approach to a full-stop landing. At other times it may conduct one or more approaches that transition to a departure and another approach. This is normally referred to as a closed pattern. A single sortie will contain at least two airfield operations, which consist of one takeoff and one full-stop landing. Each closed pattern counts as two airfield operations which consist of one approach and one departure. Therefore, a single sortie may result in multiple airfield operations. **Table 3-3** summarizes total existing operations for A-10 and HH-60 aircraft at Davis-Monthan AFB.

Aircraft	Departures		Arrivals		Closed Patterns		Total
	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	TOTAL
A-10	14,011	0	11,739	2,272	1,948	0	29,970
HH-60	3,076	0	1,538	1,538	3,000	0	9,152
Totals	17,087	0	13,277	3,810	4,948	0	39,122

Table 3-3.Baseline Average Annual Operations (A-10 and HH-60)^a

Note:

a Davis-Monthan AFB averages approximately 68,648 flight operations per year.

3.4.3 Existing Condition – Special Use Airspace

The primary airspace utilized by the 355 WG is the BMGR. The Tombstone, Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci, and Ruby/Fuzzy MOAs are accessible for training within 125 miles of Davis-Monthan AFB (see **Figure 2-3**).

Table 3-4 describes the affected SUA under the Proposed Action. **Table 3-5** provides estimated airspace operations for A-10 and HH-60 aircraft from Davis-Monthan AFB.

Table 3-4.Davis-Monthan Special Use Airspace

SUA	Description
Barry M. Goldwater Range	The Barry M. Goldwater Range (BMGR), located 37 nm west of Davis-Monthan AFB, has a combination of SUA. The Range is a mix of MOAs and restricted areas and enables the 355 WG to accomplish a vast array of training objectives. Within the Range is the Sells MOA and Restricted Areas (R)-2301, R-2304, and R-2305. The Mexican Flight Information Region (FIR) borders the Range to the south. The BMGR is split at R-2301; the Los Angeles Center (ZLA) Air Route Traffic Control Center (ARTCC) is responsible for the airspace to the west and the Albuquerque Center (ZAB) ARTCC is responsible for the airspace to the east.
Fuzzy/Ruby/Dome MOAs	The Fuzzy and Ruby MOAs are located 26 nm southwest of Davis-Monthan AFB. The Fuzzy MOA ranges from 100 feet above ground level (AGL) to 9,999 feet mean sea level (MSL) and is underneath the Ruby MOA, which contains the block altitudes from 10,000 feet MSL to 17,999 feet MSL. The Ruby MOA extends and creates an overhang to the north of the Fuzzy MOA. Both Fuzzy and Ruby fall within the ZAB ARTCC airspace jurisdiction. The Dome MOA is located to the west of BMGR and about 185 nm west of Davis-Monthan AFB. The Dome MOA is within the ZLA ARTCC airspace and lies above the Yuma International Airport Class D airspace with altitudes from 6,000 feet MSL to 17,999 feet MSL.
Outlaw/Jackal/ Morenci MOAs	The Outlaw, Jackal, and Morenci MOAs are located 40 nm to the northeast of Davis- Monthan AFB. These MOAs fall under the ZAB ARTCC area of responsibility. The MOAs range in altitude from 100 feet AGL up to but not including 18,000 feet MSL. Each MOA section offers published activation hours; if the mission hours fall outside the published hours, the MOA hours will be coordinated and activated via a Notice to Air Missions.
Tombstone MOA	The Tombstone MOA is located 53 nm southeast of Davis-Monthan AFB. The Tombstone MOA falls under the ZAB ARTCC area of responsibility and borders the Mexican FIR to the north. The MOA is split into various subsections that range in altitudes from 500 feet AGL up to but not including 18,000 feet MSL. The Douglas International Airport (KDUG) is underneath Tombstone C MOA (14,500–17,999 feet MSL). The airport contains the Douglas VORTAC, which provides navigation to and from the airport to include instrument approach procedures. Route V66 is established using the Douglas VORTAC 286 and 051 radials.

AFB = Air Force Base; AGL = above ground level; ARTCC = Air Route Traffic Control Center; BMGR = Barry M. Goldwater Range; FIR = Flight Information Region; MOA = Military Operations Area; MSL = mean sea level; nm = nautical mile; R- = Restricted Area; ZAB = Albuquerque Center; ZLA = Los Angeles Center; VORTAC = see footnote on previous page

Table 3-5.Baseline Airspace Operations

MOA/ATCAA	A-10 (annual operations)	HH-60 (annual operations)
Tombstone	2,400	1,059
Jackal/Outlaw	1,700	750
Morenci/Reserve	700	309
Gladden/Bagdad	20	9
Sells	250	110
Ruby/Fuzzy	1,900	839
Totals	6,970	3,076

ATCAA = Air Traffic Control-Assigned Airspace, MOA = Military Operating Area

3.4.4 Environmental Consequences

3.4.4.1 Evaluation Criteria

The assessment of airspace examines how the Proposed Action and Alternatives would impact airspace. An adverse impact to airspace might include significantly increasing flight operations at an airfield or modifying a terminal and/or SUA. Since the Proposed Action would not change controlled airspace or SUA, the analysis in this EA focuses on increases of air traffic. For purposes of analysis, a significant impact is considered an increase in traffic without the regulatory guidance to handle the traffic load.

3.4.4.2 Proposed Action – Davis-Monthan AFB

Table 3-6 summarizes total proposed operations for A-10 and HH-60 aircraft at Davis-Monthan AFB. The Proposed Action would result in an increase in airfield operations from the current baseline of 39,122 to an estimated 42,997 total airfield operations. The increase of 3,875 operations, or 9 percent, would be due to the addition of Base-assigned aircraft. Operations would still require ATC services by Davis-Monthan Tower and Tucson Approach for departure, pattern work, and arrival services. Additionally, these sorties, when outside Class C airspace, would require routine services from FAA enroute agencies operating and controlling traffic within the National Airspace System.

Aineneft	Departures		Arrivals		Closed Patterns		Total	
Aircrait	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	TOLAI	
A-10	12,005	0	9,725	2,280	1,994	0	26,004	
HH-60	4,743	0	2,459	2,284	4,627	0	14,113	
Cessna 182	720		720				1,440	
RC-26	720		540	180			1,440	
Totals	18,188	0	13,444	4,744	6,621	0	42,997	

Table 3-6.Proposed Action Average Annual Operations (A-10 and HH-60)^a

Note:

a Davis-Monthan AFB averages approximately 68,648 flight operations per year.

Davis-Monthan Tower is fully staffed with a minimum of five qualified controllers during the day, Monday through Friday, and four controllers after sunset to accommodate wing flying. The positional break down within the tower cab is sufficient to handle a 9-percent increase in total annual operations. Through various methods, all described within the FAA Joint Order 7110.65Z, "Air Traffic Control," the Proposed Action would not affect safety, separation, or efficiency.

3.4.4.3 Proposed Action – Special Use Airspace

Table 3-7 provides proposed airspace operations for A-10 and HH-60 aircraft from Davis-Monthan AFB. No new procedures, airspace, or reconfigurations would be needed under the Proposed Action. Aircraft would continue to operate within the existing SUA as described in Section 2.3 but would increase SUA utilization by 10.9 percent, or 1,101 total annual sorties. Since scheduling deconfliction is already being done within the 355 WG, an increase of 1,101 annual SUA operations would not be significant enough to cause an impact. Additionally, these aircraft would be spread across all the various SUA, thus reduce airspace saturation. Therefore, no significant airspace impacts would be expected to occur with implementation of Proposed Action.

MOA/ATCAA	A-10 (annual operations)	HH-60 (annual operations)
Tombstone	2,454	1,383
Jackal/Outlaw	1,739	980
Morenci/Reserve	716	404
Gladden/Bagdad	20	12
Sells	256	144
Ruby/Fuzzy	1,943	1,096
Totals	7.128	4.019

Table 3-7.Proposed Action Airspace Operations

ATCAA = Air Traffic Control-Assigned Airspace; MOA = Military Operating Area

3.4.4.4 Cumulative Impacts

As listed in **Table 3-1**, three proposed actions with the potential to impact air quality in and around the ROI are the Arizona Airspace EIS (expected completion 2025), the Personnel Recovery Training Program EA (Air Force, 2020), and the 492nd Special Operations Wing (SOW) Relocation EIS (which is a future project with no analysis performed to date). Each noise analysis, based on airspace usage for a given proposed action, would be built upon the previous baseline of the most recent NEPA document, as was done with this EA. Airspace impacts associated with past actions listed in **Table 3-1** are already included in the existing conditions for airspace, air quality, and noise. The Arizona Airspace EIS is currently ongoing and proposes changes to the size and location of various SUAs. The 492nd SOW Relocation EIS proposes to relocate the 492nd SOW aircraft and personnel to Davis-Monthan AFB and to retire all remaining A-10 aircraft at Davis-Monthan AFB, which could change airspace utilization in the surrounding SUA. When considered in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Davis-Monthan AFB, no significant cumulative impacts on airspace would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

3.4.4.5 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, Davis-Monthan AFB's air operations would remain at current conditions. The 4th Gen missions would remain or be inactivated in place at Nellis AFB, which would create a capacity issue as 5th Gen missions continue to increase in scope and number. The infrastructure at Nellis AFB would continue to fall short of current or future mission needs and operate at or beyond capacity. There would be no changes to airspace management and use beyond baseline conditions.

3.5 NOISE

3.5.1 Definition of the Resource

Sound is a physical phenomenon consisting of minute vibrations exhibited as waves, measured in frequency and amplitude, which travel through a medium, such as air or water, and are sensed by the human ear. Sound is all around us. Noise is generally described as unwanted sound. Unwanted sound can be based on objective effects (such as hearing loss or damage to structures) or subjective judgments (community annoyance). Noise analysis thus requires assessing a combination of physical measurement of sound, physical and physiological effects, and psycho- and socio-acoustic effects. The response of different individuals to similar noise events is diverse and influenced by the type of noise, the perceived importance of the noise, its appropriateness in the setting, the time of day, the type of activity during which the noise occurs, and the sensitivity of the individual. Noise may also affect wildlife through disruption of nesting, foraging, migration, and other life-cycle activities.

As shown in **Table 3-2**, the ROI for noise is the Davis-Monthan AFB, local environs around the Base, and the associated SUA.

3.5.1.1 Noise Metrics

Noise and sound levels are expressed in logarithmic units measured by decibels (dB). A sound level of 0 dB is approximately the threshold of human hearing and is barely audible under extremely quiet listening conditions. Normal speech equates to a sound level of approximately 60 dB, sound levels above 120 dB begin to be felt inside the human ear as discomfort, and sound levels between 130 and 140 dB are felt as pain (Berglund and Lindvall, 1995).

All sound contains a spectral content, which means the magnitude or level differs by frequency, where frequency is measured in cycles per second, or hertz. To mimic the human ear's non-linear sensitivity and perception of different frequencies of sound, the spectral content is weighted. For example, environmental noise measurements usually employ an "A-weighted" scale, denoted as dBA, that de-emphasizes very low and very high frequencies to better replicate human sensitivity. As is done in many environmental documents, the "A" in dBA is dropped for brevity to refer to A-weighted sound levels. All sound levels presented in this document are A-weighted unless otherwise noted.

In accordance with DoD guidelines and standard practice for environmental impact analysis documents, the noise analysis in this EA uses the Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) and the Onset-Rate Adjusted DNL. DNL is a cumulative measure of multiple flight and engine maintenance activities throughout an average year. Onset-Rate Adjusted DNL is a cumulative measure of multiple flight activities within airspace.

3.5.2 Existing Conditions- Davis-Monthan AFB

Many components may generate noise and warrant analysis as contributors to the total noise impact. The predominant noise sources at Davis-Monthan AFB consist of aircraft operations and industrial operations of an active airfield. Construction, ground support equipment along the runway, and vehicular traffic all contribute to the noise environment, though these generally are transitory and provide a negligible contribution to the overall average noise level at Davis-Monthan AFB.

Wing operations vary year to year; therefore, the flying hour program of record is used for analysis because it presents the condition that accounts for the full environmental impacts possible. The current A-10 flying program equates to 29,970 annual operations² at Davis-Monthan AFB, and the current HH-60 flying program equates to 9,152 annual operations, broken down by departures, arrivals, and closed patterns, as summarized in **Table 3-8**. Davis-Monthan AFB generates approximately 64,842 based aircraft flight operations per year and receives approximately 3,806 transient flight operations per year. In addition to A-10 and HH-60, many kinds of transient aircraft fly at Davis-Monthan AFB, including C-130s and F-16s.

Aircraft	Departures		Arrivals		Closed Patterns		Totolo
	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Totais
A-10	14,011	0	11,739	2,272	1,948	0	29,970
HH-60	3,076	0	1,538	1,538	3,000	0	9,152
Totals	17,087	0	13,277	3,810	4,948	0	39,122

 Table 3-8.

 Baseline Average Annual Operations (A-10 and HH-60)^a

Note:

a Davis-Monthan AFB averages approximately 68,648 flight operations per year.

Figure 3-1 shows the DNL noise contours from 65 to 85 dB in 5-dB increments for the existing conditions at Davis-Monthan AFB. Noise generated from aircraft operations at Davis-Monthan AFB occurs within the airfield and extends to cover areas to the northwest and southeast of the airfield.

² One sortie is two operations: one departure and one arrival from the airfield.





Table 3-9 summarizes the acreage breakdown for DNL noise levels at Davis-Monthan AFB from 65 through 85 dBA in 5-dBA increments. A total of 1,103 acres are exposed to 65 dB DNL or greater noise levels; 123 of those acres are located outside of Davis-Monthan AFB property.

DNL	Existing Conditions Acreage					
(dBA)	On Installation	Off Installation	Totals			
65+	980	123	1,103			
70+	657	N/A	657			
75+	385	N/A	385			
80+	256	N/A	256			
85+	56	N/A	56			

Table 3-9.Baseline Noise Exposure Acreage

dBA = A-weighted decibel; DNL = Day-Night Average Sound Level; N/A = not applicable

Table 3-10 shows the DNL values at each of the points of interest (POIs) under the existing conditions (see **Figure 3-1**). Values range from 45 to 62 dB DNL. These values are all well below the DoD threshold of 65 dB DNL for land use recommendations for noise-sensitive land uses.

Map ID	Point Type	Named Point of Interest	Baseline DNL (dB)
H01	Hospital	University Physicians Hospital - Kino	54
SCH01	School	Children Reaching for the Sky Preparatory	56
SCH02	School	Future Investment Middle School	56
SCH03	School	Julia Keen Elementary School	62
SCH04	School	Robison Elementary School	56
SCH05	School	Los Ninos Elementary School	45
SCH06	School	Craycroft Elementary School	49
T01	Census Tract Center	Census Tract 20	56
T02	Census Tract Center	Census Tract 40.73	56
T03	Census Tract Center	Census Tract 41.18 BlkGrp 1	51
T04	Census Tract Center	Census Tract 41.18 BlkGrp 3	52
T05	Census Tract Center	Census Tract 41.12 BlkGrp 1	46
W01	Place of Worship	Our Savior Lutheran Church	58
W02	Place of Worship	The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints Employment Center	58
W03	Place of Worship	Ideal Missionary Baptist Church	62
W04	Place of Worship	Word In Season Christian Center	55
W05	Place of Worship	RCCG Glory Tabernacle	55
W06	Place of Worship	Potters House	56
W07	Place of Worship	First Free Will Baptist Church	56
W02	Place of Worship	The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints Employment Center	54

Table 3-10.Baseline Points of Interest Noise Exposure

BlkGrp = block group; dB = decibel; DNL = Day-Night Average Sound Level; ID = Identification

3.5.3 Existing Conditions – Special Use Airspace

Table 3-11 summarizes the airspaces used by Davis-Monthan AFB A-10 and HH-60 aircraft and their approximate annual operations. Many other aircraft from multiple military installations use the listed MOAs and Air Traffic Control-Assigned Airspace (ATCAAs), such as the F-16 and the F-35.

MOA/ATCAA	A-10	HH-60
Tombstone	2,400	1,059
Jackal/Outlaw	1,700	750
Morenci/Reserve	700	309
Gladden/Bagdad	20	9
Sells	250	110
Ruby/Fuzzy	1,900	839
Totals	6,970	3,076

Table 3-11. Baseline Airspace Operations

ATCAA = Air Traffic Control-Assigned Airspace; MOA = Military Operating Area

3.5.4 Environmental Consequences

The assessment of noise examines how the Proposed Action would impact the noise environment in the vicinity of the Installation and SUA. An adverse impact to noise would comprise significant increases to noise exposure levels at an airfield or SUA. The analysis in this EA assessed potential impacts by comparing Proposed Action noise exposure levels to those of the No Action Alternative.

3.5.4.1 Evaluation Criteria

Airfield Noise

To accomplish the impact analysis, noise modeling using DNL is based on annual average day aircraft operations, which are determined by dividing the total yearly airfield operations by 365 days per year. DNL has two time periods of interest: daytime (7:00 am–10:00 pm) and nighttime (10:00 pm–7:00 am).

Noise modeling was conducted by determining and building each aircraft's flight tracks (paths over the ground) and profiles (which include data such as altitude, airspeed, power settings, and other flight conditions). This information was developed iteratively with a team primarily made up of representatives from the Installation's flying squadrons. These data were combined with information about the numbers of each type of operation by aircraft/track/profile, local climate, ground surrounding the airfield, and similar data related to aircraft engine runs that occur at specific, static locations on the ground (e.g., pre- and post-flight and maintenance activities).

For this analysis, DNL contours of 65 to 85 dB, presented in 5-dB increments, graphically depict the aircraft noise environment (see **Figure 3-1**). Analysts used the NOISEMAP software suite, the DoD-accepted method for representing the overall community noise exposure over time from military and civilian aircraft activity (Air Force Civil Engineer Center, 2023).

Noise exposure is also presented in terms of DNL at representative POIs and on- and off-Installation acreages within each noise contour. The two main purposes of POI analysis are to provide additional information of potential impacts to decision-makers and to allow the public to gain additional insight into how noise levels would change at areas of most interest to them. Based upon this goal, POIs were selected by first compiling a list of schools and healthcare facilities in the vicinity of each airfield. Census tract centroids (the geometric center of each census tract area) provided many additional POI locations most likely to contain nearby noise-sensitive land uses (e.g., residential, daycare, places of worship, nursing homes). The final POI screening involved analyzing the areas surrounding the airfield and primary flight paths to identify noise-sensitive locations most likely to experience elevated aircraft noise that were not already captured by other nearby POIs. The resulting POI locations for this analysis totals 19: 6 schools, 1 healthcare facility, 5 census tract centroids, and 7 places of worship.

Airspace Noise

Noise modeling in the airspace was accomplished by determining the use of each airspace unit and building each aircraft's flight profiles based on the aircraft's configuration (airspeed and power setting) and the amount of time spent at various altitudes throughout the airspace.

Construction Noise

The Proposed Action includes construction projects that would occur within the Installation boundary at Davis-Monthan AFB, generating temporary construction noise. The proposed construction sites would be in areas close to the runways currently exposed to 65 dB DNL or greater. Therefore, the construction activity would not generate significant impacts or warrant additional noise analysis because noise-sensitive locations would not be affected.

3.5.4.2 Proposed Action – Davis-Monthan AFB

The Proposed Action would result in a decrease from 29,270 annual A-10 operations to 26,004 annual A-10 operations; however, nighttime A-10 operations would increase slightly from 2,272 to 2,280. HH-60 annual operations would increase from 9,152 to 14,113. Under the Proposed Action, 1,440 annual Cessna 182 operations and 1,440 annual RC-26 operations would occur at Davis-Monthan AFB. **Table 3-12** summarizes the average annual operations for airframes under the Proposed Action.

Aircroft	Departures		Arrivals		Closed Patterns		Totolo	
Aircrait	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Totals	
A-10	12,005	0	9,725	2,280	1,994	0	26,004	
HH-60	4,743	0	2,459	2,284	4,627	0	14,113	
Cessna 182	720	0	720	0	0	0	1,440	
RC-26	720	0	540	180	0	0	1,440	
Totals	18,188	0	13,444	4,744	6,621	0	42,997	

 Table 3-12.

 Proposed Action Average Annual Operations

Figure 3-2 shows the DNL noise contours from 65 to 85 dB in 5-dB increments under the Proposed Action. As with baseline conditions, noise generated from aircraft operations at Davis-Monthan AFB would occur primarily within the airfield and would extend to areas to the northwest and southeast of the airfield. Noise contours under the Proposed Action would be only slightly larger than those under baseline conditions.

Table 3-13 lists the acreage breakdown for Davis-Monthan AFB. A total of 1,101 acres would be exposed to 65 dB DNL or greater noise levels, 117 of those acres would be located outside the Installation boundary. Under the Proposed Action, there would be an overall decrease of acreage outside of the Installation boundary exposed to 65 dB DNL. Approximately 7 additional acres on Installation would be newly exposed to noise levels of 75 dB DNL.

Table 3-13.Proposed Action Noise Exposure Acreage

Proposed Action Acreage				Change Relative to Baseline/ No Action			
(dBA)	On Installation	Off Installation	Total	On Installation	Off Installation	Total	
65+	984	117	1,101	5	-7	-2	
70+	652	N/A	652	-5	N/A	-5	
75+	392	N/A	392	7	N/A	7	
80+	253	N/A	253	-3	N/A	-3	
85+	55	N/A	55	-1	N/A	-1	

dBA = A-weighted decibel; DNL = Day-Night Average Sound Level





Table 3-14 summarizes the estimated DNL values at each of the POIs and the net change compared to baseline conditions. The values would range from 45 to 62 dB DNL, with most of the locations experiencing no noise increase relative to baseline conditions. Points T01 and W01 would be expected to be exposed to 1 dB DNL less noise under the Proposed Action. Point H01 would be exposed to 2 dB DNL more noise (increasing from 54 dB DNL to 56 dB DNL) and point W02 would be exposed to 1 dB DNL more noise (increasing from 58 dB DNL to 59 dB DNL) under the Proposed Action.

Map ID	Point Type ^a	Named Point of Interest	Baseline DNL (dB)	Proposed Action DNL (dB)	Increase From Baseline DNL (dB)
H01	Hospital	University Physicians Hospital - Kino	54	56	+2
S01	School	Children Reaching for the Sky Preparatory	56	56	0
S02	School	Future Investment Middle School	56	56	0
S03	School	Julia Keen Elementary School	62	62	0
S04	School	Robison Elementary School	56	56	0
S05	School	Los Ninos Elementary School	45	45	0
S06	School	Craycroft Elementary School	49	49	0
T01	Census Tract Center	Census Tract 20	56	55	-1
T02	Census Tract Center	Census Tract 40.73	56	56	0
T03	Census Tract Center	Census Tract 41.18 BlkGrp 1	51	51	0
T04	Census Tract Center	Census Tract 41.18 BlkGrp 3	52	52	0
T05	Census Tract Center	Census Tract 41.12 BlkGrp 1	46	46	0
W01	Place of Worship	Our Savior Lutheran Church	58	57	-1
W02	Place of Worship	The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter- Day Saints Employment Center	58	59	+1
W03	Place of Worship	Ideal Missionary Baptist Church	62	62	0
W04	Place of Worship	Word In Season Christian Center	55	55	0
W05	Place of Worship	RCCG Glory Tabernacle	55	55	0
W06	Place of Worship	Potters House	56	56	0
W07	Place of Worship	First Free Will Baptist Church	56	56	0

Table 3-14.	
Day-Night Average Sound Level at POIs for Proposed Activ	on

BlkGrp = block group; dB = decibel; DNL = Day-Night Average Sound Level; ID = Identification; POI = point of interest Note:

a The Census Tracts represent neighborhoods surrounding Davis-Monthan AFB where noise-sensitive locations (e.g., residences, schools, place of worship) are likely to occur.

The noise levels that would occur under the Proposed Action would remain well below the threshold at which noise-sensitive land uses are recommended (65 dB DNL) for aircraft operations, and no noise-sensitive locations would be subjected to significant increases in noise. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Action would result in less than significant long-term impacts to noise in the vicinity of the airfield.

3.5.4.3 Proposed Action – Special Use Airspace

Under the Proposed Action, A-10 operations with airspace would increase by approximately 2 percent and HH-60 operations with airspace would increase by approximately 31 percent. **Table 3-15** lists the A-10 and HH-60 airspace operations under the Proposed Action.

MOA/ATCAA	A-10	HH-60
Tombstone	2,454	1,383
Jackal/Outlaw	1,739	980
Morenci/Reserve	716	404
Gladden/Bagdad	20	12
Sells	256	144
Ruby/Fuzzy	1,943	1,096
Totals	7,128	4,019

Table 3-15.Proposed Action Airspace Operations

ATCAA = Air Traffic Control-Assigned Airspace; MOA = Military Operating Area

A 2-percent increase in A-10 operations corresponds to an imperceptible increase to noise under the airspaces. A 31-percent increase in HH-60 operations corresponds to approximately a 2-dB Onset-Rate Adjusted DNL increase to noise under the airspaces. However, other aircraft using these airspaces also contribute to the overall noise level. HH-60 aircraft are among the least loud of the aircraft using these airspaces, so the increase in noise level due to the increase in HH-60 operations likely would be imperceptible against the background of noise from other jet aircraft (e.g., F-16, F-35) operations within the airspaces.

The noise level increases that would occur due to the Proposed Action would be expected to be minor to imperceptible.

3.5.4.4 Cumulative Impacts

Recent proposed actions that involve Davis-Monthan AFB airspace and associated SUA include the Arizona Airspace EIS (expected completion 2025) and the Personnel Recovery Training Program Final EA, (Air Force, 2020). The Arizona Airspace EIS examines expanding low-altitude flight in 10 MOAs overlying Arizona and New Mexico. The number of sorties projected to occur in each MOA would be increased by approximately 10 percent to conservatively account for the fluctuations in training activity. The Personnel Recovery Training Program EA examined training events with low-altitude flight zones in the Fuzzy, Outlaw, Sells Low, and Tombstone MOAs.

As noise levels associated with the Arizona Airspace EIS and the Personnel Recovery Training Program EA would be driven by low-altitude aircraft operations, increases in noise due to the Proposed Action would be expected to be minor to imperceptible when combined with noise from these other actions. Each noise analysis for a future proposed action, including the 492nd SOW Relocation EIS, would be built upon the previous baseline of the most recent NEPA document, as was done with this EA. Estimated increase in noise for a given action would incorporate previous activities at the Base. When considered in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Davis-Monthan AFB, no significant cumulative impacts on noise would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

3.5.4.5 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, Davis-Monthan AFB's air operations would remain at current conditions. The 4th Gen missions would remain or be inactivated in place at Nellis AFB, which would create a capacity issue as 5th Gen missions continue to increase in scope and number. The infrastructure at Nellis AFB would continue to fall short of current or future mission needs and operate at or beyond capacity. There would be no changes to noise beyond baseline conditions.

3.6 SAFETY

3.6.1 Definition of the Resource

This section discusses safety concerns associated with ground, explosives, and flight activities. Ground safety considers issues associated with ground operations and maintenance activities that support unit operations including arresting gear capability, jet blast/maintenance testing, and safety danger. Aircraft maintenance testing occurs in designated safety zones. Ground safety also considers the safety of personnel and facilities on the ground that may be placed at risk from flight operations in the vicinity of the airfield and in the airspace. Clear Zones (CZ) and Accident Potential Zones (APZs) around the airfield restrict the public's exposure to areas where there is a higher accident potential. Although ground and flight safety are addressed separately, in the immediate vicinity of the runway, risks associated with safety-of-flight issues are interrelated with ground safety concerns.

Explosives safety relates to the management and safe use of ordnance and munitions. Flight safety considers aircraft flight risks such as mid-air collision, bird/wildlife aircraft strike hazard (BASH), and inflight emergency. The Air Force has safety procedures and aircraft-specific emergency procedures produced by the original equipment manufacturer of the aircraft.

As indicated in **Table 3.2**, the ROI for Safety includes Davis-Monthan AFB and areas immediately adjacent to the Base where ground and explosives safety concerns are described, as well as the airfield and airspaces where flight safety is discussed.

3.6.2 Existing Conditions

3.6.2.1 Ground Safety

Ground safety concerns include several categories, including ground and industrial operations, operational activities, and motor vehicle use. Ground mishaps can occur from the use of equipment or materials and from maintenance functions.

Ongoing Air Force safety programs covering industrial activities, operation of motor vehicles and other equipment, and everyday operations are continuously refined as new activities and new information becomes available. All Aircrew receive regular safety training in order to keep the chances of mishaps as low as possible.

3.6.2.2 Explosives Safety

Aircraft munitions include ammunition, propellants (solid and liquid), pyrotechnics, warheads, explosives devices, and chemical agent substances and associated components that present real or potential hazards to life, property, or the environment. Defense Explosive Safety Regulation 6055.09_Air Force Manual 91-201 (DESR6055.09_AFMAN) 91-201, *Explosives Safety Standards*, defines the guidance and procedures dealing with munition storage and handling.

Facilities/activities with explosive safety quantity-distance (ESQD) arcs at Davis-Monthan AFB include the Munitions Storage Area (MSA), the Explosive Ordnance Demolition area, the alert hangar and apron, combat aircraft parking areas, hot cargo pad, aircraft explosives cargo area, the arm/de-arm aprons on the airfield, the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Group (AMARG's) Explosive Ordnance Disposal area, and ammunition shipping/inspection/storage facilities.

During typical training operations, aircraft are not loaded with high-explosive ordnance. Training munitions usually include captive air-to-air training missiles, countermeasure chaff and flares, and cannon ammunition with inert projectiles. All munitions are stored and maintained in the MSA within facilities sited for the allowable types and amounts of explosives. All storage and handling of munitions are carried out by trained and qualified Munitions Flight personnel and in accordance with Air Force-approved technical orders.

3.6.2.3 Flight Safety

The safety of the public with respect to aircraft operations at Davis-Monthan AFB is a primary concern for the Air Force. In accordance with DoDI 4165.57, *Air Installations Compatible Use Zones*, APZs are established at military airfields to delineate recommended compatible land uses for the protection of people and property on the ground. APZs define the areas of a military airfield that would have the highest potential to be affected if an aircraft mishap were to occur. Air Installations Compatible Use Zones guidelines identify three types of APZs for airfields based on aircraft mishap patterns: CZ, APZ I, and APZ II. The standard Air Force CZ for Class B runways such as Runway 12/30 at Davis-Monthan AFB is a rectangle area that extends 3,000 feet from the end of a runway, is 3,000 feet wide, and identifies the area with the highest probability for mishaps. APZ I, which typically extends 5,000 feet from the end of the CZ, has a lower mishap probability, and APZ II, which typically extends 7,000 feet from the end of APZ I, has the lowest mishap probability of the three zones.

As shown in **Figure 3-3**, the CZs are located entirely within Base boundaries. The northern APZ I is approximately 40 percent on Base and 60 percent off Base. The southern APZ I is approximately 20 percent on Base and 80 percent off Base. Both the northern and southern APZs II are almost entirely off Base. The northern APZ I has 24 acres of residential land use, which is incompatible. No other incompatible land use is found in the northern or southern CZs or APZs. Conditionally compatible land uses exist in both the northern and southern APZs.

Aircraft flight operations in the MOAs/ATCAs are governed by standard rules of flight. Additionally, in accordance with Davis-Monthan AFB Instruction 11-250, specific procedures applicable to local operations are contained in detailed standard operation procedures that must be followed by all aircrews operating from the Installation.

The primary public concern with regard to flight safety is the potential for aircraft accidents. Such mishaps may occur as a result of mid-air collisions, collisions with man-made structures or terrain, weather-related accidents, mechanical failure, pilot error, or bird/wildlife aircraft collisions. Flight risks apply to all aircraft; they are not limited to the military.

Aircraft mishaps and their prevention are of paramount concern to the Air Force. The Air Force defines four categories of aircraft mishaps: Classes A, B, C, and D (**Table 3-16**). Class A mishaps are of primary concern because of their potentially catastrophic results.

Class A mishaps, the most severe, provide an indicator of aircraft safety. Based on historical data on mishaps at all installations and under all conditions of flight, the military services calculate Class A mishap rates per 100,000 flying hours for each type of aircraft in the inventory to provide the basis for evaluating risks among different aircraft and levels of operations. These mishap rates do not consider combat-related losses. **Table 3-17** shows some sample aircraft types and the mishap rates for the lifetime of the aircraft program, as well as the rate over the last 10-year period (through the last complete fiscal year).

Bird-aircraft strikes constitute a safety concern because they can result in damage to aircraft or injury to aircrews or local populations if it results in an aircraft crash. Aircraft may encounter birds at altitudes of Flight Level 300 or higher. However, most birds fly closer to the ground. Over 98 percent of reported bird-aircraft strikes occur below 5,000 feet above ground level (AGL) (Air Force Safety Center [AFSEC], 2018a). Approximately 49 percent of bird-aircraft strikes happen in the airport environment (i.e., climb-out, traffic pattern, approach, and landing), and about 42 percent occur during low-altitude flight training (AFSEC, 2018b).

Table 3-16. Aircraft Class Mishaps

Mishap Class	Total Property Damage	Fatality/Injury
A	\$2,000,000 or more and/or aircraft destroyed	Fatality or permanent total disability
В	\$500,000 or more but less than \$2,000,000	Permanent partial disability or three or more persons hospitalized as inpatients
С	\$50,000 or more but less than \$500,000	Nonfatal injury resulting in loss of one or more days from work beyond day/shift when injury occurred
D	\$20,000 or more but less than \$50,000	Recordable injury or illness not otherwise classified as A, B, or C

Source: DoDI 6055.07, Mishap Notification, Investigation, Reporting, and Record Keeping (6 June 2011)

Table 3-17.				
Class A Mishap Rates for Air Force Aircraft				

Aircraft	Annual Flight Hours	Year Introduced	Class A Mishap Rate – Lifetime	Class A Mishap Rate – Last 5 Years
A-10	75,265	1972	1.85	0.53
H-60	22,799	1982	3.26	0.88
	0004			

Source: AFSEC, 2021a, 2021b

While any bird-aircraft strike has the potential to be serious, many result in little or no damage to the aircraft, and only a minute portion result in a Class A mishap. During the years 1985–2014, the Air Force BASH Team documented 108,670 bird-aircraft strikes worldwide (AFSEC, 2018c). Of these, 16 resulted in Class A mishaps where the aircraft was destroyed (AFSEC, 2018d).

Davis-Monthan AFB also maintains an active BASH plan, as required under AFI 91-212, *Bird/Wildlife Aircraft Strike Hazard (BASH) Management Program*. This plan is continually updated to address any potential changes in conditions at Davis-Monthan AFB. The goal of the BASH plan is to reduce the likelihood of an aircraft colliding with a bird or other wildlife, thereby causing potentially catastrophic damage to the aircraft or potentially the loss of life of the pilot from the damage. BASH avoidance measures include notices to pilots of bird activity within the area, seasonal notifications during bird migrations, and wildlife management within the airfield environment.

Defensive countermeasures (i.e., chaff and flare) are authorized for use within MOAs to be utilized under the Proposed Action (except for the Tombstone MOA). Chaff are small bundles of fibers that confuse enemy radar, allowing the aircraft to potentially escape a radar-guided weapon. There would be no change in chaff usage under the Proposed Action. Flares are used to create a false heat signature to confuse a heatseeking weapon. Flare deployment in authorized airspace is governed by regulations that are based on safety and environmental considerations and limitations:

- The Department of Air Force Manual 13-201, *Airspace Management*, establishes practices to decrease disturbances from flight operations and protect the public from the hazards and effects associated with flight operations.
- Air Force Manual (AFMAN)13-212V1, *Range Planning and Operations*, outlines procedures governing weapons range use of flares.
- AFMAN 11-214, *Air Operations Rules and Procedures*, delineates procedures for flare employment.




3.6.3 Environmental Consequences

3.6.3.1 Evaluation Criteria

Safety-related impacts from a proposed activity are assessed according to the potential to increase or decrease safety risks to personnel, the public, property, or the environment. Adverse impacts related to safety would occur if the Proposed Action and Alternatives result in Air Force Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) criteria being exceeded or the improper implementation of established or proposed safety measures, creating an unacceptable safety risk to personnel. Adverse impacts would occur if the Proposed Action results in the following:

- substantially increases risks associated with the safety of construction personnel, contractors, military personnel, or the local community;
- substantially hinders the ability to respond to an emergency; or
- introduces a new health or safety risk for which the Base is not prepared or does not have adequate management and response plans in place.

3.6.3.2 Proposed Action – Davis-Monthan AFB and Special Use Airspace

Ground Safety

Negligible, temporary, adverse impacts on-ground safety would be expected under the Proposed Action. Davis-Monthan AFB would require new construction, which could expose personnel to risks from heavy equipment operation, hazardous materials (HAZMAT), and potentially noisy and confined environments. To minimize health and safety risks, contractors would be required to maintain site-specific health and safety programs that follow all applicable regulations. Davis-Monthan AFB personnel would review these programs prior to work beginning to ensure that contractors take appropriate measures to reduce the potential health and safety risks. Current operational processes and procedures would continue.

Explosives Safety

Under the Proposed Action, the 66 WPS and the 422 TES functions would have a number of live weapons requirements. The number of LOLA aircraft parking spaces currently at Davis-Monthan AFB is inadequate to support the increase of up to 14 additional LOLA needed to support the increase in live weapons requirements. The exact locations of the new LOLA spaces have not been determined but would be near the present LOLA.

No facilities/activities with ESQD arcs at Davis-Monthan AFB would be impacted with implementation of the Proposed Action, including the MSA, the Explosive Ordnance Demolition area, the alert hangar and apron, combat aircraft parking areas, hot cargo pad, aircraft explosives cargo area, the AMARG's Explosive Ordnance Disposal area, and the ammunition shipping/inspection/storage facilities. Therefore, no impacts to explosives safety would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

Flight Safety

No changes to existing APZs or CZs would be required with implementation of the Proposed Action. The number of sorties would increase minimally; therefore, implementation of the Proposed Action would not increase the safety risk to these or other off-Base areas. Davis-Monthan AFB would continue to work with communities and developers to apply the Air Installations Compatible Use Zones guidelines. Therefore, no impacts to ground safety would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

The increase in airfield operations that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action would negligibly increase the risk of bird/wildlife aircraft strikes at Davis-Monthan AFB. The BASH plan would remain in place to reduce these risks.

The Proposed Action would result in an increase in airfield operations from the current baseline of 39,122 to an estimated 42,997 total airfield operations annually. The increase of 3,875 operations, or 9 percent,

would be due to the addition of Base-assigned aircraft. The number of A-10 sorties would decrease, while the number of HH-60 sorties would increase. Both aircraft have mishap rates under 1 incident per 100,000 sorties. Therefore, no increase in HH-60 or A-10 incidents would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action. Impacts to safety (and associated mishaps) related to the operation of two Cessna 128s and one RC-26B would be negligible with implementation of the Proposed Action.

The majority of flight operations for the HH-60 and the A-10 aircraft would be conducted over remote areas; however, in the unlikely event that an aircraft accident occurred, existing response, investigation, and follow-on procedures would be enforced to ensure the health and safety of underlying populations and lands. Implementation of flight safety procedures and compliance with all flight safety requirements would minimize the chances for aircraft mishaps.

Fire risk associated with flares stems from an unlikely, but possible, scenario of a flare reaching the ground or vegetation while still burning. If a flare struck the ground while still burning, it could ignite surface material and cause a fire. The approved altitude from which flares are dropped ranges from 2,000 to 5,000 feet depending on the MOA and is regulated by the Airspace Manager based on a number of factors including flare burnout rate. Defensive flares typically burn out in 3.5 to 5 seconds, during which time the flare would fall between 200 and 400 feet.

Flare and ordnance deployment in authorized ranges and airspace is governed by a series of regulations based on safety and environmental considerations and limitations. These regulations establish procedures governing the use of flares over ranges, other government-owned and -controlled lands, and non-government-owned or -controlled areas. The frequency of flare use would remain the same with implementation of the Proposed Action. Pilots would only use flares in compliance with existing airspace altitude and seasonal restrictions to ensure fire safety.

3.6.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Action, in addition to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions on and off Davis-Monthan AFB (**Table 3-1**), would not have significant adverse cumulative impacts on explosives safety at Davis-Monthan AFB or the surrounding area because the ESQD arcs would remain as currently defined. Beneficial impacts associated with improvement of explosives safety with implementation of the proposed projects associated with the Davis-Monthan Multiple Development Projects EA would build upon those of other projects undertaken to improve explosives safety within the MSA. Potential health and safety hazards associated with construction of buildings would be short term and limited to individual projects and would not be cumulative when considered in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable planned actions at Davis-Monthan AFB. If future actions increase the number of planes and sorties, as the 492nd SOW Relocation EIS is proposing, flight safety could be impacted proportionally to the increase in operations. Future actions will be evaluated for impacts separately.

3.6.3.4 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, Davis-Monthan AFB's air operations would remain at current conditions. The 4th Gen missions would remain or be inactivated in place at Nellis AFB, which would create a capacity issue as 5th Gen missions continue to increase in scope and number. The infrastructure at Nellis AFB would continue to fall short of current or future mission needs and operate at or beyond capacity. There would be no changes to ground, explosive, or flight safety beyond baseline conditions.

3.7 AIR QUALITY

3.7.1 Definition of the Resource

Under the CAA and subsequent amendments, the USEPA has divided the country into geographical regions known as Air Quality Control Regions (AQCRs) to evaluate compliance with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Davis-Monthan AFB is located in Pima County, Arizona, which is in the Pima Intrastate AQCR (40 CFR § 81.269).

As shown in **Table 3-2**, the ROI for air quality is Davis-Monthan AFB and the associated SUA. The training airspace consists of a number of MOAs and other complexes. These areas, along with the counties they underlie and the associated AQCRs, can be found in **Table 3-18**. Both the Morenci and Tombstone MOAs include portions extending into New Mexico.

Airspace Location	County	AQCR			
Tombstone MOA	Cochise, Hidalgo (NM)	Southeast Arizona Intrastate AQCR (40 CFR § 81.272) New Mexico Southern Border Intrastate AQCR (40 CFR § 81.99)			
Morenci MOA	Greenlee, Graham, Catron (NM)	Southeast Arizona Intrastate AQCR Southwestern Mountains – Augustine Plains Intrastate AQCR (40 CFR § 81.241)			
Jackal MOA	Navajo, Apache, Graham, Gila	Northern Arizona Intrastate AQCR (40 CFR § 81.270) Southeast Arizona Intrastate AQCR Central Arizona Intrastate AQCR (40 CFR § 81.271)			
Outlaw MOA	Gila, Pinal	Central Arizona Intrastate AQCR			
Fuzzy MOA	Santa Cruz, Pima	Southeast Arizona Intrastate AQCR Pima Intrastate AQCR			
Ruby MOA	Pima	Pima Intrastate AQCR			
Sells MOA	Pima, Maricopa	Pima Intrastate AQCR Maricopa Intrastate AQCR (40 CFR § 81.36)			
R2301E	Pima, Maricopa	Pima Intrastate AQCR Maricopa Intrastate AQCR			
R2304	Maricopa	Mariaana Intractata AOCR			
R2305	Maricopa				
R2301W	Yuma	Mobaye Yuma Intractate AOCR (40 CER & 81 268)			
Dome MOA Yuma		WOHAVE-TUHA INHASIALE AQUK (40 UFK 8 01.200)			

 Table 3-18.

 Low-Altitude Training Airspace Locations within Air Quality Control Regions

AQCR = air quality control region; CFR = Code of Federal Regulations; MOA = military operations area; NM = New Mexico

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would be relevant for all the atmospheric horizon. GHG emissions from the entire flight path of aircraft are applicable because mixing height is not relevant for these pollutants. Data on individual sorties are unavailable; however, the average time spent per sortie is available. As a result, the GHG emission estimates are based on the average time the aircraft spends executing a sortie.

3.7.1.1 Criteria Pollutants

In accordance with CAA requirements, the air quality in each region or area is measured by the concentration of various pollutants in the atmosphere. Measurements of these "criteria pollutants" in ambient air are expressed in units of parts per million (ppm) or in units of micrograms per cubic meter (μ g/m³). Regional air quality is a result of the types and quantities of atmospheric pollutants and pollutant sources in an area as well as surface topography and prevailing meteorological conditions.

The CAA directed the USEPA to develop, implement, and enforce environmental regulations that would ensure clean and healthy ambient air quality. To protect public health and welfare, the USEPA developed numerical concentration-based standards (i.e., NAAQS) for pollutants that have been determined to impact human health and the environment and established both primary and secondary NAAQS under the provisions of the CAA. The primary and secondary NAAQS are presented in **Table 3-19**.

Pollutant	Primary/ Secondary ^{a,b}	Averaging Time	Level ^c	Form	
Carbon monoxide	primary	8 hours	9 ppm	Not to be exceeded more	
		1 hour	35 ppm	than once per year	
Lead ^d	primary and secondary	Rolling 3-month average	0.15 µg/m³	Not to be exceeded	
Nitrogen dioxide ^e	primary	1 hour	100 ppb	98th percentile of 1-hour daily maximum concentrations, averaged over 3 years	
	primary and secondary	1 year	53 ppb	Annual Mean	
Ozone ^f	primary and secondary	8 hours	0.070 ppm	Annual fourth-highest daily maximum 8-hour concentration, averaged over 3 years	
	primary	1 year	12 µg/m³	annual mean, averaged over 3 years	
Particle pollution (PM _{2.5})	secondary	1 year	15 µg/m³	annual mean, averaged over 3 years	
	primary and secondary	24 hours	35 µg/m³	98th percentile, averaged over 3 years	
Particle pollution (PM ₁₀)	primary and secondary	24 hours	150 µg/m³	Not to be exceeded more than once per year on average over 3 years	
Sulfur dioxide ^g	primary	1 hour	75 ppb	99th percentile of 1-hour daily maximum concentrations, averaged over 3 years	
	secondary	3 hours	0.5 ppm	Not to be exceeded more than once per year	

Table 3-19.National Ambient Air Quality Standards

Source: NAAQS Table

Notes:

- a Primary Standards: the levels of air quality necessary, with an adequate margin of safety to protect the public health. Each state must attain the primary standards no later than 3 years after that state's implementation plan is approved by the USEPA.
- b Secondary Standards: the levels of air quality necessary to protect the public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant.
- c Concentrations are expressed first in units in which they were promulgated.
- d In areas designated nonattainment for the lead standards prior to the promulgation of the current (2008) standards, and for which implementation plans to attain or maintain the current (2008) standards have not been submitted and approved, the previous standards (1.5 µg/m³ as a calendar quarter average) also remain in effect.
- e The level of the annual nitrogen dioxide standard is 0.053 ppm. It is shown here in terms of ppb for the purposes of clearer comparison to the 1-hour standard level.
- f Final rule signed 1 October 2015, and effective 28 December 2015. The previous (2008) ozone standards are not revoked and remain in effect for designated areas. Additionally, some areas may have certain continuing implementation obligations under the prior revoked 1-hour (1979) and 8-hour (1997) ozone standards.
- g The previous sulfur dioxide standards (0.14 ppm 24-hour and 0.03 ppm annual) will additionally remain in effect in certain areas: (1) any area for which it is not yet 1 year since the effective date of designation under the current (2010) standards, and (2) any area for which an implementation plan providing for attainment of the current (2010) standard has not been submitted and approved and which is designated nonattainment under the previous sulfur dioxide standards or is not meeting the requirements of a state implementation plan call under the previous sulfur dioxide standards (40 CFR § 50.4(3)). A SIP call is a USEPA action requiring a state to resubmit all or part of its SIP to demonstrate attainment of the required NAAQS.
- µg/m³ = micrograms per cubic meter; PM_{2.5} = particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter; PM₁₀ = particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter; ppm = parts per million; ppb = parts per billion

For purposes of analyzing potential air quality impacts, this EA considered the volume of air extending up to the mixing height (3,000 feet AGL) and coinciding with the spatial distribution of the ROI. The mixing height is the altitude at which the lower atmosphere will undergo mechanical or turbulent mixing, producing a nearly uniform air mass. The height of the mixing level determines the volume of air within which pollutants

can disperse. Mixing heights at any one location or region can vary by the season and time of day, but for air quality applications, mixing height is typically defined as 3,000 feet AGL as an acceptable default value $(40 \text{ CFR } \S 93.153(c)(2)(xxii))$. Ruby MOA, Sells MOA, R2301E, R2304, R2305, R2301W and Dome MOA do not and are not anticipated to have low-altitude flight training and were not included in the criteria pollutant analysis.

The CAA requires General Conformity regulations that are applicable in nonattainment areas, or in designated maintenance areas (attainment areas that were reclassified from a previous nonattainment status and are required to prepare a maintenance plan for air quality). These regulations are designed to ensure that federal actions do not impede local efforts to achieve or maintain attainment with the NAAQS. The General Conformity Rule and the promulgated regulations are found in 40 CFR Part 93, Subpart B, Determining Conformity of Federal Actions to State or Federal Implementation Plans. Federal actions are assumed to conform if total indirect and direct project emissions are below de minimis levels (40 CFR § 93.153). These threshold levels (in tons of pollutant per year) depend upon the nonattainment or maintenance status that USEPA has assigned to an area. Once the net change in nonattainment pollutants is calculated, the results are compared to the *de minimis* thresholds. If the total direct and indirect emissions from the action are below the de minimis threshold rates, the emissions are exempt from the provisions of the General Conformity regulations. If the emissions exceed the thresholds, then they are not exempt and must be further evaluated under the General Conformity regulations. Hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) are pollutants for which there are no NAAQS but are still regulated under the federal CAA because of their potentially adverse effects on human health and the environment. Also known as "air toxics," these pollutants are comprised of a wide array of organic and inorganic compounds. In relation to aviation sources, HAP emissions are present in the exhaust of aircraft (mostly organic HAPs), aircraft auxiliary power units, aerospace ground equipment (AGE) for aircraft, motor vehicle engines and, to a lesser extent, from boilers, fuel facilities, and other stationary sources that may be associated with airfield operations. There are currently no federal regulatory guidelines specific to HAPs emissions from aircraft engines, specifically, and airports, in general. Studies of commercial aircraft have indicated that at engine power conditions substantially higher than approximately 15 to 30 percent thrust, the engine combustion efficiency is close to 100 percent. Measurement of many organic HAPs becomes difficult or impossible because the concentration of HAPs is too small to measure (USEPA/FAA, 2009). Because aircraft operations are the primary emission generating activity for the Proposed Action, HAP emissions are not carried forward in the air quality impact analysis.

3.7.1.2 Greenhouse Gases

GHGs are gases that trap heat in the atmosphere. The potential effects of proposed GHG emissions are by nature global and result in cumulative impacts because most individual anthropogenic sources of GHG emissions are not large enough to have a noticeable effect on climate change. Therefore, the impact of proposed GHG emissions to climate change is discussed in the context of cumulative impacts.

EO 14008, *Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad* (January 2021), instructs agency heads to prepare Climate Action Plans for their agency operations. The Department of the Air Force published its Climate Action Plan in October 2022 (Air Force, 2022). The plan delineates the goals and actions needed to meet the requirements of EO 14008 and EO 14057, *Catalyzing Clean Energy Industries and Jobs Through Federal Sustainability* (December 2021). The plan identifies the climate change priorities for the Department of the Air Force, including but not limited to:

- Ensure installation resiliency and adaptability by modernizing infrastructure and facilities;
- Seamlessly integrate climate and operational considerations throughout processes, plans and decision-making; and
- Reduce fossil fuel demand of current and future weapon systems to achieve lower GHG emissions.

On 9 January 2023, the CEQ published interim guidance to assist in analyzing GHG and climate change effects of proposed actions (88 FR 1196). The guidance explains how agencies should apply NEPA

principles and existing best practices to their climate change analysis. The inclusion of this guidance in the evaluation of the Proposed Action's GHG emissions is included in **Section 3.7.5.4.**

3.7.2 Regional Climate

Arizona, the sixth largest US state, encompasses diverse climates and topography. The deserts in the south are some of the hottest and driest areas of the country, while the higher terrain of the Colorado Plateau in the northeast has a cooler climate, with cold winters and mild summers. Pima County is known for extreme heat in the summer months and mild conditions during the winter. The average high and low temperatures during the summer months at Davis-Monthan AFB range from about 100 to 68 degrees Fahrenheit (°F). The average high and low temperatures during the winter months range from 74 to 39°F. Much of Arizona is characterized as arid to semiarid, with annual average precipitation ranging from less than 4 inches in the southwest to around 40 inches in the White Mountains in the east-central region. Arizona is currently in a long-term drought that has lasted more than 20 years. Long-term droughts raise the risk of wildfires, already a concern for this arid state. In 2011, the Wallow Fire consumed more than 500,000 acres in eastern Arizona, making it the state's largest wildfire on record (Frankson et al., 2022).

3.7.3 Existing Conditions – Davis-Monthan AFB

Davis-Monthan AFB currently maintains six separate Class II air quality permits and one Class II/III permit issued by the Pima County Department of Environmental Quality Air Program. Class II permits are issued to sources subject to a standard, limitation or other requirement under the Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources, or HAP regulations. Class III permits are issued to cover any stationary source that has the potential to emit, without controls, significant quantities of regulated air pollutants, any stationary rotating machinery rated at more than 325 brake horsepower, and/or fuel-burning equipment with a sustained fire rate of more than one million British thermal units per hour for more than eight hours. These permits cover stationary source emissions from Installation operations. The permitted stationary sources include fuel storage tanks, loading racks, dispensing equipment, emergency and nonemergency power generators, fire pumps, jet engine test cells, paint spray booths, architectural coating operations, media blasting equipment, degreasers, boilers and heaters, landfill vent and controls, and miscellaneous chemical usage.

Mobile source emissions are generated by aircraft, vehicles, equipment, and other sources that move or have the potential to move from place to place. Flying operations that generate emissions include aircraft landings and takeoffs, taxiing from the hangar, returning post-flight, auxiliary power unit operation, and onground engine maintenance activities. Vehicle emissions include privately owned vehicles used by workers commuting to the Installation. Equipment emissions come from forklifts, backhoes, tractors, and other onsite construction equipment; AGE used to service aircraft include generators, light carts, compressors, bomb lifts, hydraulic test stands; and other portable equipment required for aircraft operations.

The area where Davis-Monthan AFB is located, in the southern portion of Tucson, Arizona, is in attainment for all criteria pollutants (**Table 3-20**). Pima County as a whole is in attainment with all of the NAAQS, with the exception of the Rillito PM_{10} nonattainment area just northwest of Tucson, the Ajo PM_{10} and sulfur dioxide maintenance areas, approximately 100 miles west of Davis-Monthan AFB, and a small area designated as maintenance for sulfur dioxide in the northeast area of Pima County, near San Manuel, which is an extension of the Pinal County sulfur dioxide maintenance area. The PM_{10} area designations are the result of drought and local winds that have sporadically resulted in elevated PM_{10} levels when meteorological conditions were conducive to dust entrainment. From 2019 to 2021, the Rillito planning area averaged an estimated 6.1 annual exceedances of the PM_{10} NAAQS (USEPA, 2022). The sulfur dioxide areas were designated as the result of copper smelter emissions; in both areas, the smelters have long ceased operations (USEPA, 2003, 2008).

Pollutant	Averaging Time	NAAQS	Pima County Design Value ^a	% NAAQS
Carbon monovido	1-hr	35 ppm	1.6 ppm	5
Carbon monoxide	8-hr	9 ppm	0.8 ppm	9
Nitrogon diovido	Annual	53 ppb	8 ppb	15
Nillogen dioxide	1-hr	100 ppb	37 ppb	37
Ozone	8-hr	0.07 ppm	0.068	97
	24-hr	35 µg/m³	11 µg/m³	31
P1V12.5	Annual	12 µg/m³	5.0 μg/m ³	42
PM ₁₀	24-hr	150 μg/m³	6.1 exceedances (Rillito)	N/A
Sulfur dioxide	1-hr	75 ppb	1 ppb	1

 Table 3-20.

 Comparison of Criteria Pollutant Design Values for Pima County to NAAQS

Source: USEPA, 2022

Note:

a A design value is a statistic that describes the air quality status of a given location relative to the level of the NAAQS.

N/A = Not Applicable; PM_{2.5} = particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter; PM₁₀ = particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter

The Tucson area was a designated maintenance area for carbon monoxide, but the designation lapsed in 2020 after 20 years of compliance with the NAAQS. The area is currently in attainment for the ozone standard, but has trended toward noncompliance in recent years, as evidenced by the 2021 design value, which is 97 percent of the NAAQS for ozone.

3.7.4 Existing Conditions – Special Use Airspace

The SUA where proposed training would occur covers several Arizona counties, with small portions of the easternmost MOAs extending into New Mexico. **Table 3-21** identifies the attainment status of each of the relevant counties. For these airspaces, the attainment status applies to flight operation emissions that occur at or below the mixing height of 3,000 feet AGL. These locations of low-altitude flight include are noted above in **Table 3-20** and include Tombstone A and B, Jackal Low, Morenci, and Fuzzy MOAs. Because of the large multi-county, multi-state areas covered by the airspaces, counties with nonattainment and/or maintenance designations fall within the ROI.

Ajo, Arizona (Pima County), is distant from Davis-Monthan AFB, and the activities associated with the Proposed Action would be limited to areas north, south, and east of the Installation. Cochise County is in nonattainment for PM₁₀ and a maintenance area for sulfur dioxide. Both areas are near Douglas, Arizona, and thus in proximity of the low-flight components of the Tombstone MOA. Morenci, Arizona (Greenlee County), also is a maintenance area for sulfur dioxide and is within the Tombstone MOA. Nogales, Arizona (Santa Cruz County), is in nonattainment for PM₁₀ and a maintenance area for PM_{2.5} and is within the Fuzzy MOA. San Manuel, Arizona (Pinal County), is a maintenance area for sulfur dioxide, part of which is within the Fuzzy MOA. Other areas in Pinal County are in nonattainment for ozone, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, sulfur dioxide, and lead.

Flight in the training airspaces from aircraft originating from Davis-Monthan AFB with time spent below 3,000 feet AGL ranges from 30 percent for A-10s to 100 percent for HH-60s of the total sortie time.

 Table 3-21.

 Airspace Attainment Status for Davis-Monthan AFB and Low-Altitude Training Airspaces by County^a

County	Base/Airspace	O 3	СО	NOx	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	Pb
Pima	Davis-Monthan AFB, ^b Outlaw ^c				A/M	NA & A/M		
Santa Cruz	Fuzzy ^b					NA	A/M	
Cochise	Tombotonobic				A/M	NA		
Hidalgo (NM)	Tombstone							
Greenlee					A/M			
Graham	Morenci, ^b Jackal Low, ^b Jackal ^c							
Catron (NM)	,							
Navajo (Jackal only)	Jackal ^c							
Apache (Jackal only)								
Gila (Outlaw only)	Jackal, Outlaw ^c	NA			NA	NA		NA
Pinal	Jackal Low ^b	NA			NA & A/M	NA	NA	NA

Source: USEPA 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2023 Notes:

a Gray denotes areas that are in attainment/unclassified; yellow denotes designated nonattainment areas; blue denotes designated maintenance areas; green denotes counties with both nonattainment and maintenance area designations.

b Locations where low-altitude flight (less than 3,000 feet AGL) would occur.

c Locations where proposed expanded low-altitude flight would occur under a separate proposed action and is addressed under Cumulative Impacts.

A/M = attainment/maintenance; CO = carbon monoxide; NOx = nitrogen dioxide; NA = nonattainment; O₃ = ozone; P = partial county; Pb = lead; PM_{2.5} = particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter; PM₁₀ = particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter; SO₂ = sulfur dioxide

3.7.5 Environmental Consequences

3.7.5.1 Evaluation Criteria

General Conformity applies to nonattainment and maintenance areas. If the emissions from a federal action proposed in a nonattainment area exceed annual *de minimis* thresholds identified in the Rule, a formal conformity determination is required of that action.

The environmental impact methodology for air quality impacts presented in this EA was derived by utilizing the same operational data as directed by AFMAN 32-7002, *Environmental Compliance and Pollution Prevention* (4 February 2020). The air analysis for aircraft operations factors in the engine types used in the aircraft, the time spent at or below 3,000 feet AGL at specific engine power settings, the emission factors associated with those flight modes, engine maintenance run-ups, and other relevant details. These data are included in the Air Force Air Conformity Applicability Model (ACAM) and in supplemental spreadsheets used for analysis. Construction operations similarly evaluate the operation of construction equipment and other fuel-burning sources as the primary emission sources of that activity. These data, along with information on the affected environment and the proposed and alternative actions, are used to produce a consistent determination of air quality impacts.

ACAM (version 5.0.18b) was used to provide emissions estimates for the A-10, Cessna 182 and RC-26B airfield operations and maintenance activities. HH-60 activities were calculated based on Air Force data. ACAM provides estimated air emissions from proposed federal actions for each specific criteria and precursor pollutant as defined in the NAAQS. For aircraft, operational modes (including taxi/idle [in and out], take off, climb-out, approach, and pattern flight that includes touch and go operations) are used as the basis of the emission estimates. Additionally, data provided by the Installation on additional on-ground airfield activities were incorporated into the emission calculations. Emissions were calculated separately for the Davis-Monthan AFB airfield operations and areas of low-altitude operations away from the airfield and

evaluated based on nonattainment/maintenance designations of the locations where the SUA is located. More detailed information on the methodology and approach for quantifying emissions can be found in **Appendix B**.

For attainment area criteria pollutants, the project air quality analysis used the USEPA's General Conformity maintenance area *de minimis* threshold of 100 tons per year as an initial indicator of the local significance of potential impacts to air quality. It is important to note that the significance indicator only provides a clue to the potential impacts to air quality. If the intensity of any net emissions increase for the Proposed Action is below 100 tons per year in the context of an attainment criteria pollutant, the indication is the air quality impacts would not be significant for that pollutant.

In the case of criteria pollutants for which the ROI does not attain a NAAQS or has been designated a maintenance area for the NAAQS, the analysis compared the net increase in annual direct and indirect emissions to the applicable pollutant *de minimis* threshold(s).

3.7.5.2 Proposed Action – Davis-Monthan AFB

As indicated in **Section 2.1**, the A-10 transition would occur in 2024 and the HH-60 transitions would begin in 2025. During this time, two Cessna 182 CAP aircraft would beddown and operate from Davis-Monthan AFB. Additionally, one RC-26B aircraft would be relocated from Morris ANGB to the Installation. The year 2026 is analyzed as the first year of steady state operations upon completion of the Proposed Action.

Construction to support these changes would occur from 2023 through 2024. Construction activities would include new hangars, new flight simulators, new Ops buildings, parking, and a road extension to access the Ops buildings. Construction emissions were estimated using developed assumptions and ACAM calculation information.

Under the Proposed Action, construction of associated infrastructure would generate temporary emissions. Once aircraft are relocated, the additional flight operations of the A-10C, HH-60W, Cessna 182 and RC-26B aircraft would be implemented. Airspace operations at the SUA Training Airspace would increase with the additional A-10C and HH-60W operations. The airspace analyses conservatively assumed that all lowaltitude training operations presented in **Table 2-3** (Section 2.1) would occur beginning in 2025. Stationary sources that may be added as part of the proposed action could include heaters, boilers, emergency generators and paint spray booths or other maintenance equipment used for aircraft. The exact sources would be identified during the design phases of construction and any sources evaluated for inclusion in the appropriate Installation air permit. Additionally, some increase in the use of engine test cells, which are permitted stationary sources, would be anticipated.

Estimated air emissions at Davis-Monthan AFB are provided in **Tables 3-22**. These estimates represent emissions from the proposed aircraft operations, commuters, and the proposed building construction under the Proposed Action (see **Section 2.1**). Lead is not included in the analysis as there would be no air emission sources of lead at Davis-Monthan AFB associated with the Proposed Action. For the criteria pollutant emissions occurring at or near Davis-Monthan AFB, for which nonattainment or maintenance designations do not apply (see **Table 3-20**), the annual emissions have been compared to the 100-ton per year maintenance area General Conformity threshold as a significance indicator.

Flight emission estimates include airfield operations; for the HH-60 helicopters, an estimate of cruise emissions within Pima County. The SUA is located in other counties, and so the total cruise emissions occur in both Pima County and adjacent counties. Because it is not known exactly what the percentage of emissions would be in any location, all transit emissions for the HH-60s have conservatively been included in the Pima County totals. They have additionally been included in the transits for each SUA and so serve as the bounding case (most conservative estimate) for all low-altitude transit emissions for the HH-60 helicopters.

Volatile organic compounds, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, and PM_{2.5} emissions would increase with implementation of the Proposed Action. The proposed net changes would be less than the

indicator of significance threshold of 100 tons per year for all of the pollutants. Therefore, it is unlikely these increases would cause significant impacts such as causing NAAQS violations.

Table 3-22.
VOC, CO, NOx, SO ₂ , and PM _{2.5} Emission Estimates under the Proposed Action, including
Proposed Construction Activities and Aircraft Operations at Davis-Monthan AFB

Voar/Activity	Total Annual Emissions in Tons							
real/Activity	VOCs	со	NOx	SO ₂	PM _{2.5}			
2023								
Proposed construction	0.41	0.40	0.29	0.001	0.01			
Comparative indicator threshold	100	100	100	100	100			
Exceed de minimis threshold?	No	No	No	No	No			
2024								
Proposed construction	2.95	3.43	2.20	0.01	0.07			
Attainment area significance indicator threshold	100	100	100	100	100			
Exceed attainment area significance indicator threshold?	No	No	No	No	No			
2026 – steady state (proposed operations)								
A-10C aircraft								
LTOs	11.1	46.5	18.6	3.0	2.1			
Closed patterns	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.001	0.01			
Subtotal	11.1	46.5	18.6	3.0	2.1			
HH-60 aircraft								
LTOs	0.07	12.0	31.7	3.0	6.2			
Closed patterns	0.000	1.0	3.5	0.3	0.6			
Cruise within Pima County	0.01	1.9	7.6	0.7	1.6			
Subtotal	0.1	15.0	42.8	4.1	8.3			
RC-26B aircraft								
LTOs	4.3	7.7	32.3	0.7	0.9			
Cessna-182 aircraft								
LTOs	0.9	0.7	0.2	0.03	0.1			
Stationary source operation – A-10 jet engine test cell	0.3	1.0	0.8	0.1	0.2			
Stationary source operation – RC-26B jet engine test cell	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.004	0.01			
Total proposed operations/net change	16.7	70.9	94.8	7.9	11.6			
Attainment area significance indicator threshold	100	100	100	100	100			
Exceed attainment area significance indicator threshold?	No	No	No	No	No			

AFB = Air Force Base; CO = carbon monoxide; LTO = landing take off cycle; NOx = nitrogen dioxide; PM_{2.5} = particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter; SO₂ = sulfur dioxide; VOC = volatile organic compound

Table 3-23 compares the estimated emissions of the Proposed Action to the General Conformity *de minimis* threshold for PM₁₀, as part of Pima County is nonattainment for this criteria pollutant in the Rillito planning area directly northwest of Tucson. The Rillito area is close enough to the Installation that flight activities would enter the area, and emissions from flight activities could migrate to the area.

Table 3-23.

General Conformity Applicability Emissions Estimates at Davis-Monthan AFB under the Proposed Action including Proposed Demolition/Construction Activities and Aircraft Operations

Year/Activity	PM ₁₀ (tons per year)
2023	
Proposed construction	0.06
Total proposed operations/net change	
De minimis threshold	100
Exceed <i>de minimis</i> threshold?	No
2024	
Proposed construction	5.2
Total proposed operations/net change	
De minimis threshold	100
Exceed <i>de minimis</i> threshold?	No
2026 – steady state (proposed operations)	
A-10C aircraft	
LTOs	3.0
Closed patterns	0.01
Subtotal	3.0
HH-60 aircraft	
LTOs	6.9
Closed patterns	0.7
Cruise within Pima County	1.7
Subtotal	9.3
RC-26B aircraft	
LTOs	0.9
Cessna-182 aircraft	
LTOs	0.1
Total mobile source proposed operations/net change	13.3
De minimis threshold	100
Exceed de minimis threshold?	No

AFB = Air Force Base; LTO = landing take off cycle; PM₁₀ = particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter

Emissions of PM_{10} would remain well below the *de minimis* threshold. As a result, the requirements of the General Conformity Rule are not applicable, as documented in the Detail ACAM Report and Record of Conformity Applicability.

3.7.5.3 Proposed Action – Special Use Airspace

Various low-altitude training areas are designated as either nonattainment or maintenance for criteria pollutants. For the General Conformity Applicability Analysis of activities occurring in these areas, the estimated direct and indirect air emissions associated with implementing the Proposed Action were compared to the applicable General Conformity Rule *de minimis* thresholds. These estimates represent emissions from the proposed A-10C and HH-60W aircraft operations at low altitude. The net change between the existing environment and proposed operations is solely additive, as implementation of the Proposed Action would increase activity in every SUA. The increase in ordnance emission estimates for

training operations was based on the total annual estimated munitions expended after implementing the Proposed Action, as the amount of increase compared to existing conditions is not known. The total emissions for ordnance were subdivided across the SUA based on the percentage increase in sorties operating in each SUA (Tables 3-24-27). Small portions of Tombstone and Morenci MOAs include portions of Hidalgo and Catron Counties in New Mexico, both of which are in attainment. All emissions in these MOAs have been conservatively estimated to occur in the much larger Arizona airspace. Data on ordnance emission factors is incomplete; however, emissions from most of the anticipated ordnance were captured in the analysis.

Tombstone SUA Operations	NOx	SO ₂ ª	со	voc	PM 10 ^a	PM _{2.5}	Pb	CO ₂ e
A-10C sorties	0.9	0.1	0.2	0.01	0.2	0.2	N/A	284
HH-60 sorties	5.4	0.5	1.3	0.005	1.2	1.1	N/A	1,511
Ordnance	0.4	N/A	2.8	N/A	1.4	0.2	0.03	4.4
Total	6.7	0.6	4.4	0.02	2.8	1.6	0.03	1,799
HH-60 transit emissions to/from Tombstone	4.4	0.4	1.1	0.004	1.0	0.9	N/A	1,247
Tombstone total low- altitude training emissions	11.1	1.0	5.5	0.02	3.8	2.5	0.03	3,047
General Conformity <i>de minimis</i> threshold		100			100			N/A
Attainment area significance indicator threshold	100		100	100		100	25	N/A
Threshold exceedance?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	N/A

Table 3-24.				
Emission Estimates for Tombstone MOA Low-Altitude Activities (ton j	per y	year))

a Transit to/from Tombstone MOA and operations in the MOA occur in Pima and Cochise counties and General Conformity applies to these pollutants.

AFB = Air Force Base; CO = carbon monoxide; CO₂e = carbon dioxide equivalent; MOA = military operations area; N/A = not applicable; NOx = nitrogen dioxide; PM_{2.5} = particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter; SO₂ = sulfur dioxide; SUA = special use airspace; VOC = volatile organic compound

Jackal Low SUA Operations	NOxª	SO ₂ ^a	со	VOCª	PM ₁₀ ª	PM _{2.5}	Pb	CO ₂ e
A-10C sorties	0.7	0.1	0.1	0.01	0.2	0.2	N/A	205
HH-60 sorties	3.9	0.4	0.9	0.003	0.9	0.8	N/A	1,087
Ordnance	0.3	N/A	2.0	N/A	1.0	0.2	0.02	3
Total	4.8	0.4	3.1	0.01	2.0	1.1		1,295
HH-60 transit emissions to/from Jackal Low	1.1	0.1	0.3	0.001	0.3	0.2	N/A	315
Total Jackal Low low- altitude training emissions	5.9	0.5	3.4	0.01	2.3	1.3	0.02	1,610
General Conformity <i>de minimis</i> threshold	100	100		100	100	100	25	N/A
Attainment area significance indicator threshold			100					N/A
Threshold exceedance?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	N/A

 Table 3-25.

 Emission Estimates for Jackal Low MOA Low-Altitude Activities (ton per year)

Notes:

a Transit to/from Jackal Low MOA and operations in the MOA occur in Pima and Pinal counties and General Conformity applies to these pollutants.

AFB = Air Force Base; CO = carbon monoxide; CO₂e = carbon dioxide equivalent; MOA = military operations area; N/A = not applicable; Pb = lead; NOx = nitrogen dioxide; PM_{2.5} = particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter; SO₂ = sulfur dioxide; SUA = special use airspace; VOC = volatile organic compound

Morenci SUA Operations	NOx	SO ₂ ª	со	voc	PM ₁₀ ^a	PM _{2.5}	Pb	CO ₂ e
A-10C sorties	0.3	0.03	0.1	0.003	0.1	0.1	N/A	84
HH-60 Sorties	1.6	0.1	0.4	0.001	0.4	0.3	N/A	443
Ordnance	0.1	N/A	0.8	N/A	0.4	0.1	0.01	1
Total	2.0	0.2	1.3	0.004	0.8	0.5	0.01	528
HH-60 transit emissions to/from Morenci	0.9	0.2	0.2	0.001	0.2	0.2	N/A	241
Total Morenci low- altitude training emissions	2.8	0.3	1.5	0.01	1.0	0.6	0.01	769
General Conformity <i>de minimis</i> Threshold		100			100			N/A
Attainment area significance indicator threshold	100		100	100		100	25	N/A
Threshold exceedance?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	N/A

 Table 3-26.

 Emission Estimates for Morenci Low-Altitude MOA Activities (ton per year)

Notes:

a Transit to/from Morenci MOA and operations in the MOA occur in Pima and Pinal counties and General Conformity applies to these pollutants.

AFB = Air Force Base; CO = carbon monoxide; CO₂e = carbon dioxide equivalent; MOA = military operations area; N/A = not applicable; NOx = nitrogen dioxide; Pb = lead; PM_{2.5} = particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter; SO₂ = sulfur dioxide; SUA = special use airspace; VOC = volatile organic compound

Fuzzy SUA Operations	NOx	SO2	со	voc	PM ₁₀ ^a	PM _{2.5} ^a	Pb	CO2e
A-10C sorties	0.9	0.1	0.2	0.01	0.2	0.2	N/A	258
HH-60 sorties	4.8	0.5	1.2	0.004	1.1	1.0	N/A	1,357
Ordnance	0.3	N/A	2.6	N/A	1.2	0.2	0.03	4
Total	6.0	0.5	4.0	0.01	2.5	1.4	0.03	1,619
HH-60 transit emissions to/from Fuzzy	1.2	0.1	0.30	0.00	0.3	0.2	N/A	344
Total Fuzzy low-altitude training emissions	7.2	0.7	4.3	0.01	2.8	1.6	0.03	1,963
General Conformity <i>de minimis</i> threshold					100	100		N/A
Attainment area significance indicator threshold	100	100	100	100			25	N/A
Threshold exceedance?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	N/A

 Table 3-27.

 Emission Estimates for Low-Altitude Fuzzy MOA Activities (ton per year)

Notes:

a Transit to/from Fuzzy MOA and operations in the MOA occur in Pima and Pinal counties and General Conformity applies to these pollutants.

AFB = Air Force Base; CO = carbon monoxide; CO₂e = carbon dioxide equivalent; MOA = military operations area; N/A = not applicable; NOx = nitrogen dioxide; Pb = lead; PM_{2.5} = particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter; SO₂ = sulfur dioxide; SUA = special use airspace; VOC = volatile organic compound

While emissions for all pollutants would increase with implementation of the Proposed Alternative, the net changes would be less than the *de minimis* thresholds in all of the counties in which low-altitude flight and operations would occur. Because the emissions associated with the Proposed Action are below the General Conformity *de minimis* thresholds, the requirements of the General Conformity Rule, are not applicable, as documented in the Detail ACAM Reports and Record of Conformity Applicability.

Current and reasonably foreseeable projects that may be ongoing in the same timeframe as proposed and alternative actions are listed in **Table 3.1**. Any contribution of the Proposed Action that could, in combination with past, present, and reasonably future activities, contribute to cumulative impacts to air quality would be due to increases in annual volatile organic compounds, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, PM₁₀, and/or PM_{2.5} emissions from airfield operations and related activities and flight below the mixing height in the regions where training airspaces are located.

While the Tombstone MOA currently has areas A and B for low-altitude flight, the size of the Tombstone MOA is proposed for expansion to add 10 nm to the northern edge and to lower the altitude for the entire MOA to 100 feet AGL, which is being analyzed under a separate NEPA action. Similarly, the floor of Outlaw and Jackal MOAs would be lowered to 500 feet AGL and the ceiling of Jackal Low MOA would be reduced to 500 feet AGL. The changes to the Tombstone MOA would increase the area where low-altitude flight could occur. Additional low-altitude flight likely would occur in these MOAs as a result of the proposed altitude and geographic boundary changes.

3.7.5.4 Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change

Table 3-28 presents GHG annual emissions under the Proposed Action. The projected steady state annual emissions identified for 2026 represent airfield operations at Davis-Monthan AFB, commuters and airspace transit and flight at the SUA training airspaces. The GHG emissions calculated for aircraft operations include emissions throughout the flight horizon. Detailed information on GHG calculations is included in the introduction to **Appendix B**.

Climate change presents a global problem caused by increasing concentrations of GHG emissions. While climate change results from the incremental addition of GHG emissions from millions of individual sources, the significance of an individual source alone is impossible to assess on a global scale beyond the overall need for global GHG emissions reductions to avoid existential global outcomes. It can be useful to evaluate the GHG emissions not just from an annual perspective, but across the lifetime of the proposed action as GHG emissions have much longer atmospheric lifetimes than criteria and other air pollutants. Evaluating the life-cycle emissions provides a fuller picture of the GHG emissions to which the Proposed Action could contribute to the total atmospheric concentration of GHGs. A period of 20 years was selected based on most of the aircraft and flight activity, which includes the A-10C and the HH-60W.

Year/Activity	Total Annual Emissions in Tons (CO₂e)			
2023 – proposed construction	110			
2024 – proposed construction	784			
2026 – steady state (proposed operations)				
Airfield Ops	22,056			
Low-Altitude Transit and Airspace Ops	7,388			
High Altitude Transit and Airspace Ops	8,268			
Personnel	520			
2026 – steady state total	38,232			
Estimated life-cycle emissions (steady state over 20 years)	765,530			

Table 3-28.Greenhouse Gas Emissions under the Proposed Action

 CO_2e = carbon dioxide equivalent

Operational energy (aviation fuel and energy to power aircraft) comprises over 80 percent of the Air Force's energy use. Life-cycle emissions for the Proposed Action assume no changes in operations from 2026 to 2046. However, likely reductions would include reductions in ground mobile source emissions as vehicles and equipment continue to be electrified, and as the Air Force implements its Climate Action Plan.

Reduction of fuel use offers the most significant opportunity to optimize operational capability while simultaneously reducing GHG emissions. Technological enhancements to achieve this reduction include but are not limited to aerodynamic advancements, streamlined flight planning, incorporation of drag reduction technologies onto current platforms, enhanced engine sustainment practices, and increases in the use of simulation and augmented reality systems. Additionally, the Air Force has instituted an installations portfolio goal of net-zero emissions by FY 2046 (Air Force, 2022). During the estimated 20-year life-cycle of the Proposed Action, many activities would be incorporated into the Air Force functions to reduce GHG emissions across the Air Force assets.

As a result of ongoing climate change, Tucson and the surrounding region could experience a continuing of recent upward trends in average temperatures and extreme heat, an increase in the frequency of wildfire occurrence and severity, and a decrease in spring precipitation (U.S. Global Change Research Program, 2017).

Increases in temperature, increases in wildfires, and a decrease in spring precipitation could interact with resource areas such as air quality, water resources, and socioeconomics. While Davis-Monthan AFB has adapted operations to manage temperature changes, exacerbation of climate conditions in the future could increase the cost of proposed operations and could impede operations during extreme events. Additional measures could be needed to mitigate such impacts over the operational life expectancy of the Proposed Action.

3.7.5.5 Cumulative Impacts

As listed in **Table 3-1**, three proposed actions with the potential to impact air quality in and around the ROI are the Arizona Airspace EIS (expected completion 2025),the Personnel Recovery Training Program EA (Air Force, 2020), and the 492nd SOW Relocation EIS (which is a future project with no analysis performed to date).

The total NOx emissions increase at Davis-Monthan AFB associated with personnel recovery training and the 4th Gen missions alignment would be estimated to reach 100 tons per year. Given that the area is in near-nonattainment of the ozone NAAQS and NOx are ozone precursors, the combined actions were reviewed to determine the accuracy of the results. The increase in NOx for the Personnel Recovery Training Program is primarily due to the addition of ground vehicle operations at Davis-Monthan AFB. Emissions estimates for this activity were conservatively generated in ACAM using nonroad emission factors typically used for construction. The overall indication for cumulative impacts of NOx is that the realignment action would generate the majority of NOx emissions and the personnel recovery training would add a minor amount of additional emissions, the sum of which approaches 100 tons per year.

The total CO emissions increase at Davis-Monthan AFB associated with personnel recovery training and the 4th Gen missions realignment is estimated to reach 102 tons per year. The design value for CO in Pima County for 2021 represents 5 percent of the hourly NAAQS and 9 percent of the 8-hour NAAQS. Given that CO emissions in the County are so low, the additional cumulative quantity would not result in a significant impact such as exceedance of the NAAQS standard for CO.

NOx and all other criteria pollutant emissions at Davis-Monthan AFB would be reduced over time as newer engines replace the more inefficient ones captured in the Personnel Recovery Training EA. Additionally, the Air Force-wide commitment to GHG reductions would also positively affect all criteria pollutant emissions as installation use of renewable energy and other initiatives are implemented and increased. As a result, NOx and other emissions at Davis-Monthan AFB would reduce over time, eliminating the likelihood of significant cumulative impacts to regional air quality.

In addition to military actions, a small commercial development is planned near Davis-Monthan AFB. The gross area of the proposed development is approximately 30 acres and incorporates seven lots. Construction at this location is anticipated to be temporary and short term. It is unknown what entities may locate in this development, but any air emission sources would be covered under a Pima County Department of Environmental Quality air permit. Emissions from this development, in combination with all direct and indirect emissions sources in the area, would not be anticipated to result in significant air emission impacts.

3.7.5.6 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, Davis-Monthan AFB's air operations would remain at current conditions. The 4th Gen missions would remain or be inactivated in place at Nellis AFB, which would create a capacity issue as 5th Gen missions continue to increase in scope and number. The infrastructure at Nellis AFB would continue to fall short of current or future mission needs and operate at or beyond capacity. There would be no changes to air quality beyond baseline conditions.

3.8 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

3.8.1 Definition of the Resource

Biological resources include native or invasive plants and animals; sensitive and protected floral and faunal species; and the associated habitats, such as wetlands, forests, grasslands, cliffs, and caves in which they exist. Habitat can be defined as the resources and conditions in an area that support a defined suite of organisms. The following is a description of the primary federal statutes that form the regulatory framework for the evaluation of biological resources.

As shown in **Table 3-2**, the ROI for biological resources is Davis-Monthan AFB and the associated SUA. The ROI for biological resources included in the analysis of primary airspace and primary ranges under the Proposed Action includes eight counties in Arizona and New Mexico: Maricopa, Pinal, Yuma, Pima, Cochise, and Santa Cruz counties, Arizona; Hidalgo and Luna counties, New Mexico.

3.8.1.1 Endangered Species Act

The ESA established protection for threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend. Sensitive and protected biological resources include plant and animal species listed as threatened, endangered, or special status by USFWS. The ESA also allows the designation of geographic areas as critical habitat for threatened or endangered species. Under the ESA, an "endangered species" is defined as any species in danger of extinction throughout all, or a large portion, of its range. A "threatened species" is defined as any species likely to become an endangered species in the foreseeable future. USFWS maintains a list of candidate species under evaluation for possible listing as threatened or endangered under the ESA. Although candidate species receive no statutory protection under the ESA, USFWS encourages cooperative conservation efforts for these species because they are species that may warrant protection in the future under the ESA.

3.8.1.2 Migratory Bird Treaty Act

The MBTA makes it unlawful for anyone to take migratory birds or their parts, nests, or eggs unless permitted to do so by regulations. Per the MBTA, "take" is defined as " pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or attempt to pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect." (50 CFR § 10.12). Birds protected under the MBTA include nearly all species in the US except for non-native/human-introduced species and some game birds.

EO 13186, *Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds*, requires all federal agencies undertaking activities that may negatively impact migratory birds to follow a prescribed set of actions to further implement MBTA. EO 13186 directs federal agencies to develop a Memorandum of Understanding with USFWS that promotes the conservation of migratory birds.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314, 116 Stat. 2458) provided the Secretary of the Interior the authority to prescribe regulations to exempt the Armed Forces from the incidental take of migratory birds during authorized military readiness activities. Congress defined military readiness activities as all training and operations of the US Armed Forces that relate to combat and the adequate and realistic testing of military equipment, vehicles, weapons, and sensors for proper operation and suitability for combat use. Further, in October of 2012, the Authorization of Take Incidental to Military Readiness Activities was published in the Federal Register (50 CFR § 21.42), authorizing incidental take during military readiness such activities may result in significant adverse effects on a population of a migratory bird species.

In December 2017, the US Department of the Interior issued M-Opinion 37050, *The Migratory Bird Treaty Act Does Not Prohibit Incidental Take*, which concluded that the take of migratory birds from an activity is not prohibited by the MBTA when the purpose of that activity is not the take of a migratory birds, eggs, or nests. On 11 August 2020, the US District Court, Southern District of New York, vacated M-37050. Thus, incidental take of migratory birds is again prohibited. The interpretation of the MBTA remains in flux, and additional court proceedings are expected.

3.8.1.3 Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act

The *Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940* (16 USC §§ 668–668d) (BGEPA) prohibits actions to "take, possess, sell, purchase, barter, offer to sell, purchase or barter, transport, export or import, at any time or any manner, any bald eagle [or any golden eagle], alive or dead, or any part, nest, or egg thereof." Further, the BGEPA defines "take" as:

[P]ursue, shoot, shoot at, poison, wound, kill, capture, trap, collect, molest or disturb.

The BGEPA defines "disturb" as:

[T]o agitate or bother a bald or golden eagle to a degree that causes, or is likely to cause, based on the best scientific information available, injury to an eagle, a decrease in productivity by substantially interfering with the eagle's normal breeding, feeding or sheltering behavior, or nest abandonment by substantially interfering with the eagle's normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior.

The BGEPA also prohibits activities around an active or inactive nest site that could result in disturbance to returning eagles.

3.8.1.4 Invasive Species

Invasive species are non-native species whose introduction causes or is likely to cause economic or environmental harm, or harm to human, animal, or plant health. EO 13751, *Safeguarding the Nation from the Impacts of Invasive Species*, requires federal agencies to identify actions that may affect invasive species; use relevant programs to prevent introductions of invasive species; detect, respond, and control such species; monitor invasive species populations; and provide for restoration of native species. Invasive species damage native habitat and impede management by outcompeting native species.

3.8.2 Existing Conditions – Davis-Monthan AFB

3.8.2.1 Vegetation

Geographically, Davis-Monthan AFB falls within the Tucson Basin and is located in the Sonoran Desert, which is part of the Tropical-Subtropical Desertlands climatic zone (Brown, 1982). The Tucson Basin falls at the eastern edge of the Arizona Upland Subdivision of the Sonoran Desert scrub Biotic Community, and is adjacent to the Semi-desert Grassland biome to the east and the Lower Colorado River Valley Subdivision of the Sonoran Desert to the west (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a).

Of the Base's 10,550 acres of land, approximately 6,653 acres have been altered by human activities (e.g., buildings, roads, airfields, and yards) and are considered developed, improved, and semi-improved areas. The remaining 3,897 acres are unimproved areas of native Sonoran Desert vegetation, although some areas contain non-native invasive species such as buffelgrass (*Pennisetum ciliare*) and fountain grass (*Pennisetum sp.*) (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a, 2023). Native vegetation on Davis-Monthan AFB occurs in the southeast part of the Base in the area surrounding Atterbury Wash and along the southwest side of the airfield. Three primary native plant communities and a fourth community defined by a greater present of prickly pear (*O. engelmannii*) and cholla (*Cylindropuntia sp.*) cactuses have been identified on the Base.

The Sonoran Desert Xeri-Riparian community occurs in the more mesic drainage areas of Davis-Monthan AFB and includes desert willow (*Chilopsis linearis*), mesquite (*Prosopis* sp.), catclaw (*Acacia greggii*), seepwillow (*Baccharis salicifolia*), and palo verde (*Parkinsonia microphylla, P. florid*). Three plant communities occur in the drier upland areas. A Lower Colorado River Valley Subdivision community is dominated by creosote bush (*Larrea tridentata*) and white bursage (*Ambrosia dumosa*). Other common species in this plant community include burrowbush (*Hymenoclea monogyra*), seepwillow (*Baccharis salicifolia*), Anderson lycium (*Lycium andersonii*), and catclaw (Acacia greggii). The Arizona Upland Subdivision community often referred to as Paloverde-Cacti Desert contains more arboreal (i.e., tree-like) species and contains foothill paloverde, creosote bush, saguaro (*Carnegia gigantea*), ocotillo (*Fouquieria splendens*), barrel cactus (*Echinocactus wislizenii*), chainfruit cholla (*Cylindropuntia fulgida*), staghorn cholla (*C. vericolor*). A prickly pear-cholla-mixed shrub plant community also has been identified on Davis-Monthan AFB. This plant community contains creosote bush and paloverde but has more prickly pear and cholla cacti. In some areas, an understory of the invasive buffelgrass is common.

In the developed, improved, and semi-improved areas of Davis-Monthan AFB the vegetation is typically mown grassland (non-irrigated) such as in the AMARG district, along roadways, and around the airfield. Irrigated grass areas are limited to recreational fields. Desert landscaping is used throughout the Base and

includes native Sonoran Desert species such as paloverde, mesquite, creosote bush, and a variety of cactus species, including saguaros.

3.8.2.2 Wildlife

Native fauna at Davis-Monthan AFB consists of species adapted for survival in the hot, dry environment and is typical of the Sonoran Desert ecosystem. The diversity of habitat available on Davis-Monthan AFB provides opportunities for some species and restricts others, depending on their capability and propensity to tolerate human activities. Although developed areas limit the amount of native habitat available to wildlife. the housing, grassy, and landscaped areas offer water, which attracts and supports a wide range of avifauna, rodents, insects, and those species that prey upon them. Warehouses, large enclosures, and open aircraft in the storage areas can be attractive to bat and bird species, as well as bobcats and covotes. Rodents burrow in open areas as well as beneath shrubs and rocks; resident and migratory avian species nest or roost in cacti, shrubs, and trees. The undeveloped area surrounding Atterbury Wash is a hot spot for local faunal species diversity due to the presence of seasonal water, the greater cover and density of native vegetation, and less human activity. Surveys have documented a wide variety of wildlife species (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a). Common mammals include coyote (Canis latrans), bobcat (Felis rufus), black-tailed jackrabbit (Lepus californicus), desert cottontail (Sylvilagus audubonii), Merriams kangaroo rat (Dipodomys merriami) and the round tailed ground squirrel (Spermophilus tereticaudus). More than 50 birds have been identified on the Base and common species include Gambel's quail (Callipepla gambelii). roadrunner (Geococcyx californianus), mourning dove (Zenaida macroura), cactus wren (Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus), and black-throated sparrow (Amphispiza bilineata). Common reptile species found in the area include the collared lizard (Crotaphytus sp.), desert spiny lizard (Sceloporus magister), greater earless lizard (Cophosaurus texanus), ornate tree lizard (Urosaurus ornatus), regal horned lizard (Phrynosoma solare), tiger whiptail (Aspidoscelis tigris), western banded gecko (Coleonyx variegatus), coachwhip (Coluber flagellum), gopher snake (Pituophis catenifer), and Mojave rattlesnake (Crotalus scutulatus). Invertebrates, including insects and spiders, are likely diverse across the Installation, as they are common in the Sonoran Desert (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a).

3.8.2.3 Threatened or Endangered Species and Other Protected Species

Surveys for endangered, threatened, candidate, and other protected species and their habitats have been performed within the Installation boundaries. No federally listed threatened or endangered species have been observed on Davis-Monthan AFB, nor does critical habitat exist within Davis-Monthan AFB (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a). The Installation manages threatened and endangered species proactively to prevent potential listings as well as conserve species that are legally protected or of concern at the state or federal level. Whenever practicable within the constraints of the military mission, Davis-Monthan AFB will avoid/minimize impacts to the species and manage their habitats found on Base.

Threatened or Endangered Species

The Monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*) is a candidate species being considered for protection under the ESA. Monarch butterflies feed on nectar from many flower species but breed only where there are milkweeds (*Asclepias* spp.). Most of the land within the Davis-Monthan AFB is developed and unlikely to provide significant habitat to Monarch butterflies (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a). In addition, milkweeds are unlikely to occur in undeveloped native vegetation.

The Pima pineapple cactus (*Coryphantha scheeri* var. *robustispina*) is listed as endangered and could potentially occur on Davis-Monthan AFB. The cactus does occur at several localities several miles from the Base (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a). However, surveys for the cactus were conducted by the Arizona Game and Fish Department (AZGFD) in 1990, on 400 acres in 2009, and again in 2015 in undeveloped areas. No Pima pineapple cacti were found.

The cactus ferruginous pygmy owl (*Glaucidium brasilianum cactorum*) is protected under MBTA but was recently proposed for listing as threatened under the ESA by the USFWS (86 FR 72547, December 22, 2021). The pygmy owl has not been observed on Davis-Monthan AFB but the thickets of paloverde trees,

mesquite, and saguaro cacti in and surrounding Atterbury Wash is potential suitable habitat. The cactus ferruginous pygmy owl frequently nests in existing cavities in saguaro cacti.

Migratory Birds

Avian surveys have documented over 50 species of birds on Davis-Monthan AFB, many of which are protected under the federal MBTA (see **Section 3.8.2.2**). Migratory bird species are most likely to occur in the undeveloped areas of the Base. Even though the developed areas of the ROI have been fragmented into small habitat patches, decreasing the quality of habitat available to migratory birds, landscaping, available water, buildings, and stored aircraft provide or create potential nesting and roosting habitat for birds. The Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*) typically occurs in wooded and riparian areas and hunts birds and small mammals. It has adapted to urban areas and nests on Davis-Monthan AFB including developed and undeveloped areas. There are active Great Horned Owl (*Bubo virginianus*) nests on Davis-Monthan AFB. Habitat for this species includes woodlands, canyons, stream sides, and deserts. There are historic nests in the AMARG district, including an old nest in the eastern part of the Base. Other possible nests are on or near the firing range.

Several migratory birds, also listed as Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) by the AZGFD (see next section), occur on Davis-Monthan AFB. These include the ferruginous hawk (*Buteo regalis*), American peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*), western burrowing owl *Athene cunicularia ssp. hypugaea*), and Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*).

The western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia* ssp. *hypugaea*) nests in burrows in open areas and prefers open plains, prairies, and fields. It is often seen by day standing on the ground and on fence posts. Burrowing owls do not dig burrows but rely on existing burrows created by other animals or artificial burrows created for them. Burrowing owls tend to use the same burrows over the course of multiple years as well as satellite burrows. There are approximately 50 active burrows on the Base each year in open areas of the developed portion of the Base, including the airfield. Davis-Monthan AFB coordinates with the AZGFD to monitor the burrowing owl.

Ferruginous hawks have been recorded during raptor surveys but are expected to occur only as migrants and winter residents. Marginal roosting and foraging habitat exist on the Base with the open fields in the AMARG area. Similarly, the peregrine falcon may also occur as a spring and fall migrant potentially preying on concentrations of rock doves (pigeons) (*Columbia livia*) on Base.

The Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*) prefers prairies, rangeland, desert, and brush areas. The species breeds in western North America and migrates to Argentina for the winter. The hawks build platform nests of branches and twigs and often reuse nests from previous seasons (up to 50-percent reuse). Minor disturbances in the vicinity of nests have occasionally led to nest abandonment (Ehrlich, 1988). Since 1997, one to two pairs have nested per year on the Base (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a).

Bald and golden eagles also are protected under the BGEPA. Neither species occurs on Davis-Monthan AFB and suitable habitat does not occur on Base.

Arizona Species of Greatest Conservation Need

The AZGFD identifies SGCN in its state wildlife action plan, *The Arizona Wildlife Conservation Strategy:* 2022-2032, based on seven criteria (AZGFD, 2022). SGCN species are considered vulnerable to future population declines or have experienced population declines and warrant special management attention. The list of SGCN species includes species protected by the ESA, MBTA, or the BGEPA, and species that may have no or limited regulatory protection. Davis-Monthan AFB has identified those SGCN species that may potentially occur on or in the vicinity of the Base (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a) (**Table 3-30**). The criteria for listing plants as a SGCN include being listed under the ESA or being highly safe guarded or salvage restricted under the Arizona Native Plant Law. Birds listed as SGCN are discussed in the previous section. SGCN that may occur in the vicinity of the Davis-Monthan AFB but have not been observed on the Base are not discussed. A description of those species can be found in the Davis-Monthan AFB *Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan* (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a).

Table 3-30.
Arizona Species of Greatest Conservation Need with the Potential to Occur within or near
Davis-Monthan AFB

Common Name	Scientific Name	State SGCN Tier Level/Status ^a	Known Occurrence on Davis-Monthan AFB			
Mammals						
California leaf-nosed bat	Macrotus californicus 2		No			
Mexican long-tongued bat	Choeronycteris mexicana	2	No			
Spotted bat	Euderma maculatum	2	No			
Western red bat	Lasiurus blossevillii 2		Yes			
Western yellow bat	Lasiurus xanthinus 2		No, but Likely			
Lesser long-nosed bat	Leptonycteris curasoae yerbabuenae	1	No			
Cave myotis	Myotis velifer 2		No, but Likely			
Birds						
Cactus ferruginous pygmy owl	Glaucidium brasilianum cactorum	1	Potential migratory			
Western burrowing owl	Athene cunicularia ssp. hypugaea)	2	Yes			
Ferruginous hawk	hawk Buteo regalis		Yes			
American peregrine falcon	erican peregrine falcon Falco peregrinus anatum		Yes			
Swainson's hawk	Buteo swainsoni	2	Yes			
Reptiles						
Sonoran Desert tortoise	Gopherus morafkai	1	No			
Gila monster	Heloderma suspectum	1	No			
Tucson shovel-nosed snake	Chionactis occipitalis klauberi	3 ^b	No			
Plants						
Saguaro	Carnegiea gigantea	AZ Native Plant Law	Yes, as a planted ornamental			
Needle-spined pineapple cactus	Echinomastus erectocentrus var. erectocentrus	ADA salvage restricted	No			

Source: Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a; AZGFD, 2022

a. Tier 1 = T&E species, former T&E species, species with conservation agreements or closed season species; Tier 2 = deemed vulnerable but do not match Tier 1 criteria; Tier 3 = unknown status and do not meet Tier 2 criteria, more information needed
 b. AZGFD lists *Chionactis occipitalis* as a Tier 3 SGCN, but not the *klauberi* subspecies.

ADA = Arizona Department of Agriculture; AZGFD = Arizona Game and Fish Department; SGCN = Species of Greatest Conservation Need; T&E = threatened and endangered

Of the bat species listed as SGCN, the western red bat (*Lasiurus blossevillii*) is one of 12 bat species confirmed to occur on Davis-Monthan AFB during acoustical surveys. It most likely occurs on Base from May through September. The western red bat's preferred habitat includes riparian and wooded areas with roost trees approximately 40 feet or taller. Although no wooded areas occur on Base, palm trees may provide roost sites.

None of the three reptile SGCN are known to occur on Davis-Monthan AFB. The AZGFD does not list the Tucson shovel-nosed snake subspecies as a SGCN, but only lists the full species of western or Mohave shovel-nosed snake (*Chionactis occipitalis*) as a Tier 3 SGCN (AZGFD, 2022).

The saguaro (*Carnegiea gigantea*), a tree-like cactus species, is protected under the Arizona Native Plant Law (Arizona Administrative Code Title 3, Article 11). Saguaros occur on well-drained soils, desert slopes, and flats, especially rocky slopes. They can reach heights of up to 50 feet. On Davis-Monthan AFB, saguaros occur at a low density, but occur both in developed areas as landscape plants and naturally in undeveloped areas.

3.8.2.4 Invasive Species

The primary pest management concern on Davis-Monthan AFB is the persistent spread of the invasive non-native buffelgrass (*Pennisetum ciliare*). Invasive species of secondary concern include fountain grass (*Pennisetum* sp.) and Lehmann's lovegrass (*Eragrostis lehmanniana*). Establishment of non-native grasses has created areas on Davis-Monthan AFB that are much more prone to wildfires.

3.8.3 Existing Conditions – Special Use Airspace

3.8.3.1 Vegetation

Native vegetation varies greatly by elevation and ecological diversity is extremely high. The Madrean Archipelago and the Sonoran Basin and Range comprise the two primary ecoregions under the SUA proposed for use. Vegetation within the Madrean Archipelago ecoregion is mostly grama-tobosa shrubsteppe in the basins and oak-juniper woodlands on the ranges, except at higher elevations where ponderosa pine is predominant (USEPA, 2013). The Sonoran Basin and Range contains scattered low mountains and large areas of paloverde-cactus shrub and giant saguaro cactus.

3.8.3.2 Wildlife

The Madrean Archipelago and the Sonoran Basin and Range ecoregions support a wide range of wildlife species. Some common bird and mammal species known to the region include Gambel's quail (*Lophortyx gambelii*), Gila woodpecker (*Melanerpes uropygialis*) roadrunner (*Geococcyx californianus*), curve-billed thrasher (*Taxostoma curvirostre*), mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*), cactus wren (Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus), black-throated sparrow (*Amphispiza bilineata*), White-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*), black bear (*Ursus americanus*), big horn sheep (*Ovis canadensis*), mountain lion (*Puma concolor*), coyote (*Canis latrans*), bobcat (*Felis rufus*), black-tailed jackrabbit (*Lepus californicus*), desert cottontail (*Sylvilagus auduboni*), Merriam's kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys merriami*), white-throated woodrat (*Neotoma albigula*), desert pocket mouse (*Perognathus penicillatus*) and round tailed ground squirrel (*Spermophilous tereticaudus*).

3.8.3.3 Threatened or Endangered Species

Federally listed threatened, endangered, and/or candidate mammal and bird species that could occur in the ROI are presented in **Table 3-31**. Plant, invertebrate, and fish species are not presented, as the Proposed Action would be unlikely to impact these species.

3.8.4 Environmental Consequences

3.8.4.1 Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation criteria for potential impacts on biological resources are based on the following:

- importance (i.e., legal, commercial, recreational, ecological, or scientific) of the resource;
- proportion of the resource that would be effected relative to its occurrence in the region;
- sensitivity of the resource to the proposed activities; and
- duration of potential ecological impact.

Adverse impacts on biological resources would occur if the Proposed Action or Alternatives negatively affect species or habitats of high concern over relatively large areas or if estimated disturbances cause reductions in population size or distribution of a species of high concern.

Table 3-31.
Threatened and Endangered Species Associated with the Special Use Airspace

Name	Scientific Name	Federal Listing Status				
Mammals						
Jaguar	Panthera onca	Endangered				
Ocelot	Felis pardalis	Endangered				
Sonoran pronghorn	Antilocapra americana sonoriensis	Endangered				
Birds						
California least tern	Sterna antillarum browni	Endangered				
Masked bobwhite	Colinus virginianus ridgwayi	Endangered				
Mexican spotted owl	Strix occidentalis lucida	Threatened				
Southwestern willow flycatcher	Empidonax traillii extimus	Endangered				
Yellow-billed cuckoo	Coccyzus americanus	Threatened				
Yuma clapper rail	Rallus longirostris yumanensis	Endangered				
Reptiles						
Narrow-headed gartersnake	Thamnophis rufipunctatus Threatened					
Northern Mexican gartersnake	Thamnophis eques megalops	Threatened				
Sonoyta Mud turtle	Kinosternon sonoriense longifemorale	Endangered				
New Mexican ridge-nosed rattlesnake	Crotalus willardi	Threatened				
Amphibians						
Chiricahua leopard frog	Rana chiricahuensis Threatened					
Sonora tiger salamander	Ambystoma tigrinum stebbinsi	Endangered				

As a requirement under the ESA, federal agencies must provide documentation that ensures that the agency's proposed actions would not adversely affect the existence of any threatened or endangered species. The ESA requires that all federal agencies avoid "taking" federally threatened or endangered species (which includes jeopardizing threatened or endangered species habitat). Section 7 of the ESA establishes a consultation process with USFWS that ends with either a "No Effect" determination by the federal agency or a Biological Opinion from the USFWS that the Proposed Action either would or would not jeopardize the continual existence of a species.

3.8.4.2 Proposed Action – Davis-Monthan AFB

Vegetation

The areas designated for construction activities under the Proposed Action are disturbed or developed. Due to the lack of intact native vegetation in the areas proposed for development and the minimal vegetation clearing associated with construction activities that would occur under the Proposed Action, no significant impacts to vegetation would be anticipated to occur.

<u>Wildlife</u>

The areas designated for construction activities under the Proposed Action have limited suitable habitat for wildlife. The developed portion of Davis-Monthan AFB, in which the projects proposed would be located, supports relatively common wildlife species such as small mammals.

Wildlife management on Davis-Monthan AFB focuses on maintaining existing habitat and ensuring the viability of existing populations. Clearing or mechanical disturbance of natural desert vegetation would not occur during project construction. Project areas would be surveyed for species of concern, particularly for western burrowing owls and raptor nests. Efforts to monitor burrowing owls on Davis-Monthan AFB and to conduct habitat, mammal, amphibian, and reptile surveys on Davis-Monthan AFB are ongoing.

Aircraft operations always have the potential for bird and other wildlife strikes. This can occur during takeoff and landing on and near active runways, as well as during flight at altitude. With an increase in air operations associated with the Proposed Action, there likewise would be an increased risk of BASH. However, Davis-Monthan AFB maintains a Wildlife Aircraft Strike Hazard Plan to manage BASH risk and implement measures to greatly reduce the likelihood for BASH incidents. The outcome of the BASH program is both increased safety for pilots and military aircraft as well as fewer incidents of injury or death to birds and other wildlife. As such, with the continued airfield management and risk reduction implementation measures associated with the BASH program discussed in **Section 3.3**, the impacts on birds and other wildlife from the addition of the aircraft associated with the Proposed Action would be minor.

Threatened or Endangered Species and Other Protected Species

No federally listed threatened or endangered species, including those obtained from the USFWS' IPaC tool (**Appendix A**), have been observed on Davis-Monthan AFB, nor does critical habitat exist within Davis-Monthan AFB.

Several state SGCN have the potential to occur at Davis-Monthan AFB. Coordination with environmental personnel should be conducted to avoid any SGCN and all known nesting sites for migratory birds during construction activities. The Proposed Action would not adversely affect any threatened or endangered species or their habitat and is therefore determined to have "no effect" on threatened or endangered species. To date, the USFWS has not commented on the Air Force's determination of "no effects"; however, such concurrence is not required to move forward (or not) with a proposed action. Correspondence with the USFWS is provided in **Appendix A**.

Invasive Species

Soil disturbance during construction would create potential sites for establishment of invasive species. However, most of these sites would be occupied by new buildings or hardscape (e.g., parking lots) and surrounded by maintained landscaping, thus preventing establishment of invasive species. Best management practices (BMPs), such as checking construction sites for presence of invasive plants, would be employed. If invasive plants are present, mechanical or chemical treatment of the plants, avoiding areas of invasive plants, and thoroughly cleaning and inspection of equipment and work clothing before moving off site would lessen the probability of spreading seeds throughout the Installation. No significant impacts involving invasive species would be anticipated to occur

3.8.4.3 Proposed Action – Special Use Airspace

Impacts to biological resources occurring under the SUA that would be utilized under the Proposed Action could result from overflights and associated noise, the use of munitions and flares, and bird-aircraft collisions. No sonic booms would occur due to the Proposed Action. Wildlife, especially avian species, utilizing the surrounding undeveloped areas below the SUA for foraging and breeding would normally be sensitive to increased noise impacts from military aircraft. Although there is variability in responses across species, many birds and wildlife have the ability to habituate to noise and movement from military aircraft (Grubb et al., 2013), and military aircraft operations have been ongoing at Davis-Monthan AFB for decades and are now part of the natural noise environment.

Most aircraft training operations would occur at altitudes above where most bird species would be migrating or foraging. As such, it is highly unlikely that aircraft movement within the SUA would adversely impact foraging birds or have a risk of BASH. Migrating birds could have a greater potential of encountering aircraft during training operations, especially those that migrate at altitudes above 2,000 feet AGL; however, given the large area and high altitude where training would occur, and the fact that most migratory song birds migrate at altitudes under 2,000 feet (Kerlinger, 2008), the likelihood for birds to encounter aircraft during training operations is low. Research has also shown that raptors (e.g., peregrine falcons, prairie falcons, golden eagles) showed very little response to low-level, mid-level, and high-level flyovers, resulting in no change in productivity (Ellis et al., 1991). Additionally, a study of low-level (500 feet) jet aircraft passes throughout the nesting season showed no differences detected in the nestling provisioning rates or subtle behavioral differences and noted that the results provided "little support for the hypothesis that low-altitude

jet aircraft overflights affect parental behavior of peregrine falcons" (Palmer et al., 2003). For these reasons, the increased aircraft movement under the Proposed Action would have negligible impacts on avian species.

An evaluation of military jet noise effects on captive desert ungulates (e.g., mule deer and mountain sheep) showed heart rate and behavioral responses to be limited in time (from 1 to 4 minutes) and also indicated that animals habituated to sound levels of even low-altitude aircraft (Weisenberger et al., 1996). Given the altitudes at which training would occur under the Proposed Action, the increased aircraft movement in the training areas would have no significant impacts on terrestrial animals.

Under the Proposed Action, chaff and flares would be used over the BMGR and Ruby Fuzzy MOAs. To minimize the potential for flares to ignite vegetation, flares would be employed at an altitude that prevents the flares from impacting the ground or structures. Chaff and flares would be used in compliance with the 355 WG Inflight Guide. Chaff and flare usage would be consistent with existing usage, and impacts would be negligible.

3.8.4.4 Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Action, in addition to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions on and off Davis-Monthan AFB (**Table 3-1**), would result in negligible impacts to biological resources. Construction activities would occur in previously disturbed areas with minimal natural resources present. The additional sorties and training actions under the Proposed Action would be an insignificant addition to the activities already occurring at Davis-Monthan AFB and the SUAs. Future actions at Davis-Monthan AFB, including the 492nd SOW Relocation EIS, would require additional Section 7 of the ESA consultation with the USFWS to evaluate impacts to threatened and endangered species. When considered in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Davis-Monthan AFB, the Proposed Action and Alternatives would result in minimal increases in BASH risk, wildfire risk, and noise disturbance to wildlife. These actions would not result in any adverse effects on threatened and endangered species. As such, no significant cumulative impacts on biological resources would be expected.

3.8.4.5 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, Davis-Monthan AFB's air operations would remain at current conditions. The 4th Gen missions would remain or be inactivated in place at Nellis AFB, which would create a capacity issue as 5th Gen missions continue to increase in scope and number. The infrastructure at Nellis AFB would continue to fall short of current or future mission needs and operate at or beyond capacity. There would be no changes to biological resources beyond baseline conditions.

3.9 WATER RESOURCES

3.9.1 Definition of the Resource

The primary water resource discussed in this section is surface water, which includes all lakes, ponds, rivers, streams, impoundments, and wetlands within a defined area or watershed. Surface water may be affected by stormwater infiltration and runoff generated during precipitation events. Groundwater and floodplains are also discussed.

Water resources are vulnerable to contamination and quality degradation. The CWA set the national policy objective to "restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters." The CWA provides the authority to establish water quality standards, control discharges into surface and subsurface waters (including groundwater), develop waste treatment management plans and practices, and issue permits for discharges. A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit under Section 402 of the CWA is required for discharges into navigable waters. The USEPA oversees the issuance of NPDES permits at federal facilities as well as water quality regulations (Section 401 of the CWA) for both surface and groundwater. The CWA also regulates the discharge of pollutants seaward for 3 miles.

As shown in **Table 3-2**, the ROI for effects to water resources is Davis-Monthan AFB and the Santa Cruz River Watershed.

3.9.2 Existing Conditions

3.9.2.1 Surface Water

Davis-Monthan AFB is intersected by the border of the Upper Santa Cruz and Rillito Creek Watersheds (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a). Patano Wash, a major tributary of the Rillito River, is located 3.5 miles northeast of the Base. Atterbury Wash, the primary drainage of the eastern part of the Base, drains into Patano Wash; Julian Wash, a drainage of the western portion of the Base, flows northwest into the Santa Cruz River (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a). Surface water resources at Davis-Monthan AFB include intermittent and ephemeral streams, floodplains, and several small ponds (**Figure 3-4**). Streams on Base include Kinnison Wash and Atterbury Wash, which drain the east side of the Base and eventually flow into the Rillito River (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2020), as well as a network of 17 sections and branches of unnamed streams. There are no perennial drainages within the boundaries of Davis-Monthan AFB. The low level and irregularity of rainfall results in erratic and potentially erosive flows in the local drainages. The Julian, Kinnison, and Atterbury washes are classified as intermittent, meaning they contain flowing water only at certain times of the year when provided by groundwater supply. The unnamed streams are classified as ephemeral, meaning they contain flowing water only during and immediately after precipitation events. Julian Wash, along with several of the unnamed ephemeral streams present on Base, is classified as a Water of the US and is therefore protected under the CWA (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2020).

3.9.2.2 Stormwater

Stormwater associated with Davis-Monthan AFB drains into 12 different drainage areas that discharge to various waterbodies in the city of Tucson via 16 outfalls in the form of surface channels and underground pipes. These outfalls are operated under an Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AZPDES) 2016 General Permit and an NPDES Stormwater General Permit, both of which are issued by the ADEQ Water Quality Division (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2018). None of the receiving waters associated with Davis-Monthan AFB's stormwater outfalls is listed as impaired; however, Lakeside Lake was included on Arizona's 2012–2014 Not Attaining Waters list due to levels of ammonia, chlorophyll-A, nitrogen, and phosphorus, as well as low levels of dissolved oxygen and a high pH (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2018). No discharges associated with Base activities that cause or contribute to exceedance of an applicable surface water quality standard have been identified, and benchmark monitoring of specific outfalls is conducted in accordance with the NPDES permit (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2018).

3.9.2.3 Groundwater

The primary source of water for Davis-Monthan AFB is the Tucson Basin Aquifer, which is the uppermost aquifer in the area occupied by the Base, located at approximately 400 feet below land surface (Tucson Water, 2018). The Base operates 11 wells that pump groundwater from the Tinaja Beds and the Fort Lowell Formation of the aquifer (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a) for human consumption.

3.9.2.4 Floodplains

Davis-Monthan AFB is located in an area categorized as Zone D, "Areas in which Flood Hazards are Undetermined." A recent study of floodplains associated with Julian, Kinnison, and Atterbury washes indicated the probable existence of a 100-year floodplain associated with Atterbury Wash where it passes through a southeastern portion of the Installation (**Figure 3-4**) (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a).

3.9.2.5 Wetlands

There are no wetlands on Davis-Monthan AFB (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a), and this EA does not discuss this resource further.





3.9.3 Environmental Consequences

3.9.3.1 Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation criteria for potential impacts on water resources are based on water availability, quality, and use; existence of floodplains; and associated regulations. Potential adverse impacts to water resources would occur if the Proposed Action results in the following:

- reduced water availability or supply to existing users,
- overdraft of groundwater basins,
- excess of safe annual yield of water supply sources,
- adverse effects to water quality,
- adverse effects to public health from creating or worsening health hazard conditions, or
- violation of established laws or regulations adopted to protect sensitive water resources.

3.9.3.2 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action within the ROI would involve the construction of several facilities to accommodate the relocation of six missions to Davis-Monthan AFB from Nellis AFB, including hangars, helicopter simulator facilities, and LOLAs.

Surface Water

Impacts to surface water, such as localized increases in stormwater runoff volume and intensity, can result from clearing and grading land and moving soil. Under the Proposed Action, new impervious surfaces would be created, potentially introducing pollutants into construction areas. However, in accordance with Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) 3-210-10, *Low Impact Development (LID)* (as amended, 2020) and EISA Section 438, any increase in surface water runoff as a result of the Proposed Action would be attenuated through the use of temporary and/or permanent drainage management features (e.g., use of porous materials, directing runoff to permeable areas, and use of detention basins to release runoff over time). The integration of LID concepts incorporates site design and stormwater management principles to maintain the site's predevelopment runoff rates and volumes to further minimize potential adverse impacts associated with increases in impervious surface area.

Prior to construction, the contractor would be required to obtain coverage under an AZPDES Construction General Permit by filing a Notice of Intent with ADEQ and prepare a site-specific stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) to manage stormwater discharges during and after construction until the area is revegetated. Upon revegetation, the contractor would file a Notice of Termination with ADEQ to terminate permit coverage. The Air Force would specify compliance with the stormwater discharge permit. Strict adherence to the SWPPP and the management actions identified for each construction site would reduce potential impacts to surface water resources.

Approximately 7 acres of soil would be disturbed during construction activities under the Proposed Action. Construction activities would take place on previously disturbed land adjacent to existing buildings and infrastructure. No activities associated with the Proposed Action would occur within or intersect any surface waters. However, these activities would have the potential to increase erosion and sedimentation of nearby surface waters during construction and for a brief period after due to temporary disturbance of soils.

As the Proposed Action would have the potential to disturb up to 7 acres of ground surface, Davis-Monthan AFB would be required to obtain a Construction Activity General Permit (CGP) under its 2016 General Permit, which regulates the Base's stormwater outfalls. This permit requires various controls and BMPs to reduce impacts on surface water through pollution prevention, and includes sedimentation and erosion controls, soil stabilization, and pollutant management. These BMPs would be implemented to prevent sediments and other pollutants from potentially entering nearby surface waters via Davis-Monthan AFB's

stormwater conveyance system. Therefore, impacts to surface water resources on Davis-Monthan AFB from ground-disturbing activities associated with the Proposed Action would be anticipated to be short term and minor.

There would be no expected impacts to surface water from operations. New facilities would be administrative in nature with no increase in water usage or wastewater particular to those facilities.

Stormwater

Under the Proposed Action, 391,000 ft² of new impervious surface area would be added to the Base as a result of the construction of new facilities. This increase in impervious surface area would be anticipated to result in a minor, long-term increase in stormwater runoff at Davis-Monthan AFB.

Stormwater infrastructure at Davis-Monthan AFB has the capacity to handle increases in runoff that would potentially result from increases in impervious surface area. Additionally, the Air Force contractors would follow BMPs outlined in the CGP, Stormwater Management Plan, and SWPPP to ensure that any potential adverse impacts to water resources due to stormwater runoff would be minimized to the greatest extent possible. These BMPs include continued monitoring and routine inspection of the handling and storage of presumed pollutants that have the potential to pollute stormwater runoff, including but not limited to pesticides, construction trash, and sediment (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2018).

<u>Groundwater</u>

Construction-related activities would create the potential for contaminants, mainly fuel, to leach or discharge to the Tucson Basin Aquifer. The Air Force contractor would follow BMPs designed to prevent polluted stormwater runoff, as well as BMPs to manage pollution prevention outlined in the AZDEQ CGP, to minimize the potential of chemicals entering the aquifer. There would be no expected impacts to groundwater from operations. New facilities would be administrative in nature with no increase in water usage or wastewater particular to those facilities. Therefore, the Proposed Action would be anticipated to have negligible, short-term, indirect impacts on groundwater.

Floodplains

The Proposed Action would not occur within the probable 100-year floodplain located in the vicinity of Atterbury Wash. The nearest activity under the Proposed Project is approximately 3.5 miles west. Therefore, no direct or indirect impacts relating to floodplains would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

3.9.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Action, in addition to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (**Table 3-1**), would not be expected to adversely impact water resources at Davis-Monthan. Construction activities would only occur in previously disturbed areas lacking surface water resources. Future actions at Davis-Monthan AFB, including the 492nd SOW Relocation EIS, most likely would be constructed on previously disturbed land, avoiding any water resources. As such, cumulative impacts to water resources from the Proposed Action would not be significant. When considered in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Davis-Monthan AFB, no significant cumulative effects to water resources would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

3.9.3.4 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, Davis-Monthan AFB's air operations would remain at current conditions. The 4th Gen missions would remain or be inactivated in place at Nellis AFB, which would create a capacity issue as 5th Gen missions continue to increase in scope and number. The infrastructure at Nellis AFB would continue to fall short of current or future mission needs and operate at or beyond capacity. There would be no changes to water resources beyond baseline conditions.

3.10 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

3.10.1 Definition of the Resource

Geological resources include geology, topography, and soils. Geology refers to the structure and configuration of surface and subsurface features. Characteristics of geology include geomorphology, subsurface rock types, and structural elements. Topography refers to the shape, height, and position of the land surface. Soil refers to the unconsolidated materials overlying bedrock or other parent material. Soils are defined by their composition, slope, and physical characteristics. Attributes of soil, such as elasticity, load-bearing capacity, shrink-swell potential, and erodibility, determine its suitability to support a particular land use.

Prime farmland, as defined by the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) in the Farmland Protection Policy Act (7 USC §§ 4201–4209), is land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops, and is available for these uses.

As shown in **Table 3-2**, the ROI for geological resources is Davis-Monthan AFB.

3.10.2 Existing Conditions

3.10.2.1 Geology

Davis-Monthan AFB is located in Arizona within the Tucson Basin, surrounded by the Tucson Mountains approximately 15 miles to the west, the Santa Catalina Mountains approximately 20 miles to the north, the Rincon Mountains approximately 10 miles to the east, and the Santa Rita Mountains approximately 25 miles to the south. These features are located within a larger geological unit known as the Basin and Range physiographic Province, characterized by northwest-to-southeast trending mountain ranges separated by wide alluvial basins. The Basin and Range Province extends from west Texas through southern New Mexico, southeastern and northwestern Arizona, northwestern Mexico, Nevada, western Utah, and part of southern California (National Park Service, 2019).

The Base is situated in an intermontane trough formed between the Tucson Mountains and the Rincon, Santa Catalina, and Santa Rita mountains, all within the Sonoran Desert. The Rincon and Santa Catalina mountain ranges are geologically a single metamorphic core complex and ranging in elevation from approximately 2,800 feet to 9,100 feet above sea level (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a).

The Tucson Mountains are a rugged, strongly dissected mountain ridge carved from uplifted, tilted, and faulted intrusive³ and extrusive⁴ igneous rock and sediments. Regionally, the oldest rocks are isolated blocks of Paleozoic limestone. Other rock types include rhyolite tuff, early Cretaceous fine-grained siltstones, sandstones, mudstones and granites, and middle Tertiary volcanics and basalts. The mountains are skirted by younger sedimentary and alluvial deposits that range from late Miocene to Quaternary periods (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a).

3.10.2.2 Topography

The terrain on Davis-Monthan AFB is generally flat, sloping downward southeast to northwest from an elevation of 2,950 feet to 2,550 feet above sea level. The Base has two significant sloping areas: one is a highway cut for Kolb Road and the other is Atterbury Wash, located in the eastern part of the Base. The slopes in these areas constitute constraints to development. The major landforms in the Sonoran Desert

³ Intrusive refers to rock that was formed by magma cooling deep below the earth's surface over thousands to millions of years (United States Geological Survey [USGS], 2022).

⁴ Extrusive refers to rock that was formed by magma cooling above or very near the earth's surface almost instantly (USGS, 2022).

are desert plains, conjoined alluvial fans (locally known as bajadas), and terraces (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a).

3.10.2.3 Soils

Figure 3-5 illustrates and **Table 3-32** summarizes the soils present at Davis-Monthan AFB in relation to the Proposed Action.

Map Unit Symbol	Name	Slope (%)	Drainage Rating	Acres in ROI	Percent of ROI
CaA	Cave soils and urban land	0–8	Well drained	182	1.7
HaA	Hantz loam	0–1	Well drained	183.2	1.7
MoA	Mohave soils and urban land	1–8	Well drained	5,667.0	53.7
PiA	Pinaleno-Stagecoach complex	5–16	Well drained	1140.7	10.8
PiB	Pits, dumps	N/A	N/A	36.1	0.3
SaA	Sahuarita soils, Mohave soils and urban land	1–5	Well drained	289.6	2.7
TuA	Tubac gravelly loam	1–8	Well drained	3,009.2	28.5
YaA	Yaqui fine sandy loam	1–3	Well drained	51.1	0.5

Table 3-32.Soil Types Associated with Davis-Monthan AFB

Source: USDA Web Soil Survey

N/A = not applicable; ROI = Region of Influence

Soils present at Davis-Monthan AFB primarily consist of Mohave soils and urban land, followed by Tubac gravelly loam, and Pinaleno-Stagecoach complex. Each of these soils is characterized by low to moderate slopes, efficient drainage, slight susceptibility to wind and water erosion,⁵ and medium runoff potential (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a). Most soils on Base have been previously disturbed, highly urbanized, or developed and used for military purposes.

3.10.2.4 Prime Farmland

Hantz loam soil is found on Davis-Monthan AFB and is considered to have the potential to be prime farmland soil if irrigated and either protected from flooding or not frequently flooded during the growing season.⁶ However, agriculture and irrigation are not current operations at Davis-Monthan AFB. Given Davis-Monthan AFB's historic use for military training, this soil would not be considered prime farmland or warrant future designation under the Farmland Protection Policy Act. Therefore, prime farmland is not carried forward for analysis.

3.10.3 Environmental Consequences

3.10.3.1 Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation criteria for potential impacts on geological resources are based on the following:

- substantial alteration of unique or valued geologic or topographic conditions;
- substantial soil erosion, sedimentation, and/or loss of natural function (e.g., compaction); and
- development on soils with characteristics that do not support the intended land use.

⁵ Data obtained from the USDA Web Soil Survey, Wind Erodibility Index, https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/

⁶ Data obtained from the USDA Web Soil Survey, Farmland Classification, https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/





3.10.3.2 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would involve the construction of five projects and disturb a total of 391,000 ft² of soil. Construction occurring under the Proposed Action would involve earthwork, including excavation, backfilling, and compacting of soils or fill materials on and immediately adjacent to the project sites. These activities would expose soils and increase their susceptibility to water and wind erosion. Inclement weather (e.g., rain or wind) would have the potential to increase the probability and severity of these potential effects.

<u>Geology</u>

The underlying geology of the area would not change under the Proposed Action. No direct or indirect impacts to geology would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

Topography

None of the projects under the Proposed Action would occur in areas that necessitate large-scale alteration of topography to accommodate construction. Any alteration of ground surfaces would be limited to basic construction activities such as compacting and excavating to prepare the ground for the siting of a structure. After placing and compacting reuse or fill soils, superficial soils would be graded to conform to local topography to maintain efficient drainage. Therefore, short-term, negligible impacts to topography would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

<u>Soils</u>

All construction projects implemented under the Proposed Action would involve soil-disturbing activities in areas consisting of Mohave soils and urban land, which is well drained and has a moderate potential for erosion (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a) (**Figure 3-5**). Slopes within the areas proposed for construction range from 1 to 8 percent, with a medium runoff potential. All project sites under the Proposed Action are generally suitable for development; however, the Air Force would validate soil conditions at each site prior to construction to address any limiting factors by management or design.

Under the Proposed Action, potential adverse effects on soils, including soil loss, contamination, and structural alteration, would be managed at an individual project level. When implementation of a project would disturb 1 or more acre of land, the construction contractor would obtain and comply with a CGP under the ADEQ-administered AZPDES program (see **Section 3.9**). The CGP would require the preparation and implementation of a site-specific SWPPP prior to construction, including BMPs and erosion and sediment control requirements (ADEQ, 2021). Implementation of BMPs would minimize impacts to soil resources, and projects would be designed and implemented in accordance with UFC 3-210-10 (as amended 2016) and EISA Section 438 (see **Section 3.9.3.2**) to minimize impacts to soil resources. With proper implementation of BMPs and adherence to relevant permitting, adverse impacts to soils resulting from the Proposed Action would be expected to be short term and minor.

Under the Proposed Action, reasonably foreseeable development plans and projects within and around the Tucson area also would be subject to regulation under the AZPDES permitting program. Depending on the nature and size of development, regulatory compliance measures would be in place to prevent or minimize potential effects on or from geological resources.

3.10.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Action, in addition to the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (**Table 3-1**), would have negligible cumulative impacts to soils during new construction activities, which would occur in previously disturbed areas. BMPs and compliance with permits would minimize the cumulative impact on soils. None of the projects listed in **Table 3-1** would have impacts to soils. Therefore, when considered in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Davis-Monthan AFB, no significant cumulative impacts to geological resources would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

3.10.3.4 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, Davis-Monthan AFB's air operations would remain at current conditions. The 4th Gen missions would remain or be inactivated in place at Nellis AFB, which would create a capacity issue as 5th Gen missions continue to increase in scope and number. The infrastructure at Nellis AFB would continue to fall short of current or future mission needs and operate at or beyond capacity. No soil would be disturbed, and there would be no change to geological resources beyond baseline conditions.

3.11 LAND USE

3.11.1 Definition of Resources

Land use describes the natural or developed condition of a given parcel of land or area and the type of functions and structures it supports. Land use designations vary by jurisdiction, but commonly used terms include residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, and recreation/open space. Land use is typically guided and regulated by management plans, policies, regulations, and ordinances that determine the type and extent of land use allowable in specific areas, including specially designated land uses or environmental conservation lands.

As shown in **Table 3-2**, the ROI for land use is Davis-Monthan AFB and local environs.

3.11.2 Existing Conditions

Davis-Monthan AFB is located in Pima County at the southeast corner of the city of Tucson, Arizona. The Base is approximately 10,700 acres in size, of which 54 percent is developed, 45 percent is undeveloped, and 1 percent is under easement and maintained by Pima County (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2020). The Base is best known as the location of the Air Force Material Command's 309th AMARG. Davis-Monthan AFB is divided into seven planning districts: Flightline Operations, North Planning, Housing Planning, Main Base Planning, AMARG Planning, Main Base South, and the munitions and range areas. The largest of these districts is the Flightline Operations District, which includes the runway, taxiways, aprons, and aircraft parking and hangar areas.

Figure 3-6 shows the land use categories on the Installation. Proposed construction locations would be on land designated as either open space or aircraft maintenance operations.

In regard to local land use planning, the Installation is bounded by residential development to the north and east, heavy and light industrial development to the west, and largely undeveloped land to the south and southwest with some residential development adjacent to the Base. There are two residential communities north of the Installation, Eastside and Terre Del Sol, and two to the south, Littletown and Drexel-Alvernon.

3.11.3 Environmental Consequences

3.11.3.1 Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation criteria for potential impacts on or from land use are based on the following:

- land use that would discontinue or substantially change existing or adjacent land use; and
- land use that would be inconsistent with applicable management plans, policies, regulations, and ordinances.




3.11.3.2 Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, construction of new facilities would occur within the existing boundaries of the Installation. Proposed construction locations would be on land designated as either open space or aircraft maintenance operations. Proposed construction that would occur on land designated as open space would be sited along the existing flight line and adjacent to other existing facilities. New construction activities would continue to be designed to meet the land use needs of the Base.

Under the Proposed Action, there would be an overall decrease of 7 acres in the total area exposed to noise levels of 65 dB DNL or greater outside of the Installation boundary. Existing land use under the Proposed Action would remain generally unchanged. No impacts to land use on Base or outside of the boundary of the Installation would be anticipated.

3.11.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Action, in addition to the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (**Table 3-1**), would not change land use, would be consistent with existing land use, and would not affect future adjacent land use. In addition, none of the reasonably foreseeable projects listed in **Table 3-1** would impact land use at Davis-Monthan AFB. Noise would continue to be modeled and evaluated for each future activity, building on previous modeling efforts. No impacts to land use on Base or outside of the boundary of the Installation would be anticipated. When considered in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Davis-Monthan AFB, no significant cumulative impacts to land use would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

3.11.3.4 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, Davis-Monthan AFB's air operations would remain at current conditions. The 4th Gen missions would remain or be inactivated in place at Nellis AFB, which would create a capacity issue as 5th Gen missions continue to increase in scope and number. The infrastructure at Nellis AFB would continue to fall short of current or future mission needs and operate at or beyond capacity. There would be no change to land use or designations beyond baseline conditions.

3.12 SOCIOECONOMICS

3.12.1 Definition of the Resource

Socioeconomics is the relationship between economics and social elements, such as population levels and economic activity. There are several factors that can be used as indicators of economic conditions for a geographic area: demographics, median household income, percentage of families living below the poverty level, employment, and housing data. Data on employment identify gross numbers of employees, employment by industry or trade, and unemployment trends. Data on industrial, commercial, and other sectors of the economy provide baseline information about the economic health of a region. Socioeconomic data are typically presented at county, state, and national levels to characterize baseline socioeconomic conditions in the context of regional, state, and national trends.

As shown in **Table 3-2**, the ROI for socioeconomics includes Davis-Monthan AFB and the surrounding environs (i.e., the city of Tucson and Pima County).

3.12.2 Existing Conditions

3.12.2.1 Population

The city of Tucson has experienced minor population growth since 2000 (**Table 3-33**), with growth rates lower than that of Pima County and the US. Tucson grew approximately 11.3 percent, compared to approximately 21.7 percent for the county, 37.4 percent for Arizona, and 15.3 percent for the US. According to the US Census Bureau. According to the US Census Bureau (USCB), Tucson's population was over

540,000 persons in 2019, and Pima County's population was over 1 million persons (USCB, 2022c). Of the total population of Arizona, about 7.7 percent reside in Tucson and about 15 percent reside in Pima County.

 Table 3-33.

 Populations in the ROI, Arizona, and the United States (2010–2019)

Geographic Area	2010	Average Annual Growth Rate 2000– 2010 (percent)	2019	Average Annual Growth Rate 2010– 2019 (percent)	Total Growth 2000–2019 (percent)
City of Tucson	520,116	0.7	541,482	0.4	11.3
Pima County	980,263	1.5	1,027,207	0.5	21.7
Arizona	6,392,017	2.2	7,050,299	1.1	37.4
United States	308,745,538	0.9	324,697,795	0.7	15.3

Source: USCB, 2001, 2004, 2012, 2022a, 2022c ROI = Region of Influence

There are nearly 14,000 active-duty military, dependents, Reserve/ANG, civilian, and contract employees associated with Davis-Monthan AFB (**Table 3-34**). Approximately 48.4 percent of active-duty military and their dependents live on Base (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2016a).

Table 3-34. Personnel at Davis-Monthan AFB in 2016

Personnel	Living On Base	Living Off Base	Totals
Active-Duty Military	2,870	2,873	5,743
Military Dependents	1,700	2,000	3,700
Reserve/ANG	0	1,804	1,804
Civilian and Contract Employees	0	2,688	2,688
Totals	4,570	9,365	13,935

Source: Davis-Monthan AFB, 2016a AFB = Air Force Base, ANG = Air National Guard

3.12.2.2 Employment

The annual average labor force in 2021 in Pima County was 480,903 persons, and the average unemployment rate was 5.0 percent (23,808 unemployed). The Pima County unemployment rate was marginally higher than the average unemployment rate for Arizona (4.9 percent) and was slightly lower than the 5.3-percent national average unemployment rate (US Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2022a, 2022b).

US Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) data and information on the county's largest employers show that employment in the area is dominated by the Government and Government Enterprises sector, followed closely by the Health Care and Social Assistance sector, which are also the nation's two largest employment sectors. The Government and Government Enterprises sector accounts for 17 percent of employment in Pima County, 11.8 percent of employment in the state of Arizona, and 12.6 percent of employment in the US, while the Health Care and Social Assistance sector accounts for 13.6 percent, 11.7 percent, 11.8 percent of employment in Pima County, Arizona, and the US, respectively (BEA, 2021).

The single largest employer in Pima County overall is the Air Force, employing approximately 13,830 persons. The Air Force is also the largest employer specifically within the Government and Government Enterprises sector, while Banner University Medical Center, Tucson Campus, is the largest employer in the Health Care and Social Assistance sector, employing approximately 5,380 persons (Maricopa Association of Governments, 2020).

3.12.2.3 Housing

USCB estimates show that housing vacancy rates in Pima County for both homeowner and rental housing in 2019 were above the national average, although the homeowner vacancy rate was only higher by 0.1 percent (**Table 3-35**). There are more than 26,000 vacant units in Pima County, with almost 50 percent of these units located within the city of Tucson (USCB, 2020a). The percentage of homes that are owner-occupied in Pima County (63.2) and in the city of Tucson (50.6) is below the US average of 64 percent, while the percentage of owner-occupied homes in Arizona (64.4) is higher than all three other geographies. Approximately 12 percent of the housing units in Pima County are vacant, reflecting the national percentage of 12.1 (USCB, 2020a).

Table 3-35. Housing

Description	City of Tucson	Pima County	Arizona	US
Total units	239,287	459,912	3,003,286	137,428,986
Owner-occupied	50.6%	63.2%	64.4%	64%
Renter-occupied	49.4%	36.8%	35.6%	36%
Vacant units	26,796	55,173	432,018	16,672,938
Homeowner vacancy rate ^a	1.5%	1.7%	1.9%	1.6%
Rental vacancy rate ^b	6.8%	6.8%	6.2%	6.0%
Median value ^c	\$155,300	\$184,100	\$225,500	\$217,500

Source: USCB, 2022b

Notes:

a Homeowner vacancy rate is the proportion of the homeowner inventory that is vacant "for sale."

b Rental vacancy rate is the proportion of the rental inventory that is vacant "for rent."

c Median value of owner-occupied units.

3.12.2.4 Schools

There are 11 major public school districts in the Tucson area, the largest of which is the Tucson Unified School District (TUSD) (DoD, 2022). The TUSD had an enrollment of approximately 42,000 students in the most recent fully recorded school year (2020–2021), a decrease in enrollment over the past several years (Arizona Department of Education, 2021). There are two schools on Base: Borman Elementary School and the Sonoran Science Academy, a private charter school (tuition-free) that offers classes for grades 6–12. Children associated with Davis-Monthan AFB also have access to Roberts Naylor K–8 school and Palo Verde High school, two TUSD neighborhood schools. However, they are free to attend any of the public schools in and around Tucson, as Arizona state law allows children to be enrolled in public schools outside of their local area based on available classroom space. Additionally, there are more than 40 private schools in and around Tucson, as well as a variety of charter schools, magnet schools, alternative and specialized education centers, and virtual learning opportunities (DoD, 2022).

3.12.3 Environmental Consequences

3.12.3.1 Evaluation Criteria

Consequences to socioeconomic resources were assessed in terms of the potential impacts on the local economy from implementation of the Proposed Action. The level of impact from expenditures associated with the Proposed Action was assessed in terms of direct impacts on the local economy and related impacts on other socioeconomic resources (e.g., housing, employment). The magnitude of potential impacts can vary greatly depending on the location of an action. For example, implementation of an action that creates 10 employment positions might be unnoticed in an urban area but might have significant impacts in a rural region. In addition, if potential socioeconomic changes from a proposed action resulted in substantial shifts in population trends or in adverse effects on regional spending and earning patterns, such effects might be considered adverse.

3.12.3.2 Proposed Action

Population

The requirements for an estimated additional 646 military, contract, and civilian personnel under the Proposed Action in Pima County would have a small impact on the region's population. Assuming all personnel relocated with family members to Pima County or Tucson, this would be a negligible increase in the county's population of over 1 million people and minor increase in the city's population of over 500,000 people, leading to minor, long-term impacts on the local or regional population.

Under the Proposed Action, construction of LOLA spaces, munitions and munitions support facilities, helicopter simulator facilities, and other unspecified facilities would result in a temporary increase of 20 to 50 construction personnel, which would have no impact on the socioeconomic condition on the region. No new in-migration regionally would be anticipated because there are enough existing construction personnel in Pima County to support the new construction.

Employment

The 646 additional military, contract, and civilian personnel would represent a 4.6-percent increase in the total persons permanently assigned to and working at Davis-Monthan AFB, where approximately 14,000 military and civilian personnel are currently employed. A 4.6-percent increase in the amount of people employed at the Base would not have an impact on the availability of employment in the region; personnel relocating would already be employed by the Air Force and would not compete for currently available positions that could be filled by the local workforce; however, it is possible that military dependents could join the local workforce.

Local construction personnel would be needed to complete construction actions associated with the Proposed Action, which would have the potential to create a short-term beneficial impact on regional employment. Therefore, no adverse impacts on employment would be expected to occur under the Proposed Action.

<u>Housing</u>

Adequate housing is available in the ROI to accommodate the increase in personnel; therefore, no adverse impacts on housing would be expected to occur under the Proposed Action.

<u>Schools</u>

Due to Arizona's open enrollment policy and the number of schools available in the area surrounding the Base, there are adequate educational resources available in the ROI to accommodate the increase in personnel; therefore, no adverse impacts on educational resources would be expected to occur under the Proposed Action.

3.12.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Action, in addition to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions on and off Davis-Monthan AFB (**Table 3-1**), would not result in an adverse cumulative impact to the region's population, employment, housing, or educational opportunities. Construction projects could result in a cumulative beneficial impact, as local sales and payroll taxes would increase. Any potential beneficial impact on employment would be short term and limited to the construction period and would not have cumulative effects. Construction associated with the Davis-Monthan Multiple Development Projects EA would have beneficial cumulative impacts on housing because it would provide additional on-Base housing. Further, while the number of employees could increase at Davis-Monthan AFB due to some reasonably foreseeable actions listed in **Table 3-1**, this increase would not be expected to result in a substantial change in the regional population. When considered in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Davis-Monthan AFB, no significant cumulative impacts to socioeconomic resources would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

3.12.3.4 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, Davis-Monthan AFB's air operations would remain at current conditions. The 4th Gen missions would remain or be inactivated in place at Nellis AFB, which would create a capacity issue as 5th Gen missions continue to increase in scope and number. The infrastructure at Nellis AFB would continue to fall short of current or future mission needs and operate at or beyond capacity. There would be no change to socioeconomic conditions beyond baseline conditions.

3.13 Environmental Justice and Protection of Children

3.13.1 Definition of the Resource

Federal agencies are directed by EOs to address disproportionate environmental and human health effects in minority and low-income communities and to identify and assess environmental health and safety risks to children.

EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, pertains to environmental justice issues and relates to various socioeconomic groups and disproportionate impacts that could be imposed on them. This EO requires that federal agencies' actions substantially affecting human health or the environment do not exclude persons, deny persons benefits, or subject persons to discrimination because of their race, color, or national origin. EO 12898 was enacted to ensure the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Consideration of environmental justice concerns includes race, ethnicity, and the poverty status of populations in the vicinity of a proposed action.

EO 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks, states that each federal agency

"(a) shall make it a high priority to identify and assess environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children; and (b) shall ensure that its policies, programs, activities, and standards address disproportionate risks to children that result from environmental health risks or safety risks."

For the purposes of this analysis, minority populations are defined as Alaska Natives and American Indians, Asians, Blacks or African-Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders or persons of Hispanic origin (of any race); low-income populations include persons living below the poverty threshold as determined by the USCB; and youth populations are children under the age of 18 years.

As shown in **Table 3-2**, the ROI for environmental justice and the protection of children is Davis-Monthan AFB and the surrounding environs (i.e., the city of Tucson and Pima County).

Minority, low-income, and youth populations that could be disproportionately impacted by the project are addressed for the ROI and are compared with those populations in Arizona and the US. For further discussion of the specific Native American tribes associated with the ROI, see **Section 3.14** of this EA.

3.13.2 Existing Conditions

An evaluation of minority and low-income populations in Pima County and four CTs on the western side and one southern sides of the Base forms a baseline for the evaluation of the potential for disproportionate impacts on these populations from the Proposed Action (**Table 3-36**). Only CTs on the western and southern sides of the Base were included in the baseline due to potential noise impacts; other CTs surrounding the Installation would experience no change in noise impacts.

In 2019, Arizona, Pima County, and the city of Tucson had a higher percentage of minorities in the population and a significantly higher percentage of the population that was Hispanic or Latino compared to

the US (USCB, 2022a). All four CTs evaluated have a higher minority population and percent Hispanic or Latino than Pima County.

Area	Total Population	Percent Minority	Percent Hispanic or Latino ^b	Percent Below Poverty	Percent Youth ^c	Percent Elderly
CT 20, Pima County	6,640	59.7	64.7	18.4	20.3	20.7
CT 21 Pima County	6,205	73.1	77.4	24.0	31.6	13.3
CT 41.18 Pima County	5,274	54.1	53.8	11.0	34.9	9.7
CT 40.73 Pima County	6,077	44.2	27.9	8.6	31.4	20.7
City of Tucson	541,482	56.1	43.6	22.5	21.2	14.3
Pima County	1,027,207	48.3	37.2	16.8	21.1	19.2
State of Arizona	7,050,299	45.3	31.3	15.1	23.2	17.1
United States	324,697,795	39.3	18	13.4	22.6	15.6

 Table 3-36.

 Total Population and Populations of Concern^a

Source: USCB, 2022a, 2022d

Notes:

a Bold text indicates environmental justice populations.

b Hispanic and Latino denote a place of origin.

c The US Census Bureau categorizes all people under the age of 18 as "youth"; this EA uses "children" for the same group. CT = census tract

Over the same period, the city of Tucson had a notably higher rate of poverty than Pima County, Arizona, and the US, while the rates of poverty in Pima County and the state of Arizona were higher than the rates of poverty in the US, but not drastically so. As can be seen in **Table 3-36**, CTs 20 and 21 reported a percentage of the population below the poverty level at a higher rate than that of Pima County, Arizona, and the US, while CT 21 also had a higher percentage of the population below poverty than the city of Tucson.

The percentage of children in the city of Tucson was negligibly higher than the percentage of children in Pima County, slightly lower than the percentage in the state of Arizona and the overall US (see **Table 3-36**) (USCB, 2022d). The percentage of children in CTs 21, 40.73, and 41.18 were higher than Pima County and Tucson. Both CTs 20 and 40.73 had a higher percentage of elderly population than Pima County

3.13.3 Environmental Consequences

3.13.3.1 Evaluation Criteria

Environmental justice analysis applies to potential disproportionate and adverse effects on minority, lowincome, and youth populations. Environmental justice issues could occur if an adverse environmental or socioeconomic consequence to the human population fell disproportionately upon minority, low-income, or youth populations.

3.13.3.2 Proposed Action

Because the proposed realignment and relocation actions under the Proposed Action would not impact the availability of housing, community resources, and community services, the Proposed Action would not disproportionately affect the availability of these resources to minorities, low-income populations, or children in the vicinity of Davis-Monthan AFB.

Under the Proposed Action, there would be an overall decrease of acreage outside of the Installation boundary exposed to 65 dB DNL. No off-Base schools or child-care facilities would be exposed to DNL of 65 dB or greater under baseline conditions at Davis-Monthan AFB. Additionally, no hospitals, parks, or libraries would be exposed to DNL of 65 dB or greater.

Based on the above information, disproportionally high and adverse impacts to minority, low-income, or youth populations would not be expected to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

3.13.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Action, in addition to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions on and off Davis-Monthan AFB (**Table 3-1**), would not have a disproportionate cumulative impact on minority and lowincome populations or children. When considered in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Davis-Monthan AFB, no significant cumulative impacts to environmental justice populations would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

3.13.3.4 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, Davis-Monthan AFB's air operations would remain at current conditions. The 4th Gen missions would remain or be inactivated in place at Nellis AFB, which would create a capacity issue as 5th Gen missions continue to increase in scope and number. The infrastructure at Nellis AFB would continue to fall short of current or future mission needs and operate at or beyond capacity. There would be no impact to minority, low-income, or youth populations beyond baseline conditions.

3.14 CULTURAL RESOURCES

3.14.1 Definition of the Resource

Cultural resources are any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object considered important to a culture or community for scientific, traditional, religious, or other purposes. These resources are protected and identified under several federal laws and EOs including the *Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974* (54 USC § 312501–312508 et seq.), the *American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978* (42 USC § 1996), the *Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979*, as amended (16 USC §§ 470aa–470mm), the *Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990* (25 USC §§ 3001–3013), and the NHPA, as amended (54 USC § 300101 et seq) and its implementing regulations (36 CFR Part 800). The NHPA requires federal agencies to consider effects of federal undertakings on historic properties prior to deciding or taking an action and integrate historic preservation values into their decision-making process. Federal agencies fulfill this requirement by completing the NHPA Section 106 consultation process, as set forth in 36 CFR Part 800. NHPA Section 106 also requires agencies to consult with federally recognized American Indian tribes with a vested interest in the undertaking. NHPA Section 106 requires all federal agencies to seek to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects to historic properties (36 CFR § 800.1(a)).

Cultural resources include the following subcategories:

- Archaeological (i.e., prehistoric or historic sites where human activity has left physical evidence of that activity, but no structures remain standing);
- Architectural (i.e., buildings, structures, groups of structures, or designed landscapes that are of historic or aesthetic significance); and
- Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) (resources of traditional, religious, or cultural significance to American Indian tribes).

Significant cultural resources are those listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or determined to be eligible for listing. To be eligible, properties must be 50 years old and have national, state, or local significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. They must possess sufficient integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association to convey their historical significance and meet at least one of four criteria for evaluation:

- 1) Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history (Criterion A);
- 2) Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past (Criterion B);
- 3) Embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values, or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction (Criterion C); and/or
- 4) Have yielded or be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history (Criterion D).

Properties that are less than 50 years old can be considered eligible for the NRHP under Criterion G if they possess exceptional historical importance. Those properties must also retain historic integrity and meet at least one of the four NRHP criteria (Criteria A, B, C, or D). The term "historic property" refers to National Historic Landmarks, NRHP-listed, and NRHP-eligible cultural resources.

For cultural resources analyses, the ROI is defined by the APE. The APE is defined as the "geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist," (36 CFR § 800.16(d)) and thereby diminish their historic integrity. The direct and indirect APE for this EA is 50 meters and 800 meters around each project location, respectively (**Figure 3-7**). For the purposes of this EA, project locations are defined as the buildings identified for activities under the Proposed Action.

3.14.2 Existing Conditions – Davis-Monthan AFB

3.14.2.1 Archaeological Sites

Approximately 20 archaeological sites eligible for NRHP listing have been identified at Davis-Monthan AFB (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a). The highest potential for archaeological sites is at the Atterbury Wash system, located in the eastern portion of the Installation (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021b).

An intensive cultural resources survey was conducted from 14 February 2017 to 9 June 2017 on 3,180 acres and included a site assessment of 25 previously recorded archaeological sites at Davis-Monthan AFB. The survey identified four archaeological sites within the APE not eligible for NRHP listing: 1) AZ BB:13:908, 2) AZ BB:13:916, 3) AZ BB:13:920, and 4) AZ BB:13:940 (Statistical Research, Inc., 2017).

3.14.2.2 Historic Architectural Properties

Davis-Monthan manages 433 buildings constructed prior to 1991. Thirty-nine structures were determined eligible for NRHP listing and are managed as such for all future undertakings. These eligible architectural resources consist of 11 buildings in the MSA, Hangar 8030, 27 structures part of the Titan Missile Complex, and Titan Missile Site 12 (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021b). As shown in **Figure 3-7**, no NRHP-listed or NRHP-eligible building is located within the direct or indirect APE for the Proposed Action.

3.14.2.3 Traditional Cultural Properties

TCPs may include traditionally used plants and animals, trails, and certain geographic areas. Types of resources that have been specifically identified in recent studies include, but are not limited to, rock art sites; "power" rocks and locations; medicine areas; and landscape features such as specific peaks or ranges, hot springs, meadows, valleys, and caves. No TCPs, sacred sites, human remains, associated funerary objects, unassociated funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony have been identified or recovered at Davis-Monthan AFB.



FIGURE 3-7 Cultural Resources

Direct Area of Potential Effects (50 m)

Indirect Area of Potential Effects (800 m)

0.4

Installation Boundary

Proposed Projects

0

Imagery: ESRI, 2021 Coordinate System: NAD 83 UTM Zone 12N

0.8 ⊐ Mile



3.14.3 Existing Conditions – Special Use Airspace

Table 3-37 presents the number of NRHP-listed sites and Native American lands under Davis-Monthan AFB training airspace. The training airspace overlies at least part of 10 Arizona counties (Apache, Cochise, Gila, Graham, Maricopa, Navajo, Pima, Pinal, Santa Cruz, and Yuma) and 2 New Mexico counties (Hidalgo and Luna). One-hundred eighteen NRHP-listed properties have been identified under Davis-Monthan AFB airspace. Three Native American tribes—Fort Sill Apache Tribe of Oklahoma, San Carlos Apache, and the Tohono O'odham Nation—own land under the airspace proposed for use. No other known traditional cultural resources have been identified under the airspace associated with the Proposed Action. Other cultural resources could exist, but the exact location of some traditional cultural resources is confidential. Mount Graham is a TCP as identified by the Apache Tribes of Arizona and is located in the Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci MOAs (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021b).

Airspace Designation	Number of NRHP Properties Under Airspace	Native American Lands Under the Airspace
Jackal MOA	31	Fort Sill Apache Tribe of Oklahoma and San Carlos Apache
Outlaw MOA	39	San Carlos Apache
R-2301E	1	None
R-2303A/B/C	8	None
Ruby and Fuzzy MOAs	2	Tohono O'odham Nation
Sells 1 and Low MOAs; R-2304 & R-2305	10	Tohono O'odham Nation
Tombstone A/B/C MOA	27	None

Table 3-37. NRHP-Listed Sites and Native American Reservation Lands Under Training Airspace

MOA = Military Operations Area; NRHP = National Register of Historic Places

3.14.4 Environmental Consequences

3.14.4.1 Evaluation Criteria

Adverse impacts on cultural resources would occur if the Proposed Action results in the following:

- physically altering, damaging, or destroying all or part of a resource;
- altering characteristics of the surrounding environment that contribute to the resource's significance;
- introducing visual or audible elements that are out of character with the property or alter its setting;
- neglecting the resource to the extent that it deteriorates or is destroyed; or
- the sale, transfer, or lease of the property out of agency ownership (or control) without adequate enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure preservation of the property's historic significance.

For the purposes of this EA, an impact is considered significant if it alters the integrity of a NRHP-listed, NRHP-eligible, or potentially eligible resource or potentially impacts TCPs.

3.14.4.2 Proposed Action – Davis-Monthan AFB

Archaeological Sites

Under the Proposed Action, five new buildings including two helicopter simulators would be constructed on the Installation. The two helicopter simulators would be constructed to the east and west of Building 4382. The 58 RQS facility would be constructed just east of Building 4868, and the two 88 TES buildings would be constructed southeast of the runway. Archaeological sites not eligible for NRHP listing are located within

the 800-meter indirect APE for all the proposed new construction. However, all construction would occur on land that has been disturbed from past and ongoing mission activities. The SHPO concurred with Davis-Monthan AFB's "no adverse effects" determination (**Appendix A**).

Historic Architectural Properties

No demolition or renovation activities would be implemented under the Proposed Action. No NRHP-listed or NRHP-eligible buildings are located within the direct or indirect APE for the Proposed Action. The construction of the five proposed facilities on the Installation would not be expected to have an impact on historic properties. The SHPO concurred with Davis-Monthan AFB's "no adverse effects" determination (**Appendix A**).

Traditional Cultural Properties

No TCPs, sacred sites, human remains, associated funerary objects, unassociated funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony have been identified or recovered on Davis-Monthan AFB. Therefore, construction of the five proposed facilities on the Installation would not be expected to have an impact on TCPs.

3.14.4.3 Proposed Action – Special Use Airspace

Implementation of the Proposed Action would result in an increase in the annual sorties conducted in the airspace proposed for use. However, the increase in noise would be negligible and well below 65 dBA. The increase in noise level due to the escalation in HH-60 operations likely would be imperceptible against the background noise from other jet aircraft (e.g., F-16, F-35) operations within the airspaces

No impacts to historic properties under the airspace would be expected. No supersonic flights would be included as part of the Proposed Action and the increase in overall noise would be negligible.

Use of ordnance and flares would continue in areas already used for these activities. No additional ground disturbance would occur. Flare and ordnance use is not expected to impact historic properties under the airspace. Existing use of flares and ordnance is not known to have impacted these resources; therefore, the continued use of flares and ordnance under the Proposed Action would not be expected to result in any new impacts.

The Proposed Action would not be expected to result in impacts on TCPs. Mount Graham, located within the Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci MOAs, is a TCP according to the Apache Tribes of Arizona, and the Air Force would continue to avoid overflights of this resource (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021b).

3.14.4.4 Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Action, in addition to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions on and off Davis-Monthan AFB (**Table 3-1**), would not impact cultural resources. Additional facility construction, renovation, or demolition in the future would need to be evaluated for impacts to cultural resource and would require consultation with tribes and the SHPO. Any future changes to the airspace, including an increase in aircraft operations and associated noise levels, could have the potential to impact cultural resources under that airspace. Any future project listed in **Table 3-1** involving airspace would require additional tribal consultation. When considered in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions, no significant cumulative impacts to cultural resource would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

3.14.4.5 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, Davis-Monthan AFB's air operations would remain at current conditions. The 4th Gen missions would remain or be inactivated in place at Nellis AFB, which would create a capacity issue as 5th Gen missions continue to increase in scope and number. The infrastructure at Nellis AFB

would continue to fall short of current or future mission needs and operate at or beyond capacity. No cultural resources would be impacted beyond baseline conditions.

3.15 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND WASTES, TOXIC SUBSTANCES, AND CONTAMINATED SITES

3.15.1 Definition of the Resource

CERCLA, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) and *Toxic Substances Control Act* (as implemented by 40 CFR Part 761), defines HAZMAT as any substance with physical properties of ignitability, corrosivity, reactivity, or toxicity that might cause an increase in mortality, serious irreversible illness, and incapacitating reversible illness, or that might pose a substantial threat to human health or the environment. The OSHA is responsible for the enforcement and implementation of federal laws and regulations pertaining to worker health and safety under 29 CFR Part 1910. OSHA also includes the regulation of HAZMAT in the workplace and ensures appropriate training in their handling.

The Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended by RCRA, which was further amended by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984, defines hazardous wastes as any solid, liquid, contained gaseous, or semi-solid waste, or any combination of wastes, that pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or the environment. In general, both HAZMAT and hazardous wastes include substances that, because of their quantity, concentration, physical, chemical, or infectious characteristics, might present substantial danger to public health and welfare or the environment when released or otherwise improperly managed.

Under Air Force Policy Directive (AFPD) 32-70, *Environmental Considerations in Air Force Programs and Activities*, the Air Force is committed to performing the following actions:

- cleaning up environmental damage resulting from its past activities,
- meeting all environmental standards applicable to its present operations,
- planning its future activities to minimize environmental impacts,
- responsibly managing the irreplaceable natural and cultural resources it holds in public trust, and
- eliminating pollution from its activities wherever possible.

AFMAN 31-1067, *Water and Fuel Systems*, implements AFPD 32-70 and identifies compliance requirements for underground storage tanks (USTs) and aboveground storage tanks (ASTs), and associated piping, that store petroleum products and hazardous substances. Evaluation of HAZMAT and hazardous wastes focuses on USTs and ASTs as well as the storage, transport, and use of pesticides, fuels, oils, and lubricants. Evaluation might also extend to generation, storage, transportation, and disposal of hazardous wastes when such activity occurs at or near the project site of a proposed action. In addition to being a threat to humans, the improper release of HAZMAT and hazardous wastes can threaten the health and wellbeing of wildlife species, botanical habitats, soil systems, and water resources. In the event of HAZMAT or hazardous waste release, the extent of contamination would vary based on type of soil, topography, weather conditions, and water resources.

AFMAN 32-7002, *Environmental Compliance and Pollution Prevention*, establishes procedures and standards that govern management of HAZMAT throughout the Air Force. It applies to all Air Force personnel who authorize, procure, issue, use, or dispose of HAZMAT, and to those who manage, monitor, or track any of those activities.

Through the Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) initiated in 1980, a subcomponent of the Defense ERP that became law under SARA (formerly the Installation Restoration Program), each DoD installation is required to identify, investigate, and clean up hazardous waste disposal or release sites. Remedial activities for ERP sites follow the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments under the RCRA Corrective Action Program. The ERP provides a uniform, thorough methodology to evaluate past disposal sites, control

the migration of contaminants, minimize potential hazards to human health and the environment, and clean up contamination through a series of stages until it is decided that no further remedial action is warranted.

Description of ERP activities provides a useful gauge of the condition of soils, water resources, and other resources that might be affected by contaminants. It also aids in identification of properties and their usefulness for given purposes (e.g., activities dependent on groundwater usage might be foreclosed when a groundwater contaminant plume remains to complete remediation).

As shown in **Table 3-2**, the ROI for this resource is Davis-Monthan AFB. Because the Proposed Action does not involve renovation or demolition activities, asbestos and lead-based paint are not discussed further herein.

3.15.2 Existing Conditions

Davis-Monthan AFB is classified as a large-quantity generator. ADEQ regulates hazardous waste generated, stored, transported, or disposed of by Davis-Monthan AFB under authority granted by the USEPA. Typical hazardous wastes generated on Base include flammable solvents, contaminated fuels and lubricants, paint/coating, stripping chemicals, waste oils, blast media, waste paint-related materials, and other miscellaneous wastes.

Hazardous wastes at Davis-Monthan AFB are managed in accordance with its Hazardous Waste Management Plan (Davis- Monthan AFB, 2017a). This plan covers the management of hazardous wastes from the point the material becomes a hazardous waste to the point of ultimate disposal, as required by federal and state laws and regulations. In 2019, the Base generated approximately 45 pounds of hazardous waste, which was disposed of at permitted disposal facilities off Base.

The Davis-Monthan AFB Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures Plan outlines the procedures to prevent, control, and/or mitigate releases of oil and other petroleum substances. Davis-Monthan AFB made a determination under 40 CFR § 112.20(e), as recorded in the Certification of Applicability of Substantial Harm Criteria, that the facility does not pose a risk of substantial harm. Therefore, a facility response plan is not required for Davis-Monthan AFB (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2018). The Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures Plan and Installation Emergency Management Plan address roles, responsibilities, and response actions for all major spills (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2017b).

Davis-Monthan AFB has 11 ASTs with capacities greater than 10,000 gallons. These ASTs are located throughout the Installation and are used to store Jet-A, diesel oil, and used oil. Davis-Monthan AFB also manages 39 USTs. The total Jet-A storage capacity at Davis-Monthan AFB is approximately 8,800,000 gallons (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2018). Davis-Monthan AFB receives fuel through a 6-inch commercial pipeline or by commercial tank trucks if the pipeline is inoperative.

There are 55 ERP sites at Davis-Monthan AFB, of which 43 are closed, 8 are no further response action planned, and 4 are active sites. Environmental response actions at Davis-Monthan AFB are planned and executed under the ERP, consistent with CERCLA, RCRA, and other applicable laws. Davis-Monthan AFB is not listed on the USEPA's National Priorities List (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2017c).

Davis-Monthan AFB no longer uses firefighting foam containing perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS). In 2016, Davis-Monthan transitioned from the legacy formula of aqueous film-forming foam that contains no PFOS and only trace amounts of PFOA, and is not used in training activities. In 2019, PFOS and PFOA were detected at 935 parts per trillion and 14,400 parts per trillion at two wells located along the northern boundary of the Base.

3.15.3 Environmental Consequences

3.15.3.1 Evaluation Criteria

Impacts on HAZMAT management would be considered adverse if a federal action resulted in noncompliance with applicable federal and state regulations or increased the amounts generated or

procured beyond current Davis-Monthan AFB waste management procedures and capacities. Impacts on the ERP sites would be considered adverse if the federal action disturbed (or created) contaminated sites resulting in negative effects on human health or the environment.

3.15.3.2 Proposed Action

Implementation of the Proposed Action at Davis-Monthan AFB would not add any new HAZMAT that would exceed the Base's current hazardous waste processes. Existing procedures for the centralized management of the storage, distribution, use, reuse, recycling, and disposal of HAZMAT through the Base Hazardous Materials Storage Facility are adequate to accommodate the changes anticipated under the Proposed Action. Construction waste would only be generated due to new construction projects since no demolition or renovation activities are proposed. No construction activities would occur within identified ERP sites; therefore, there would be no impacts to those sites. Construction also would not interact with PFOS and PFOA.

3.15.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Action, in addition to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (**Table 3-1**) on and off Davis-Monthan AFB, would result in negligible impacts related to HAZMAT and hazardous wastes. Any future project listed in **Table 3-1** requiring additional facility construction in the future would need to be evaluated for impacts to HAZMAT and hazardous wastes. When considered in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Davis-Monthan AFB, no significant cumulative impacts to HAZMAT, hazardous wastes, toxic substances, and contaminated sites would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

3.15.3.4 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, Davis-Monthan AFB's air operations would remain at current conditions. The 4th Gen missions would remain or be inactivated in place at Nellis AFB, which would create a capacity issue as 5th Gen missions continue to increase in scope and number. The infrastructure at Nellis AFB would continue to fall short of current or future mission needs and operate at or beyond capacity. There would be no change in management or use of HAZMAT, hazardous wastes, toxic substances, and contaminated sites beyond baseline conditions.

3.16 INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORTATION, AND UTILITIES

3.16.1 Definition of Resource

Infrastructure consists of the systems and structures that enable a population in a specified area to function. Infrastructure is wholly man-made, with a high correlation between the type and extent of infrastructure and the degree to which an area is characterized as developed. Infrastructure components include transportation and utility systems, solid waste management, and stormwater infrastructure. The availability of infrastructure and its capacity to support more users, including future development of an area, are generally regarded as essential to continued economic growth.

Transportation is defined as the system of roadways, highways, and transit services that provide ingress/egress from or to a particular location, as well as access to regional goods and services. Utilities include electrical, natural gas, potable water, sanitary sewage/wastewater, stormwater conveyance, and communications systems. Solid waste management primarily relates to landfill capacity for disposal of nonhazardous solid waste (e.g., construction waste) generated in an area or by a population. Stormwater infrastructure includes the man-made conveyance systems that function in tandem with natural drainages to collect and control the rate of surface runoff during and after a precipitation event. In urbanized areas, stormwater that is not discharged to a waterbody is conveyed to sanitary sewers, systems that collect, move, and treat liquid waste prior to its discharge back into the environment.

The ROI for infrastructure, transportation, and utilities is Davis-Monthan AFB and the external infrastructure components and services relied upon to operate the Base.

3.16.2 Existing Conditions

3.16.2.1 Transportation

Davis-Monthan AFB is located in the southeast of Tucson, Arizona within Pima County. The nearest highways to the Installation are Interstate 10 (I-10) and I-19. I-10 runs north/south to the west of the Installation and connects traffic to Phoenix, Arizona, while I-19 runs north/south to the southwest of the Base and connects traffic to the US/Mexican border.

Access to the Base is via one of four gates. The main gate is on Craycroft Road with additional gate access on Swan, Wilmot, and Irvington Roads. Craycroft Road extends generally north to south through the Main Base and provides the main entry point to the Base. Wilmot Road provides access to the AMARG and the Base hospital. Picacho Street extends east to west and connects with Yuma Street and Wilmot Road. Yuma Street runs parallel to the flight line. The HH-60 simulators and the 58 RQS facility would be located off of Yuma Street.

The primary mode of transportation on Base is private automobile. High-use areas such as the Base commissary currently experience parking problems during peak hours There is no mass transit provided on Davis-Monthan AFB, but there are several bus stops nearby. There are officially designated pedestrian and bike paths on Base that serve the dormitory area. The road system on Base is considered sufficient for current and future needs, with only minor maintenance repair expected (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2008).

3.16.2.2 Utilities

Electricity

Electricity to Davis-Monthan AFB is provided by Tucson Electric Power via two separate overhead 46kilovolt feeder lines. These lines extend from the northeast side of the Installation along Wilmot Road until they enter the substation (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a). The Base has 16.4-megawatt and 6.5-megawatt solar arrays, and one 25-megavolt ampere (MVA) transformer that distributes power to the Base. The current demand on the Installation's electrical system is approximately 16 MVA of the available 25 MVA. The electrical system capacity is adequate for current and future demand (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2016b).

Natural Gas

Natural gas is provided by the Southwest Gas Company via a commercial line that connects to the Base at the northwest and southeast corners of the Installation (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a). The system is in excellent condition and the demand on the system is approximately 0.36 million cubic feet (MCF) per day of the available 3.4 MCF per day (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2016b).

Potable Water

Potable water at Davis-Monthan AFB comes from the Tucson Basin Aquifer. Eight active, on-Base wells pump water to a mix of elevated and underground tanks with a capacity of 2.53 million gallons. An additional 10 on-Base wells are available, if needed. The Installation produces, treats, and distributes its own water for consumption and fire protection. Davis-Monthan AFB can supply a maximum of approximately 4.03 million gallons per day (MGD) to meet peak demands. The current estimated peak demand is 1.6 MGD and the average demand is approximately 1.18 MGD (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a).

The Base has decreased its demand for water by over 25% since 2007 because of investment in xeriscaping and water metering. The Installation uses gray water from the Pima County Publicly Owned Treatment Works to irrigate areas where needed to reduce drawdown from the aquifer (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2021a). The water distribution system on the Installation was constructed in the 1950s, however, the distribution system and water pressure are in adequate condition. The active wells are considered to be in

good condition and the water system is considered adequate to meet current and future needs (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2016b).

Sanitary Sewage/Wastewater

The sewer system at Davis-Monthan AFB extends east-west through two 15-inch-diameter pipes and connects the northwest corner of the Installation to the Pima County sanitary sewer system. The majority of the sanitary sewer system on Base functions by gravity flow, but the Installation does have five lift stations. The Installation discharges an average of 0.48 MGD of wastewater to Pima County with peak wastewater demand at 0.72 MGD. The maximum capacity of the discharge connection from the Base to Pima County is 3 MGD. The wastewater system is in adequate condition and has capacity for current and future needs (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2016b).

Stormwater runoff at the Installation is managed through a stormwater system consisting of surface channels and underground infrastructure. There is adequate capacity to handle most flows, however, during the rainy season (July–September), storms can lead to flooding in portions of the Base (Davis-Monthan 2016b).

3.16.2.3 Solid Waste Management

Nonhazardous solid waste generated at Davis-Monthan AFB is collected by a private contractor for disposal off site at the City of Tucson Los Reales Landfill, which has adequate capacity to meet current and future needs (City of Tucson, 2022).

3.16.3 Environmental Consequences

The Air Force defines a significant effect on or from infrastructure, transportation, and utilities within the ROI as one or more of the following:

- measurable change or service reduction within the regional transportation network;
- prolonged or repeated interruption of public transportation services regionally;
- prolonged or repeated service disruptions to utility end users; or
- substantial increase in utility demand relative to existing and planned regional uses.

3.16.3.1 Proposed Action

Transportation

Under the Proposed Action, personnel on the Installation would increase by 646. Increased truck traffic and construction workers commuting to the Installation during periods of construction would be expected to cause temporary increases in demand and increased congestion on local roads. At project sites, temporary lane closures would be expected during construction activities. The on-Base transportation network is sufficient to handle the existing traffic volume. The road system has a good foundation and requires only minor maintenance repair on the top surface (Davis-Monthan AFB, 2016b).

Electricity and Natural Gas

Short-term, negligible, adverse impacts on the electrical distribution system would have the potential to occur under the Proposed Action as the operation of newly constructed buildings has the potential to increase demand on the system; however, energy-efficient construction is expected to decrease energy consumption consistent with EO 13693, *Planning for Federal Sustainability in the Next Decade*. Net changes in long-term demand would be anticipated to be minimal.

There would be no expected impacts to natural gas due to the system's excellent condition and capacity to meet current and future demands.

Potable Water

Short-term, negligible, adverse impacts on the potable water supply system would be expected to occur during construction when existing water lines would be connected to new buildings. Long-term, adverse impacts would not be expected to occur as changes in demand would be minimal, and the potable water supply system has the capacity to meet new demands.

Solid Waste Management

Short-term, minor, adverse impacts on solid waste management would have the potential to occur due to construction and demolition projects under the Proposed Action. Based on USEPA guidance on estimating solid waste from construction, the 291,000 ft² of new construction would generate 4.39 pounds/ft² of debris. This equates to 1,277,490 pounds of solid waste created as a result of the Proposed Action. Contractors would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations for the collection and disposal of solid waste generated under the Proposed Action, and all solid waste generated would be collected and transported off Base for disposal or recycling in accordance with AFMAN 32-7002, *Environmental Compliance and Pollution Prevention*.

Sanitary and Storm Sewer

Short-term, negligible, adverse impacts on the sanitary sewer and wastewater treatment system would have the potential to occur during construction when existing lines would be connected to new buildings. Although the operation of the new buildings would increase the demand on the sanitary sewer and wastewater treatment system in the short-term, adverse impacts to the sanitary sewer and wastewater treatment systems in the long-term would not be expected as the current systems have the capacity required to meet new demands.

3.16.3.2 Cumulative Impacts

The minimal increase in demand for utilities (i.e., electricity, natural gas, sanitary waste discharge, and solid waste disposal) under the Proposed Action would have negligible cumulative impacts with the other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental planned actions, as listed in **Table 3-1**, at Davis-Monthan AFB that may create similar increases in utility demand. Future actions with the potential to affect infrastructure at Davis-Monthan AFB would be evaluated in context of the growing regional population. When considered in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Davis-Monthan AFB, no significant cumulative impacts on infrastructure, transportation, or utilities would be expected to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action

3.16.3.3 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, Davis-Monthan AFB's air operations would remain at current conditions. The 4th Gen missions would remain or be inactivated in place at Nellis AFB, which would create a capacity issue as 5th Gen missions continue to increase in scope and number. The infrastructure at Nellis AFB would continue to fall short of current or future mission needs and operate at or beyond capacity. There would be no change in infrastructure, transportation, and utilities beyond baseline conditions.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 4 LIST OF PREPARERS

The following individuals assisted in the preparation of this Draft EA.

Danielle Cemprola

Environmental Assessment Services, LLC M.B.A., Business Administration M.S., Community Development B.S., Geography Years of Experience: 14 Contribution: NEPA Program Management, Quality Control

Ronald Green, PhD

Environmental Assessment Services, LLC Ph.D., Zoology M.S., Wildlife Biology B.S., Wildlife Biology Years of Experience: 35 Contribution: Biological Resources

Kevin Groppe, PE

Environmental Assessment Services, LLC M.S., Environmental Engineering B.S., Chemical Engineering Years of Experience: 23 Contribution: Project Management, Safety

Lesley Hamilton

Cardno-Stantec B.A., Chemistry Years of Experience: 35 Contribution: Air Quality

Michael Nied

Environmental Assessment Services, LLC B.S., Biological Systems Engineering–Natural Resources Years of Experience: 10 Contribution: Biological Resources

Geoff Olander

Cardno-Stantec B.S. Mechanical Engineering Years of Experience: 30 Contribution: Airspace, Noise

Violet Perry

Environmental Assessment Services, LLC M.S., Urban Planning B.S., Outdoor Adventure Leadership Years of Experience: 1 Contribution: GIS, Water Resources

Derek Stadther

Cardno-Stantec B.S., Mechanical Engineering Years of Experience: 11 Contribution: Airspace, Noise

Joanne Stover

Environmental Assessment Services, LLC B.S., Business Administration Years of Experience: 28 Contribution: Technical Editor/Document Production

Karin Volpe

Environmental Assessment Services, LLC B.A., Urban Planning Minors: Disaster Risk Reduction Years of Experience: 3 Contribution: Waste Management, Infrastructure

4.1 GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTORS

Contributor	Organization/Affiliation
Chris Brewster	ACC 355 CES/CEIE
Kevin Wakefield	ACC 355 CES/CEIE
Barbara Long	ACC 355 CES/CEIE
Maj. Enisa Dervisevic	AF/JAOE
Don Mattner	ACC/A5/8BG
Grace Keesling	AFCEC/CIE
Lt Col Patrick Chapman	355 OSS
Sarah Amthor	AFMC AFIMSC Det 8/CEB

CHAPTER 5 REFERENCES

- Air Force Safety Center (AFSEC). 2018a. *BASH Statistics by Altitude*. (<u>http://www.safety.af.mil/Portals/71/documents/Aviation/BASH%20Statistics/USAF%20Wildlife%2</u> <u>0Strikes%20by%20Altitude.pdf?ver=2016-08-22-120752-537</u> (accessed 9 November 2018).
- AFSEC. 2018b. USAF Wildlife Strikes by Operation. (http://www.safety.af.mil/Portals/71/documents/Aviation/BASH%20Statistics/USAF%20Wildlife%2 0Strikes%20by%20Phase%20of%20Operation.pdf?ver=2016-08-22-120754-583 (accessed 9 November 2018).
- AFSEC. 2018c. USAF Wildlife Strikes by Fiscal Year. (http://www.safety.af.mil/Portals/71/documents/Aviation/BASH%20Statistics/USAF%20Wildlife%2 <u>0Strikes%20by%20Fiscal%20Year.pdf?ver=2016-08-22-120752-537</u> (accessed 9 November 2018).
- AFSEC. 2018d. Class A Mishaps by Fiscal Year. <u>http://www.safety.af.mil/Portals/71/documents/Aviation/BASH%20Statistics/Class%20A%20Mishaps%20by%20Fiscal%20Year.pdf?ver=2016-08-22-120752-567</u> (accessed 9 November 2018).
- AFSEC. 2021a. A-10 Mishap History. <u>https://www.safety.af.mil/Portals/71/documents/Aviation/Aircraft%20Statistics/a-10.pdf</u>. 1 November (accessed 11 August 2020).
- AFSEC. 2021b. *HH-60 A Mishap History*. <u>https://www.safety.af.mil/Portals/71/documents/Aviation/Aircraft%20Statistics/H-60.pdf</u>. 28 December (accessed 15 May 2023).
- Department of the Air Force (Air Force). 2020. Personnel Recovery Training Program Final Environmental Assessment, Davis-Monthan Air Force Base Arizona. <u>https://www.dm.af.mil/Portals/99/Docs/Public%20Information%20Docs/DM%20PR%20Training%</u> <u>20Final%20EA%20and%20FONSI 2 5 2020.pdf?ver=2020-02-05-191311-560</u> (accessed 28 April 2023).
- Air Force. 2022. *Climate Action Plan*. October. <u>https://www.safie.hq.af.mil/Portals/78/documents/Climate/DAF%20Climate%20Action%20Plan%2</u> <u>0-%20FINAL%20Oct%202022.pdf</u> (accessed 20 October 2022).
- Arizona Department of Education. 2021. "Accountability and Research Data: Graduation Rate, Dropout Rate, and Enrollment Reports. <u>https://www.azed.gov/accountability-research/data/</u> (accessed 30 August 2022).
- Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. 2021. Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activity to Protected Surface Waters. <u>https://static.azdeq.gov/permits/azpdes/cgp_permit.pdf</u> (accessed 3 November 2022).
- Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2022. *Arizona Wildlife Conservation Strategy:* 2022–2032. Phoenix, Arizona.
- Berglund, B. and T. Lindvall, eds. 1995. Community Noise. Jannes Snabbtryck, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Bureau of Economic Analysis. 2021. CAEMP25N Total Full-time and Part- Time Employment by NAICS Industry. Regional Data. Bureau of Economic Analysis.

https://apps.bea.gov/iTable/iTable.cfm?reqid=70&step=1&isuri=1&acrdn=7%23reqid%3D70 (accessed 30 August 2022).

- Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). 2022a. *Local Area Unemployment Statistics. Labor Force Data by County, 2021 Annual Averages.* <u>https://www.bls.gov/lau/laucnty21.xlsx</u> (accessed 30 August 2022).
- BLS. 2022b. Local Area Unemployment Statistics. Unemployment Rates for States. https://www.bls.gov/lau/lastrk21.htm (accessed 30 August 2022).
- Brown, D.E. 1982. "Biotic Communities of the American Southwest-United States and Mexico." *Desert Plants* 4(1-4).
- City of Tucson 2022. City of Tucson Los Reales Landfill 10-Year Plan.
- Davis-Monthan Air Force Base (AFB). 2008. Davis-Monthan Air Force Base. Environmental Assessment for Capital Improvements Program (CIP). Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona. Final. June.
- Davis-Monthan AFB. 2016a. *Fiscal Year 2016: Economic Impact Analysis*. <u>https://www.dm.af.mil/Portals/99/Docs/Community%20Liaison%20Documents/DMAFB%20FY16</u> <u>%20Economic%20Impact%20Analysis.pdf?ver=2017-05-04-132953-693</u> (accessed 30 August 2022).
- Davis-Monthan AFB. 2016b. *Davis-Monthan Air Force Base. Installation Development Plan.* Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona. March.
- Davis-Monthan AFB. 2017a. Hazardous Waste Management Plan.

Davis-Monthan AFB. 2017b. 355th Fighter Wing Installation 38 Emergency Management Plan 10-2.

- Davis-Monthan AFB. 2017c. *Davis-Monthan Air Force Base* 40 *Hazardous Waste Management Plan*. May.
- Davis-Monthan AFB. 2018. Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.
- Davis-Monthan AFB. 2020. F-35A Operational Beddown–Air Force Reserve Command Environmental Impact Statement. US Air Force.
- Davis-Monthan AFB. 2021a. Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan. US Air Force.
- Davis-Monthan AFB. 2021b. *Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan.* Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona. August.
- Ellis, D.H., C.H. Ellis, and D.P. Mindell. 1991. "Raptor Responses to Low-level Jet Aircraft and Sonic Booms." *Environmental Pollution*, Vol: 74 p. 53-83.
- Frankson, R., K.E. Kunkel, L.E. Stevens, D.R. Easterling, T. Brown, N. Selover, and E. Saffell, 2022. *Arizona State Climate Summary 2022*. NOAA Technical Report NESDIS 150-AZ. NOAA/NESDIS, Silver Spring, MD, 5 pp. <u>https://statesummaries.ncics.org/chapter/az/</u> (accessed 28 December 2022).
- Grubb, T.G., L.L. Pater, A.E. Gatto, and D.K. Delaney. 2013. "Response of Nesting Northern Goshawks to Logging Truck Noise in Northern Arizona." *The Journal of Wildlife Management* 77(8):1618.

- Kerlinger, P. 2008. *Phase I Avian Risk Assessment Mount Wachusett Community College Wind Energy Project*. Report Prepared for Mount Wachusett Community College.
- Maricopa Association of Governments. 2020. "Arizona Employer Viewer". <u>https://geo.azmag.gov/maps/azemployer/</u> (accessed 30 August 2022).
- National Park Service. 2019. "Sonoran Desert Network Ecosystems". <u>https://www.nps.gov/im/sodn/ecosystems.htm (accessed 15 September 2022).</u>
- Palmer, AG., D.L. Nordmeyer, and D.D. Roby 2003. "Effects of Jet Aircraft Overflights on Parental Care of Peregrine Falcons." *Wildlife Society Bulletin* (1973–2006), vol. 31, no. 2, p. 499–509.
- Statistical Research, Inc. 2017. Intensive Cultural Resource Survey of 3,180 Acres and Completion of Site-Condition Assessments of 25 Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona
- Tucson Water. 2018. *Status and Quality of the Aquifer*. <u>https://www.tucsonaz.gov/files/water/docs/Aquifer.pdf (accessed 23 September 2022).</u>
- United States Census Bureau (USCB). 2001. 2000 Census of Population and Housing. *Profiles of General Demographic Characteristics.* https://www2.census.gov/census_2000/datasets/demographic_profile/Arizona/2kh04.pdf
- USCB. 2004. 2000 Census of Population and Housing. *United States Summary: 2000- Population and Housing Unit Counts.* <u>https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2003/dec/phc3-us-pt1.pdf</u> (accessed 30 August 2022).
- USCB. 2012. 2010 Census of Population and Housing. *Population and Housing Unit Counts.* <u>https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/decennial/2010/cph-2/cph-2-4.pdf</u> (accessed 30 August 2022).
- USCB. 2022a. 2010 Decennial Census. Data Analysis Search for the United States Census Bureau. <u>https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=United%20States&tid=DECENNIALSF12010.P1&hidePreview=false</u> (accessed 30 August 2022).
- USCB. 2022b. ACS 5-Year Estimates Data Profiles Table DP04. American Community Survey: Selected Housing Characteristics. United States Census Bureau. <u>https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?text=DP04&g=0100000US_040000US04_050000US0401</u> <u>9_1600000US0477000&y=2019&tid=ACSDP5Y2019.DP04</u> (accessed 30 August 2022).
- USCB. 2022c. ACS 5-Year Estimates Data Profiles Table DP05. American Community Survey: Demographic and Housing Estimates. United States Census Bureau. <u>https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=DP05&g=0100000US_0400000US04_0500000US04019</u> <u>1600000US0477000&tid=ACSDP5Y2019.DP05</u> (accessed 30 August 2022).
- USCB. 2022d. ACS 5-Year Estimates Data Profiles Table S1701. American Community Survey: Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months. United States Census Bureau. <u>https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=poverty&g=0100000US_040000US04_050000US0401</u> <u>9_1600000US0477000&tid=ACSST5Y2019.S1701</u> (accessed 6 September 2022).
- United States Department of Defense. 2022. "Davis-Monthan AFB Education." <u>https://installations.militaryonesource.mil/military-installation/davis-monthan-afb/education/education</u> (accessed 30 August 2022).

- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2003. "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Arizona." Direct Final Rule. *Federal Register* Vol. 68, No. 212, pp 62239–62244. 3 November.
- USEPA. 2008. "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Arizona; San Manuel Sulfur Dioxide State Implementation Plan and Request for Redesignation to Attainment. Direct Final Rule." *Federal Register* Vol. 73, No. 13, pp 3396–3405. 18 January.
- USEPA. 2009a. "Approval and Promulgation of Maintenance Plan for Carbon Monoxide; State of Arizona; Tucson Air Planning Area. Proposed Rule." *Federal Register* Vol. 74, No. 149, pp.39007–39013. 5 August.
- USEPA. 2009b. "Approval and Promulgation of Maintenance Plan for Carbon Monoxide; State of Arizona; Tucson Air Planning Area. Final Rule." *Federal Register* Vol. 74, No. 243, pp.67819–67821. 21 December.
- USEPA. 2022. Air Quality Design Values. 2021 Design Value Reports. May. Accessed at <u>https://www.epa.gov/air-trends/air-quality-design-values#report</u> (accessed 22 February 2023).
- USEPA. 2023. Green Book. Arizona Nonattainment/Maintenance Status for Each County by Year for all Criteria Pollutants. 31 January. <u>https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/anayo_az.html</u> (accessed 27 February 2023).
- USEPA/Federal Aviation Administration. 2009. *Recommended Best Practice for Quantifying Speciated Organic Gas Emissions from Aircraft Equipped with Turbofan, Turbojet, and Turboprop Engines.* May.
- U.S. Global Change Research Program. 2017. *Climate Science Special Report: Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume 1.*
- United States Geological Survey. 2022. "What are Igneous Rocks?" <u>https://www.usgs.gov/faqs/what-are-igneous-</u> <u>rocks#:~:text=Intrusive%2C%20or%20plutonic%2C%20igneous%20rock,rock%20rise%20toward</u> <u>%20the%20surface</u> (accessed November 29, 2022).
- Weisenberger, M.E., P.R. Krausman, M.C. Wallace, D.W. De Young, and O.E. Maughan. 1996. "Effects of Simulated Jet Aircraft Noise on Heart Rate and Behavior of Desert Ungulates." *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, vol. 60, no. 1, 1996, pp. 52–61. <u>http://www.jstor.org/stable/3802039</u>

APPENDIX A INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION, PUBLIC AND AGENCY PARTICIPATION

This page intentionally left blank

Mailing List

Calvin Johnson Chairman Tonto Apache Tribe of Arizona 30 Tonto Apache Reservation Payson, AZ 85541

Vincent Randall Cultural Director Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 W. Datsi Street Camp Verde, AZ 86322

Eddie Martinez President Mescalero Apache Tribe PO Box 227 Mescalero, NM 88340

Holly Houghten THPO Mescalero Apache Tribe PO Box 227 Mescalero, NM 88340

Peter Steere Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Tohono O'odham Nation P.O. Box 837 Sells, AZ 85634

Jeri De Cola Cultural & NAGPRA Representative Tonto Apache Tribe of Arizona 30 Tonto Apache Reservation Payson, AZ 85541

Tanya Lewis Chairwoman Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 W. Datsi Street Camp Verde, AZ 86322

Karl A. Hoerig, PhD THPO Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona 7777 S. Camino Huivisim, Building C Tucson, AZ 85757

Kasey Velasques Chairman White Mountain Apache Tribe P.O. Box 700 Whiteriver, AZ 85941 Kurt Dongoske THPO Pueblo of Zuni Heritage and Historic Preservation Office P.O. Box 339 Zuni, NM 87327

Mark Altaha THPO White Mountain Apache Tribe P.O. Box 1032 Ft. Apache, AZ 85926

Verlonn M. Jose Chairman Tohono O'odham Nation P.O. Box 837 Sells, AZ 85634

Peter Yucupicio Chairman Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona 7474 South Camino de Oeste Tucson, AZ 85746

Jeff Francisco Cultural Resource Specialist Tohono O'odham Nation P.O. Box 837 Sells, AZ 85634

Stewart Koyiyumptewa THPO Hopi Tribe Hopi Tribe Cultural Preservation Office P.O. Box 123 Kykotsmovi, AZ 86039

Terry Rambler Chairperson San Carlos Apache Tribe of the San Carlos Reservation, Arizona PO Box "o" San Carlos, AZ 85550

Timothy L. Nuvangyaoma Chairman Hopi Tribe P.O. Box 123 Kykotsmovi, AZ 86039 Arden L. Kucate Governor Pueblo of Zuni P.O. Box 339 Zuni, NM 87327

Vernelda Grant THPO San Carlos Apache Tribe of the San Carlos Reservation, Arizona Building 3A San Carlos Ave. San Carlos, AZ 85550

Kathryn Leonard State Historic Preservation Officer AZ State Historic Preservation Office 1110 W. Washington Suite 100 Phoenix, AZ 85007

U.S. Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service Arizona Ecological Services Field Office 9828 N 31st Ave., #C3 Phoenix, AZ 85051

U.S. Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service - Southwest Regional Office PO Box 1306 Albuquerque, NM 87103

Jeff Servoss US Fish and Wildlife Arizona Ecological Services Field Office Tucson 201 North Bonita Ave Suite 141 Tucson, AZ 85745

Lisa Holm Environmental Officer FEMA-Region 9 1111 Broadway, Suite 1200 Oakland, CA 94607

Amanda Stone Arizona Department of Environmental Quality Southern Regional Office 400 W. Congress, Suite 433 Tucson, AZ 85701

Andy Rhea Southwest Gas Company, Industrial Services 3401 E. Gas Road Tucson, AZ 85714 Charla Glendening Planning Manager Arizona Department of Transportation, Transportation Planning Division 206 South 17th Ave, MD 310B Phoenix, AZ 85007

Cheri A. Boucher Arizona Game and Fish Department, Project Evaluation Program, WMHB 5000 W Carefree Highway Phoenix, AZ 85086

Chris Poirier Deputy Director/Planning Official Pima County Development Services 201 N. Stone Ave Tucson, AZ 85701

Diana Imig The Nature Conservancy Tucson Conservation Center 1510 E. Fort Lowell Rd Tucson, AZ 85719

Jason Angell Director Town of Marana Development Services 11555 W. Civic Center Dr Marana, AZ 85653

Jim DeGrood Deputy Director Pima Association of Governments 1 E. Broadway Blvd, Suite 401 Tucson, AZ 85701

Joe Derungs Project Manager USACE-Los Angeles District, Arizona-Nevada Area Office 3636 N.Central Ave., Suite 900 Phoenix, AZ 85012

Karen Vitulano NEPA Reviewer USEPA-Region 9, Environmental Review 75 Hawthorne St. San Francisco, CA 94105 Leslie Meyers Area Manager US Bureau of Reclamation Phoenix Area Office 6150 W. Thunderbird Rd Glendale, AZ 85306

Lexy Wellott Chair Tucson Planning Commission 2 East Congress Street #600 Tucson, AZ 85701

Lindy Bauer Environmental Director Pima Association of Governments 1 E. Broadway Blvd, Suite 401 Tucson, AZ 85701

Kris Mayes Arizona Attorney General Office of the Attorney General 2005 N Central Ave Phoenix, AZ 85004

Michael Spaeth Town of Oro Valley Planning and Zoning 11000 N. La Canada Dr Oro Valley, AZ 85737

Mick Jensen Senior Planner City of South Tucson Planning 1601 S. Sixth Ave Tucson, AZ 85713

Misael Cabrera Director Arizona Department of Environmental Quality Office of Administrative Council 1110 W. Washington St Phoenix, AZ 85007

Nichole Engelmann Fish and Wildlife Biologist Arizona Ecological Services State Office 9828 North 31st Avenue, Suite C3 Phoenix, AZ 85051 Ursula Nelson Interim Director Pima County Department of Environmental Quality 33 N. Stove Ave., Suite 700 Tucson, AZ 85701

Ralph Ware USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Tucson Service Center 3241 N. Romero Rd Tucson, AZ 85705

Regina Romero Mayor City of Tucson 201 N. Stone Ave, Suite 6 Tucson, AZ 85701

Reuben Teran Executive Director Arizona Department of Water Resources Arizona Water Protection Fund 1110 W. Washington St, Ste 310 Phoenix, AZ 85007

Rodney Mackey University of Arizona Planning, Design, and Construction P.O. Box 210300 Tucson, AZ 85721

Anna Casadei Director Town of Sahuarita Planning and Zoning 375 W. Sahuarita Center Way Sahuarita, AZ 85629

Teresa Martinez Executive Director, CDTC Continential Divide Trail Coalition 710 10th Street Suite 200 Golden, CO 80401

Thomas Buschatzke Director Arizona Department of Water Resources Office of the Director 1110 W. Washington St, Ste 310 Phoenix, AZ 85007 Scott Clark Director City of Tucson Planning and Development Services Department 201 N. Stone Ave - 1st Floor Tucson, AZ 85701

Tim Snow Arizona Game and Fish Department Non-Game Species and Bats 555 N. Greasewood Rd Tucson, AZ 85745

Katie Hobbs Governor State of Arizona 1700 W. Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85007

Flood Control District of Pima County 201 N. Stone Ave, 9th Floor Tucson, AZ 85701

Arizona Department of Agriculture 1688 W. Adams St Phoenix, AZ 85007

Arizona Department of Water Resources Tucson Active Management Area 400 W. Congress, Suite 518 Tucson, AZ 85701

Arizona Game and Fish Department WMHB - Project Evaluation Program 5000 W. Carefree Highway Phoenix, AZ 85086

State of Arizona Commission of Indian Affairs 1700 W. Washington St, Ste 430 Phoenix, AZ 85007

Coronado National Forest Archaeologist 300 W. Congress St Tucson, AZ 85701

Bureau of Land Management Safford Field Office 711 14th Ave Safford, AZ 85546 Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office 3201 E. Universal Way Tucson, AZ 85756

Bureau of Indian Affairs 2600 N Central Ave Phoenix, AZ 85004

Arizona State Trust Land Archaeologist 1616 W. Adams St Phoenix, AZ 85007

Arizona State Museum 1013 E. University Blvd Tucson, AZ 85721

Tonto National Forest Planning 2324 E. McDowell Rd Phoenix, AZ 85006

Tonto National Forest Forest Archaeologist/Heritage Program Manager 2324 E. McDowell Rd Phoenix, AZ 85006

Western Archaeological Conservation Center 255 N. Commerce Park Loop Tucson, AZ 85745

Pima Department of Environmental Quality 33 N. Stone Ave, Ste 700 Tucson, AZ 85701



355 CES/CEIE 3775 South Fifth Street Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ 85707-3012

Ms. Regina Romero Mayor City of Tucson 201 N. Stone Ave, Suite 6 Tucson, AZ 87701

MEMORANDUM FOR: STAKEHOLDERS

FROM: 355 Civil Engineer Squadron, Flight Chief

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment for Davis Monthan Fourth Generation Missions Regional

Dear Ms. Romero,

The United States Air Force (Air Force) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to evaluate the potential impacts associated with the Proposed Action to relocate the 4th Generation (Gen) missions from Nellis Air Force Base (AFB), Nevada, to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona. The Proposed Action to reassign the 4th Gen mission is needed because the current mission sets assigned to Nellis AFB and the Air Force Weapons Center are outpacing the ability to expand resources and capacity.

The first step in making space for the 5th Gen mission at Nellis AFB is identifying those 4th Gen missions that must be relocated and installations with available space for relocated aircraft. The Air Force proposes to relocate a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller (JTAC) training, and Guardian Angel operations to Davis-Monthan AFB. There are several other proposed actions at Davis-Monthan AFB unrelated to these relocations that are occurring on approximately the same timelines and are therefore included in the EA analysis. These actions consist of establishing a new Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) wing overhead structure, assignment of one Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Cessna 182 aircraft, and the transfer of one RC-26B aircraft from Tucson International Airport.

The EA will assess the potential environmental consequences associated with the Proposed Action and Alternatives. Potential impacts identified during the initial planning stages include effects on airspace management and use, noise, safety, air quality, cultural resources, hazardous materials and wastes, soils, water resources, biological resources, land use,

> TRAIN – DEPLOY – WIN RESCUE & ATTACK!

infrastructure, socioeconomics and environmental justice and protection of children. The EA will examine the cumulative effects when combined with past, present, and any reasonably foreseeable future actions. In support of this process, we request your input in identifying general or specific issues or areas of concern you believe should be addressed in the EA.

We intend to provide your organization with a hyperlink of the Draft EA when the document is completed. Please inform us if additional CD copies are needed or if someone else within your agency other than you should receive the Draft EA.

Please reach out to my point of contact, provided below, on any issues or concerns you have in the development of this EA. We ask your assistance in identifying any issues or concerns of which we may be unaware, particularly those that may be affected by this proposal.

The Air Force Point of Contact for this project is Mr. Kevin Wakefield, EIAP Program Manager. Please send him your comments and concerns to 3775 South Fifth Street, Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, 85707-3012, or by email or phone at kevin.wakefield.1@us.af.mil or (520) 228-4035. I look forward to receiving any input you may have regarding this endeavor. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this effort.

Sincerely,

1.0

CHRISTOPHER L. BREWSTER, PE Flight Chief, Installation Management

Attachment: Summary of the Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE 355TH CIVIL ENGINEER SQUADRON (ACC) DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA

355 CES/CEIE 3775 South Fifth Street Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ 85707-3012

U.S. Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service Arizona Ecological Services Field Office 9828 N 31st Ave., #C3 Phoenix, AZ 85051-2517

MEMORANDUM FOR: U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

FROM: 355 Civil Engineer Squadron, Flight Chief

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment for Davis Monthan Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment

Dear Sir/Madam,

The United States Air Force (Air Force) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to evaluate the potential impacts associated with the Proposed Action to relocate the 4th Generation (Gen) missions from Nellis Air Force Base (AFB), Nevada, to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona. The Proposed Action to reassign the 4th Gen mission is needed because the current mission sets assigned to Nellis AFB and the Air Force Weapons Center are outpacing the ability to expand resources and capacity.

The Air Force proposes to relocate a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller (JTAC) training, and Guardian Angel operations to Davis-Monthan AFB. There are several other proposed actions at Davis-Monthan AFB unrelated to these relocations that are occurring on approximately the same timelines and are therefore included in the EA analysis. These actions consist of establishing a new Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) wing overhead structure, assignment of one Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Cessna 182 aircraft, and the transfer of one RC-26B aircraft from Tucson International Airport.

The EA will assess the potential environmental consequences associated with the Proposed Action and Alternatives. Potential impacts identified during the initial planning stages include effects on airspace management and use, noise, safety, air quality, cultural resources, hazardous materials and wastes, soils, water resources, biological resources, land use, infrastructure, socioeconomics and environmental justice and protection of children. The EA will examine the cumulative effects when combined with past, present, and any reasonably foreseeable future actions. In support of this process, we request your input in identifying general or specific issues or areas of concern you believe should be addressed in the EA.

Taking into account various environmental concerns, the Air Force is engaging early with the appropriate resource and regulatory agencies as it formulates the undertaking. We intend to provide your agency with a copy of the Draft EA when the document is completed. Please inform us if additional copies are needed or if someone else within your agency other than you should receive the Draft EA.

The Air Force point of contact for this project is Mr. Kevin Wakefield, EIAP Program Manager. Please send him your comments and concerns to 3775 South Fifth Street, Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, 85707-3012, or by email or phone at kevin.wakefield.1@us.af.mil or (520) 228-4035. I look forward to receiving any input you may have regarding this endeavor. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this effort.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER L. BREWSTER, PE Flight Chief, Installation Management

Attachment: Summary of the Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE 355TH CIVIL ENGINEER SQUADRON (ACC) DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA

355 CES/CEIE 3775 South Fifth Street Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ 85707-3012

State Historic Preservation Office Arizona State Parks & Trails 1110 W Washington St, Suite 100 Phoenix, AZ 85007

MEMORANDUM FOR: ARIZONA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION

FROM: 355 Civil Engineer Squadron, Flight Chief

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment for Proposed Davis-Monthan Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment

Dear Kathryn Leonard,

The purpose of this letter is twofold: to give you an opportunity to review and comment on a proposed action in which the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) may have an interest; and to initiate consultation pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and 36 CFR § 800.3.

The United States Air Force (Air Force) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to evaluate the potential impacts associated with the Proposed Action to relocate the 4th Generation (Gen) missions from Nellis Air Force Base (AFB), Nevada, to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona. The Proposed Action to reassign the 4th Gen mission is needed because the current mission sets assigned to Nellis AFB and the Air Force Weapons Center are outpacing the ability to expand resources and capacity.

The first step in making space for the 5th Gen mission at Nellis AFB is identifying those 4th Gen missions that must be relocated and installations with available space for relocated aircraft. The Air Force proposes to relocate a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller (JTAC) training, and Guardian Angel operations to Davis-Monthan AFB. There are several other proposed actions at Davis-Monthan AFB unrelated to these relocations that are occurring on approximately the same timelines and are therefore included in the EA analysis. These actions consist of establishing a new Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) wing overhead structure, assignment of one Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Cessna 182 aircraft, and the transfer of one RC-26B aircraft from Tucson International Airport.

TRAIN – DEPLOY – WIN RESCUE & ATTACK! Taking into account various environmental concerns, the Air Force is engaging early with the appropriate resource and regulatory agencies as it formulates this undertaking. Pursuant to 36 CFR Sections 800.4(a) and (b), we request your assistance in defining the Area of Potential Effect (APE) and information on any historic properties located therein that may be affected. Location maps are included as part of the attachment to this letter. Your comments will help us develop the scope of our environmental review.

The EA will assess the potential environmental consequences associated with the Proposed Action and Alternatives. Potential impacts identified during the initial planning stages include effects on airspace management and use, noise, safety, air quality, cultural resources, hazardous materials and wastes, soils, water resources, biological resources, land use, infrastructure, socioeconomics and environmental justice and protection of children. The EA will examine the cumulative effects when combined with past, present, and any reasonably foreseeable future actions. In support of this process, we request your input in identifying general or specific issues or areas of concern you believe should be addressed in the EA.

We intend to provide your agency with a copy of the Draft EA when the document is completed. Please inform us if additional copies are needed or if someone else within your agency other than you should receive the Draft EA. We will also provide you with a 36 CFR § 800.4 effects determination after we have completed the historic property identification process.

Please reach out to my point of contact, provided below, on any issues or concerns you have in the development of this EA. We ask your assistance in identifying any issues or concerns of which we may be unaware, particularly those that may be affected by this proposal.

The Air Force point of contact for this project is Mr. Kevin Wakefield, EIAP Program Manager. Please send him your comments and concerns to 3775 South Fifth Street, Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, 85707-3012, or by email or phone at kevin.wakefield.1@us.af.mil or (520) 228-4035. I look forward to receiving any input you may have regarding this endeavor. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this effort.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER L. BREWSTER, PE Flight Chief, Installation Management

Attachment: Summary of the Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives


DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE 355TH WING (ACC) DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE ARIZONA

355th Wing 3405 South Fifth Street Davis-Monthan AFB AZ 85707-3012

Ms. Holly Houghten THPO Mescalero Apache Tribe PO Box 227 Mescalero, NM 88340

Subject: Environmental Assessment for Davis Monthan Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment

Dear Ms. Houghten,

The purpose of this letter is twofold: to give you an opportunity to review and comment on a proposed action in which the Mescalero Apache Tribe may have an interest; and to invite the Mescalero Apache Tribe to participate in government-to-government consultation with the United States Air Force (Air Force) pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

The Air Force is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to evaluate the potential impacts associated with the Proposed Action to relocate the 4th Generation (Gen) missions from Nellis Air Force Base (AFB), Nevada, to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona. The Proposed Action to reassign the 4th Gen mission is needed because the current mission sets assigned to Nellis AFB and the Air Force Weapons Center are outpacing the ability to expand resources and capacity.

The Air Force proposes to relocate a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller (JTAC) training, and Guardian Angel operations to Davis-Monthan AFB. There are several other proposed actions at Davis-Monthan AFB unrelated to these relocations that are occurring on approximately the same timelines and are therefore included in the EA analysis. These actions consist of establishing a new Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) wing overhead structure, assignment of one Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Cessna 182 aircraft, and the transfer of one RC-26B aircraft from Tucson International Airport.

Pursuant to Section 106 of the NHPA, implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800, and Department of Defense Instruction 4710.02, *DoD Interactions with Federally Recognized Tribes*, we request government-to-government consultation on this Proposed Action. In particular, we invite you, pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.4(a)(4), to provide information on any properties of historic, religious, or cultural significance that may be affected by our proposed undertaking. Regardless of whether the Mescalero Apache Tribe chooses to consult on this project, the Air Force will comply with the *Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act* by informing you of any inadvertent discovery of archaeological or human remains and consulting on their disposition. Being defined as a federal undertaking, we will be seeking input and inviting other potential consulting parties, such as the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office.

The EA will assess the potential environmental consequences associated with the Proposed Action and Alternatives. Potential impacts identified during the initial planning stages include effects on airspace management and use, noise, safety, air quality, cultural resources, hazardous materials and wastes, soils, water resources, biological resources, land use, infrastructure, socioeconomics and environmental justice and protection of children. The EA will examine the cumulative effects when combined with past, present, and any reasonably foreseeable future actions. In support of this process, we request your input in identifying general or specific issues or areas of concern you believe should be addressed in the EA.

We intend to provide you with a hyperlink of the Draft EA when the document is completed. Please inform us if additional CD copies are needed or if someone else within the Mescalero Apache Tribe other than you should receive the Draft EA.

Please reach out to my point of contact, provided below, on any issues or concerns you have in the development of this EA. We ask your assistance in identifying any issues or concerns of which we may be unaware, particularly those that may be affected by this proposal.

The Air Force point of contact for this project is Mr. Kevin Wakefield, EIAP Program Manager. Please send him your comments and concerns to 3775 South Fifth Street, Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, 85707-3012, or by email or phone at kevin.wakefield.1@us.af.mil or (520) 228-4035. I look forward to receiving any input you may have regarding this endeavor. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this effort.

Sincerely,

Just C.M-C

SCOTT C. MILLS, Colonel, USAF Commander

Attachment: Summary of the Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives

Summary Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona

CHAPTER 1 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION

The United States (US) Air Force (Air Force), Air Combat Command (ACC), prepared this Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 *United States Code* [USC] §§ 4321–4317), implemented through the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations of 1978 and amended in 2020 (Title 40 *Code of Federal Regulations* [CFR] Parts 1500–1508 [the September 14, 2020, version of CEQ NEPA rules is being used; 85 FR 43304-43376], as modified by the CEQ NEPA implementing regulation revisions that became effective 20 May 2022), and codified at 32 CFR Part 989, *Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP)*. Other pertinent environmental statutes, regulations, and compliance requirements were also considered during the preparation of this EA and are addressed in relevant sections.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

On 30 June 2021, the Air Force announced plans to make space for a larger than present fighter presence at Nellis Air Force Base (AFB), Nevada, by realigning the Base's close air support and rescue missions to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona. In order to free up capacity to support fifth-generation (5th Gen) aircraft test and training missions at Nellis AFB, the Air Force must relocate some older fourth-generation (4th Gen) force structure.

The Commander, Air Combat Command provided the following direction:

- Focus Nellis AFB command on 5th Gen test and training missions.
- Reorient Nellis' capabilities and capacity for future warfighting testing and training by relocating most 4th generation missions to other locations.
- Provide options for missions dislocated from Nellis AFB.

After consideration of reasonable alternatives discussed in Sections 2.4 and 2.5 of this EA, the Air Force proposes to relocate a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller (JTAC) training, and Guardian Angel operations to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona.

There are several other proposed actions at Davis-Monthan AFB unrelated to the movements described above that are occurring on approximately the same timelines and are therefore included in this analysis. These actions consist of assignment of two Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Cessna 182 aircraft and FIFTH GENERATION (5TH GEN) AIRCRAFT ARE THE NEWEST WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUCH AS THE F-22 AND F-35 FIGHTERS THAT CONTAIN NEW AND ENHANCED LEVELS OF STEALTH PROFILES, SPEED, MANEUVERABILITY, AND ADVANCED AVIONICS AND ATTACK CAPABILITIES.

the transfer of one RC-26B aircraft from the Morris Air National Guard Base (ANGB) located at the Tucson International Airport (Arizona).

1.2 BACKGROUND

Davis-Monthan AFB is located 5 miles south-southeast of downtown Tucson, Arizona. It was established in 1925 as Davis-Monthan Landing Field (**Figure 1-1**). The host unit for Davis-Monthan AFB is the 355th Wing (355 WG) assigned to ACC's Fifteenth Air Force. The Base is best known as the location of the Air Force Materiel Command's 309th Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Group, the aircraft boneyard for all excess military and US government aircraft and aerospace vehicles.



FIGURE Regional	1-1 Overview			5	
Installation	on Boundary				
N A	0	5 Miles	Coordinate System: NAD 83 UTM Zone 12N	~	

The 355 WG provides A-10 Thunderbolt II close air support to ground forces worldwide. The 355 WG is also a host unit, providing medical, logistical, mission and operational support to all assigned units. The 355 WG is also the sole Formal Training Unit (FTU) for the A-10 aircraft, providing initial and recurrent training to all Air Force A-10 pilots, including those in the AFRC and the Air National Guard (ANG).

1.3 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE ACTION

1.3.1 Davis-Monthan Restructure

The purpose of moving the 4th Gen A-10 and HH-60 aircraft squadrons from Nellis AFB is to free up range capacity at the Nevada Test and Training Range (NTTR) necessary to test and train warfighters in 5th Gen aircraft and allow personnel recovery units to take advantage of the synergy provided by co-locating with other rescue units. The Proposed Action would improve 5th Gen and beyond test, training, and tactics development capabilities at Nellis AFB to keep pace with Air Force mission requirements, evolving technology, and enemy capabilities. Nellis AFB has reached maximum capacity and space must be freed up to beddown 5th Gen missions.

The action to reassign the 4th Gen mission is needed because the current mission sets assigned to Nellis AFB and the Air Force Weapons Center are outpacing the ability to expand resources and capacity. The infrastructure available at Nellis AFB does not meet current or future mission needs and is operating at or beyond capacity.

1.3.2 Beddown Civil Air Patrol Cessna 182

The purpose of the beddown of the CAP Cessna 182 is to provide better training and to increase operations missions that the CAP conducts in support of the Air Force.

The Air Force partnership with the CAP encompasses a variety of mission sets that directly benefit the Air Force. The beddown of CAP aircraft at Davis-Monthan AFB is needed to improve communications, interaction between the CAP and Air Force, and execution of a number of these missions.

1.3.3 Relocate RC-26B Operations

The purpose of the relocation of RC-26B operations is to create space for the impending large-scale increase in international F-16 training based at the 162nd Wing (162 WG) at the Morris ANGB.

The ANG anticipates a large-scale increase in international F-16 training based at the 162 WG at Morris ANGB. A single RC-26B aircraft needs to be relocated to make room for F-16-specific ramp realignments and improvements that are incompatible with continued RC-26 operations. In 2017, responsibility for the RC-26 organization was transferred from the 162nd Operations Group at Morris ANGB to the 214th Attack Group (214 ATKG), a subordinate unit to the 162 WG that is a tenant on Davis-Monthan AFB. Relocating the RC-26 aircraft and associated manpower to Davis-Monthan AFB in existing Total Force Training Center facilities would also serve to consolidate 214 ATKG assets and operations in a common location.

1.4 SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

This EA analyzes the potential environmental consequences associated with the Proposed Action and Alternatives. The analysis also addresses facility demolition, renovation, construction, minor building additions, airspace utilization, and an increase in personnel.

This EA has been prepared in accordance with NEPA, CEQ regulations, and the Air Force EIAP. NEPA is the basic national requirement for identifying environmental consequences of federal decisions. NEPA ensures that environmental information, including the anticipated environmental consequences of a proposed action, is available to the public, federal and state agencies, tribal governments, and the decision-maker before decisions are made and before actions are taken.

Consistent with the CEQ regulations, the EA is organized into the following sections:

- Chapter 1, Purpose and Need for Action, includes an introduction and information on the project location, purpose and need statements, scope of environmental analysis, decision to be made, Interagency/Intergovernmental Coordination for Environmental Planning (IICEP), applicable laws and environmental regulations, and a description of public and agency review of this EA.
- Chapter 2, Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives (DOPAA), includes a description of the Proposed Action, alternative selection standards, screening of alternatives, alternatives eliminated from further consideration, a description of the selected alternatives, summary of potential environmental consequences, and any mitigation and environmental commitments.
- Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, includes a description of the natural and man-made environments within and surrounding Davis-Monthan AFB and the airspace that may be affected by the Proposed Action and Alternatives. This chapter also includes a discussion of direct and indirect impacts.
- Chapter 4, List of Preparers, provides a list of the preparers of this EA.
- Chapter 5, References, contains references for studies, data, and other resources used in the preparation of this EA.
- Appendices, as required, provide relevant correspondence, studies, modeling results, and public review information.

NEPA, which is implemented through the CEQ regulations, requires federal agencies to consider alternatives to the Proposed Action and to analyze potential impacts of alternative actions. Potential impacts of the Proposed Action and Alternatives described in this document will be assessed in accordance with the Air Force EIAP (32 CFR Part 989). To help the public and decision-makers understand the implications of impacts, the impacts will be described in the short and long term, cumulatively, and within context.

1.5 DECISION TO BE MADE

Based on the analysis in this EA, the Air Force will make one of three decisions regarding the Proposed Action:

- 1) Choose the Proposed Action and sign a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), allowing implementation of the selected alternative;
- Initiate preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) if it is determined that significant impacts would occur through implementation of the Proposed Action or Alternatives; or
- 3) Select the No Action Alternative, whereby the Proposed Action would not be implemented.

As required by NEPA and its implementing regulations, preparation of an environmental document must precede final decisions regarding the proposed project and be available to inform decision-makers of the potential environmental impacts.

CHAPTER 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

2.1 OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The Air Force is proposing to relocate the following 4th Gen missions from Nellis AFB, Nevada, to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona:

- 66th Weapons Squadron (66 WPS)
- A-10 Operational Test (OT) portion of the 422nd Test and Evaluation Squadron (422 TES)
- 66th Rescue Squadron (66 RQS)
- 58th Rescue Squadron (58 RQS)
- 34th Weapons Squadron (34 WPS)
- 88th Test and Evaluation Squadron (88 TES)

In order to create capacity at Davis-Monthan AFB to accept the aforementioned missions, the Air Force proposes to take the following actions with units already stationed at Davis-Monthan AFB:

- Inactivate the 354th Fighter Squadron (354 FS) and retire assigned A-10C aircraft.
- Convert the 357th Fighter Squadron (357 FS) from an active duty flying squadron to an active association with the 47th Fighter Squadron (47 FS), an AFRC A-10 FTU. Some A-10 aircraft assigned to the 357 FS would be retired, others would be reassigned to the 47 FS.

The A-10 OT portion of the 422 TES would transition in 2024. The HH-60 Weapons Instructor Course (WIC) and Test and combat-coded units, to include the 88 TES, 66 RQS, 58 RQS, 79th Rescue Generation Squadron (RGS), 55 RGS, and the 34 WPS, would move beginning in 2025.

The Air Force also proposes several unrelated actions that are analyzed in this EA due to overlap in the proposed timing:

- Beddown CAP Cessna 182.
- Relocate RC-26B operations.

Table 2-1 presents the proposed changes to the primary aerospace vehicles authorized (PAA) for each unit. Under the Proposed Action, the net change would be an increase of 1 PAA. **Table 2-2** summarizes the personnel changes from the current level for each unit. **Table 2-3** presents the total changes in sorties at Davis-Monthan AFB. A sortie is defined as a single military aircraft flight from initial takeoff through final landing. Under the Proposed Action, day sorties would change from a total of 11,739 to 11,906, an increase of 167 sorties sorties. Night sorties would change from a total of 2,272 to 3,206, an increase of 934sorties. The net increase in sorties under the Proposed Action would be 1,101. Section 2.3 provides a more detailed discussion on the change in sorties within the surrounding airspace.

Table 2-1	
Fotal Proposed Aircraft Changes at Davis-Monthan AFI	3

.

Unit	Starting Location	A-10C	HH-60W	Cessna 182	RC-26B
66 WPS	Nellis AFB	+7			
422 TES	Nellis AFB	+4			
66 RQS	Nellis AFB		+14		
58 RQS	Nellis AFB				
34 WPS	Nellis AFB		+4		
88 TES	Nellis AFB		+2		
354 FS	Davis-Monthan AFB	-18			
357 FS	Davis-Monthan AFB	-21			
47 FS	Davis-Monthan AFB	+8			
CAP	Davis-Monthan AFB			+2	
162 WG	Morris ANGB				+1
	Totals	-20	+20	+2	+1

AFB = Air Force Base; ANGB = Air National Guard Base; CAP = Civil Air Patrol; FS = Fighter Squadron; RQS = Rescue Squadron; TES = Test and Evaluation Squadron; WG = Wing; WPS = Weapons Squadron

 Table 2-2

 Davis-Monthan AFB Personnel Changes

Unit/Function	Officer Full Time	Officer Part Time	Enlisted Full Time	Enlisted Part Time	Civilian	Total Change from Current Levels
66 WPS	10	-	-	200	2	212
422 TES	5	-	-	-	4	9
66 RQS	56	-	-	569	8	633
58 RQS	22	-	129	-	12	163
34 WPS	13	-	-	18	2	33
88 TES ^a	20	-	37	-	31	88
354 FS	-40	-	-464	-	-1	-505
357 FS	-	-	-	-	-	0
47 FS	-	-	-	-	-	0
CAP Cessna 182	-	-	_	-	-	-
RC-26B	6	3			4	13

Notes:

a The total number listed for the 88 TES includes the Det 1, 413 FLTS personnel as they are the other half of the CSAR CTF and will have to be moved and be allowed to complete their HH-60 Developmental Test mission. The first number is 88 TES personnel, the second number is Det 1, 413 FLTS personnel, and the third is the total.

the second number is Det 1, 413 FLTS personnel, and the third is the total. AFB = Air Force Base; CAP = Civil Air Patrol; CSAR = combat search and rescue; CTF = combined test force; FLTS = flight test squadron; FS = Fighter Squadron; RQS = Rescue Squadron; TES = Test and Evaluation Squadron; WPS = Weapons Squadron

Unit	Aircraft Type	Current Day Sorties	Current Night Sorties	Current Total Sorties	Proposed Day Sortie	Proposed Night Sortie	Total Proposed Sorties
Davis-Mont	Davis-Monthan Restructure						
66 WPS	A-10C	N/A	N/A	N/A	861	352	1,213
422 TES	A-10C	N/A	N/A	N/A	400	72	472
66 RQS	HH-60G	N/A	N/A	N/A	550	550	1,100
58 RQS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
34 WPS	HH-60G	N/A	N/A	N/A	224	148	372
88 TES	HH-60G	N/A	N/A	N/A	147	48	195
354 FS	A-10C	3,275	416	3,691	0	0	0
357 FS	A-10C	4,232	928	5,160	0	0	0
47 FS	A-10C	4,232	928	5,160	8,464	1,856	10,320
	Subtotal	11,739	2,272	14,011	10,646	3,026	13,672
Beddown Civil Air Patrol							
CAP	Cessna 182	-	-	-	720	0	720
Relocate RC-26B Operations							
162 WG	RC-26B	-	-	-	540	180	720
То	tals	11,739	2,272	14,011	11,906	3.206	15,112
Net C	hange				167	934	1,101

 Table 2-3

 Total Sortie Changes at Davis-Monthan AFB

AFB = Air Force Base; CAP = Civil Air Patrol; FS = Fighter Squadron; N/A = not applicable; RQS = Rescue Squadron; TES = Test and Evaluation Squadron; WG = Wing; WPS = Weapons Squadron

2.2 PROPOSED ACTION AT DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB

This section provides a detailed discussion of proposed activities by squadron at Davis-Monthan AFB, providing information on the change in PAA, the change in personnel, and related construction activities.

2.2.1 66th Weapons Squadron

The 66 WPS teaches graduate-level A-10C pilot and JTAC WICs that provide training and weapons and tactics employment to officers of the Combat Air Forces and Mobility Air Forces.

Aircraft transferring to Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 7 PAA A-10. Personnel transferring to Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 10 officers, 200 enlisted personnel, and 2 civilians for a total of 212 personnel. The 66 WPS would utilize existing 354 FS facilities at Buildings 4800, 4809, and 4810.

The 66 WPS and the 422 TES functions have a number of live weapons requirements. The number of live ordnance load area (LOLA) aircraft parking spaces currently at Davis-Monthan AFB is inadequate to support the increase in live weapons requirements associated with the beddown of the 7 PAA A-10; Up to 14 additional LOLA spaces would need to be constructed. The additional LOLA spaces would be near the present LOLA.

The 66 WPS would fly 1,213 A-10C sorties per year with an average duration of 2 hours for each sortie. The training syllabus requires 861 day sorties and 352 night sorties per year to graduate 12 students per year. A night sortie is defined as takeoff or landing before 7:00 am or after 10:00 pm local time. The entire sortie does not need to occur during those hours; any portion of a sortie occurring during those hours counts as a night sortie.

The 66 WPS is responsible for both A-10 and JTAC training. The 66 WPS would utilize air-to-ground munitions and defensive countermeasures during A-10 training and small arms ordnance for JTAC training (**Tables 2-4** and **2-5**).

Table 2-4 66 WPS A-10 Weapons and Defensive Countermeasure Annual Quantities

Weapon or Defensive Countermeasure	Projected Quantity
30-millimeter target practice/high-explosive aircraft cannon ammo	208,800
2.75-inch rocket target practice/white phosphorous	2,349
Laser rocket	99
Illumination rocket	1,566
Joint direct attack munition	80
Laser-guided bomb	107
Cluster bomb unit	64
Air-to-ground missile	58
BDU-33	1,249
M-206 flares	12,000
RR-170 chaff	12,000

66 WPS = 66th Weapons Squadron

Table 2-5
66 WPS JTAC Ordnance Quantities

Ordnance Type	Projected Quantity
5.56-millimeter ball ammunition	16,620
5.56-millimeter tracer ammunition	15,720
5.56-millimeter ultimate training munition	4,860
7.62-millimeter ammunition	11,400
9-millimeter ammunition	16,160
Grenade simulator	44
40-millimeter smoke round	126
Smoke grenade	100

66 WPS = 66th Weapons Squadron; JTAC = Joint Terminal Attack Controller

2.2.2 422nd Test and Evaluation Squadron

The 422 TES performs operational testing of all fighter aircraft and munitions entering and in operational use by ACC. The 422 TES is a geographically separated unit of the 53rd Test and Evaluation Group stationed at Nellis AFB. After a new fighter weapons system completes developmental testing, the mission of the 422 TES is to thoroughly vet the new equipment in a combat representative environment. A variety of aircraft are assigned to the 422 TES, to include A-10, F-15C, F-15E, F-16, F-22A and F-35A. The Air Force proposes to relocate the portion of the 422 TES that supports A-10 Operational Test to Davis-Monthan AFB.

Aircraft transferring to Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of four PAA A-10C. Personnel transfers to Davis Monthan AFB would consist of 5 officers and 4 civilians for a total of 9 personnel.

The 422 TES would fly 472 A-10C sorties per year with an average duration of 2 hours for each sortie, including 72 night sorties per year. The 422 TES also would utilize air-to-ground munitions and self-defense countermeasures for A-10 training (**Table 2-6**).

Table 2-6
422 TES A-10 Annual Weapons and Defensive Countermeasures Quantities

Weapon or Defensive Countermeasure	Projected Quantity
30-millimeter CTG TP PGU-15A	46,000
30-millimeter cartridge 2 HEI	11,500
30-millimeter CTG HEI PGU-13D	11,500
Illumination rocket	350
Joint direct attack munition	46
Laser-guided bomb	34
Cluster bomb unit	36
Air-to-ground missile	48
Heavy-weight inert bomb	160
BDU-33	450
M-206 flares	3000
RR-170 chaff	900
Chaff RR-188	3000

422 TES = 422nd Test and Evaluation Squadron

2.2.3 66th Rescue Squadron

The 66 RQS and the 58 RQS operate jointly as a composite mission. The 66 RQS provides HH-60G aircraft and the 58 RQS provides Guardian Angel pararescue personnel.

The 66 RQS operates the HH-60G Pave Hawk medium-lift Combat Search and Rescue helicopter and provides rapidly deployable, full-spectrum expeditionary personnel recovery vertical lift capabilities to theater commanders worldwide. The 66 RQS tactically employs the HH-60G helicopter and its crew in hostile environments to recover downed aircrew and isolated personnel during day, night, or marginal weather conditions in contested airspace employing skills such as weapons employment, shipboard operations, and aerial refueling. The RQS also conducts military operations including civil search and rescue, disaster relief, international aid, and emergency medical evacuation.

Aircraft transferring to Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 14 PAA HH-60W. Personnel transfers associated with the aircraft would consist of 56 officers, 569 enlisted personnel, and 8 civilians for a total of 633 personnel.

The 66 RQS would fly 1,100 A-10C sorties per year, of which approximately 550 would occur at night. The 66 RQS would utilize air-to-ground munitions and self-defense countermeasures for HH-60G training (**Table 2-7**).

Figure 2-1 below shows the proposed location of new construction for the 66 RQS on the northern portion of the Base (approximately 100,000 square feet in size. Proposed locations for construction of new helicopter simulator facilities (approximately 13,000 square feet each) are depicted in **Figure 2-2**.

Weapon or Defensive Countermeasure	Projected Quantity
.50-caliber machine gun ammunition up to Armor Piercing Incendiary Tracer	297,000 rounds
7.62-millimeter machine gun ammunition	1,587,600 rounds
Chaff	1,920
Flare	4,000

Table 2-766 RQS Annual Weapons and Defensive Countermeasures

66 RQS = 66th Rescue Squadron



FIGURE 2-1 Proposed Locations of New Construction for the 88 TES, 66 RQS, and 34 WPS under the Proposed Action — Sunglow Realignment MILCON

1,000 Feet

Existing Buildings

Ν

Installation Boundary
Proposed Projects

Imagery: ESRI, 2021. Coordinate System: NAD 83 UTM Zone 12N





FIGURE 2-2 58th RQS And HH-60 Simulator Proposed Action

500 Feet

Existing BuildingsProposed Projects

Ν



0

Imagery: ESRI, 2021. Coordinate System: NAD 83 UTM Zone 12N

2.2.4 58th Rescue Squadron

The 58 RQS Guardian Angel mission is uniquely designed and dedicated to conduct personnel recovery across the full range of military operations and during all phases of joint, coalition, and combined operations. Its most fundamental mission tasks are: (1) to prepare personnel who may be isolated or become missing while participating in US government-sanctioned military activities (or missions in uncertain or hostile environments), (2) to conduct recovery operations during peacetime and war, and (3) to lead reintegration operations after a recovery.

Personnel transferring to Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 22 officers, 129 enlisted personnel, and 12 civilians for a total of 163 personnel. The 58 RQS would require construction of a new facility (approximately 65,000 square feet) near the south end of the aircraft ramp (see **Figure 2-2**).

The 58 RQS has no assigned aircraft and relies upon the 66 RQS and other units to complete its training.

2.2.5 34th Weapons Squadron

The 34 WPS is assigned to the Air Force Weapons School and provides HH-60G and HC-130J instructional flying for air rescue missions. Aircraft transferring to Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 4 PAA HH-60W; no HC-130J aircraft would be transferred to Davis-Monthan AFB. Personnel transferring to Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 13 officers, 18 enlisted personnel, and 2 civilians for a total of 33 personnel.

The 34 WPS would require additional munitions facilities and munitions support facilities (see **Figure 2-1**). Proposed locations for construction of new helicopter simulator facilities are depicted in **Figure 2-2**.

As shown in **Table 2-3** above, the 34 WPS would fly 372 HH-60G sorties per year, of which 148 would occur at night. The 34 WPS would utilize air-to-ground munitions and self-defense countermeasures for HH-60G and HC-130J training (**Table 2-8**).

Weapon or Defensive Countermeasure	Projected Quantity
.50-caliber machine gun ammunition up to Armor Piercing Incendiary Tracer	198,200 rounds
7.62-millimeter machine gun ammunition	794,800 rounds
HH-60G chaff	4,201
HH-60G flare	2,000
HC-130J chaff	8,400
HC-130J flare	6,720

 Table 2-8

 34 WPS HH-60G Annual Weapons and Defensive Countermeasures

34 WPS = 34th Weapons Squadron

2.2.6 88th Test and Evaluation Squadron

The 88 TES is part of the Combat Search and Rescue Combined Test Force and is the Air Force's unit responsible for testing, evaluating, and developing tactics for Combat Search and Rescue. The 88 TES performs this mission on the HH-60G, HC-130J, and Guardian Angel weapon systems.

Aircraft transferring to Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 2 PAA HH-60W. Personnel transferring to Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 20 officers, 37 enlisted personnel, and 31 civilians for a total of 88 personnel.

The 88 TES would require construction of two new facilities (approximately 100,000 square feet for each building) co-located with new construction for the 66 RQS (see **Figure 2-1** above). The 88 TES would fly 195 HH-60G sorties per year, of which approximately 48 would occur at night. The 88 TES would utilize air-to-ground munitions and self-defense countermeasures for HH-60W training (**Table 2-9**).

Weapon or Defensive Countermeasure	Projected Quantity
.50-caliber machine gun ammunition up to Armor Piercing Incendiary Tracer	59,200 rounds
7.62-mm machine gun ammunition	151,000 rounds
HH-60W chaff	1,300
HH-60W flare	3,307

Table 2-988 TES HH-60W Annual Weapons and Defensive Countermeasures

2.2.7 354th Fighter Squadron

The 354 FS is an active-duty operational A-10 squadron stationed at Davis-Monthan AFB. The Air Force proposes to inactivate the 354 FS and retire the A-10s assigned to this unit.

Aircraft transferring to the Aircraft Maintenance and Regeneration Center at Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 18 PAA A-10C. Personnel departing Davis-Monthan AFB would consist of 505 positions.

The inactivation of the 354 FS would result in a decrease of 3,691 A-10C sorties per year. Night flying would decrease by 416 sorties.

2.2.8 357th Fighter Squadron

The 357 FS is an active-duty A-10C FTU stationed at Davis-Monthan AFB. This mission would transfer to the AFRC and the 357 FS would be converted to an active association with AFRC. The 357 FS resources would associate with the 47 FS to result in a single AFRC-assigned A-10C FTU squadron.

The 357 FS has 21 PAA A-10C assigned and the 47 FS has 24 PAA A-10C assigned for a combined FTU total of 45 PAA. As the 357 FS is converted to an active association and resources combined with the 47 FS, the total FTU PAA would be reduced from 45 PAA to 32 PAA, a reduction of 13 PAA A-10C. A total of 13 PAA A-10 aircraft would depart Davis-Monthan AFB under this action.

There are currently 713 personnel associated with the 357 FS at Davis-Monthan AFB. While the 357 FS would be converted to an active association without assigned aircraft, these manpower authorizations would largely stay in place. A number of the personnel would convert into an active association with the 47 FS at Davis-Monthan AFB. The remainder are expected to stay in place to support the 66 WPS and 422 TES missions moving from Nellis AFB. Maintenance for the 66 WPS and 422 TES at Nellis AFB are provided by contract maintenance that would not transfer to Davis-Monthan AFB.

The conversion of the 357 FS would result in the reduction of 5,160 A-10C sorties. Night flying would decrease by 928 sorties. A number of sorties previously flown by the 357 FS would shift to the 47 FS as the 47 FS gains aircraft from the 357 FS.

2.2.9 47th Fighter Squadron

The conversion of the 357 FS would result in the addition of 8 PAA A-10C to the 47 FS. The addition of these aircraft would result in an increase of 5,160 sorties per year, of which 928 would occur at night.

As stated in **Section 2.2.8**, personnel from the 357 FS would convert into an active association with the 47 FS at Davis-Monthan AFB. The 47 FS would utilize self-defense countermeasures for training (**Table 2-9**).

Table 2-9
47 FS Annual Weapons and Defensive Countermeasures

Weapon or Defensive Countermeasure	Projected Quantity
M206 flare	76,825
Chaff RR-188	22,696

47 FS = 47th Fighter Squadron

2.2.10 Beddown Civil Air Patrol Cessna 182

Two Cessna 182 aircraft would beddown and operate from Davis-Monthan AFB; the aircraft would be parked on the North Ramp (**Figure 2-1**). Operations would support Cadet orientation flights for the CAP, Reserve Officer Training Corps, and Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps. The aircraft would also support search and rescue and disaster relief training and operational missions, counter narcotics operations, and low/slow flying intercept training. No new facilities would be constructed for CAP operations under this Proposed Action; however, there might be associated construction in the future, which would be covered under a separate NEPA a analysis.

The Cessna 182 aircraft would fly one to three sorties per day, for a maximum of 720 sorties per year (based on three per day for 240 days per year). All sorties would conclude with a single approach to a full stop landing. Any pattern work for training and proficiency would be accomplished at satellite airfields in the local area.

2.2.11 Relocate RC-26B Operations

One RC-26B aircraft and associated personnel would be relocated from Morris ANGB to Davis-Monthan AFB. The aircraft would be off-station an average of 30 to 90 days per year supporting law enforcement activities, disaster relief, and national requests. Additional manpower would consist of 10 aircrew (6 full-time, 4 part-time), and 3 full-time contract logistics support/maintenance personnel.

No new facilities would be constructed for relocation of RC-26B operations. Personnel would be located at Building 1711 in the Snowbird Compound.

The RC-26B aircraft would average 2 to 3 sorties per day with approximately 720 sorties per year. Approximately 50 sorties would occur at night.

2.3 AIRSPACE USE

The primary airspace utilized by the 355 WG is the Barry M. Goldwater Range (BMGR). The Tombstone, Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci and Ruby/Fuzzy Military Operations Areas (MOAs) are accessible for training within 125 miles of Davis-Monthan AFB (**Figure 2-3**). MOAs consist of airspace of defined vertical and lateral limits established for the purpose of separating certain military training activities from commercial and personal air traffic. Whenever a MOA is being used, nonparticipating flight traffic may be cleared through a MOA if separation can be provided by air traffic control. Otherwise, nonparticipating traffic will be rerouted (FAA, 2021).

The BMGR was established in 1941 and is located in southwest Arizona along the US-Mexico border. It is located within Maricopa, Pima, and Yuma counties, Arizona, and covers 1,050,000 acres of land and 7,000 square miles of Special Use Airspace (SUA). BMGR supports over 54,000 operations per year. The range offers four manned target complexes, an aerial gunnery range, and three tactical ranges for advanced training scenarios. Electronic combat systems include air combat maneuvering instrumentation for live monitoring and recorded playback debrief, tactical datalink, threat simulation, moving target systems, and a range operations center providing real-time range/airspace access and management.





The total increase in operations under the Proposed Action would be 15,112sorties flown in the combined airspaces annually (an increase of 1,101 from baseline conditions).

The projected airspace operations also include those flown by other aircraft in support of the 66 WPS A-10C and JTAC WIC. These include operations flown by fixed aircraft to include bombers, electronic warfare and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft. It also includes support operations flown by rotary wing aircraft.

2.3.1 Combined Weapons Changes in Special Use Airspace/Ranges

The Proposed Action also would result in changes to the quantities of ordnance utilized. Ordnance in this case is defined as any air-to-ground munition such as bombs, missiles, rockets, or aircraft-mounted machine guns or cannons. It also includes ground-to-ground munitions such as rifle, pistol, and machine gun ammunition or grenades.

2.3.2 Combined Defensive Countermeasure Changes in Special Use Airspace/Ranges

Defensive countermeasures are defined as expendable devices used to help protect the aircraft from hostile actions. Chaff and flares are the principal defensive countermeasures dispensed by military aircraft to avoid detection or attack by enemy air defense systems.

Chaff is an electronic countermeasure designed to reflect radar waves and obscure aircraft, ships, and other equipment from radar tracking sources. Chaff bundles consist of millions of nonhazardous aluminum-coated glass fibers. When ejected from the aircraft, these fibers disperse widely in the air, forming an electromagnetic screen that temporarily hides the aircraft from radar and forms a radar decoy, allowing the aircraft to defensively maneuver or leave the area.

Flares are a principal defensive countermeasure dispensed by military aircraft to avoid detection or attack by enemy air defense systems. Flares are magnesium pellets ejected from military aircraft and provide high-temperature heat sources that act as decoys for heat-seeking weapons targeting the aircraft. These defensive countermeasures are utilized to keep aircraft from being successfully targeted by or escape from weapons such as surface-to-air missiles, air-to-air missiles, and anti-aircraft artillery.

Under the Proposed Action, chaff and flares would be only used over the BMGR and Ruby Fuzzy MOAs. To minimize the potential for flares to ignite vegetation, flares would be employed at an altitude that prevents the flares from impacting the ground or structures. Chaff and flares would be used in compliance with the 355 WG Inflight Guide. The 354 and 357 FS currently use chaff and flare within the BMGR and Ruby Fuzzy MOAs. Under the Davis-Monthan Restructure discussed in Sections 1.3.1 and 2.2, the overall usage of chaff and flare would remain consistent with existing levels of usage.



SHPO-2023-0348 (168267)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE 355TH CIVIL ENGINEER SQUADRON (ACC) DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA RECEIVED

MAR 21 2023

ARIZONA SHPO

17 March 2023

355 CES/CEIE 3775 South Fifth Street Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ 85707-3012

State Historic Preservation Office Arizona State Parks & Trails 1110 W Washington St, Suite 100 Phoenix, AZ 85007

MEMORANDUM FOR: ARIZONA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION

FROM: 355 Civil Engineer Squadron, Flight Chief

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment for Proposed Davis-Monthan Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment

Dear Kathryn Leonard,

The purpose of this letter is twofold: to give you an opportunity to review and comment on a proposed action in which the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) may have an interest; and to initiate consultation pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and 36 CFR § 800.3.

The United States Air Force (Air Force) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to evaluate the potential impacts associated with the Proposed Action to relocate the 4th Generation (Gen) missions from Nellis Air Force Base (AFB), Nevada, to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona. The Proposed Action to reassign the 4th Gen mission is needed because the current mission sets assigned to Nellis AFB and the Air Force Weapons Center are outpacing the ability to expand resources and capacity.

The first step in making space for the 5th Gen mission at Nellis AFB is identifying those 4th Gen missions that must be relocated and installations with available space for relocated aircraft. The Air Force proposes to relocate a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller (JTAC) training, and Guardian Angel operations to Davis-Monthan AFB. There are several other proposed actions at Davis-Monthan AFB unrelated to these relocations that are occurring on approximately the same timelines and are therefore included in the EA analysis. These actions consist of establishing a new Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) wing overhead structure, assignment of one Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Cessna 182 aircraft, and the transfer of one RC-26B aircraft from Tucson International Airport.

TRAIN – DEPLOY – WIN RESCUE & ATTACK! Taking into account various environmental concerns, the Air Force is engaging early with the appropriate resource and regulatory agencies as it formulates this undertaking. Pursuant to 36 CFR Sections 800.4(a) and (b), we request your assistance in defining the Area of Potential Effect (APE) and information on any historic properties located therein that may be affected. Location maps are included as part of the attachment to this letter. Your comments will help us develop the scope of our environmental review.

The EA will assess the potential environmental consequences associated with the Proposed Action and Alternatives. Potential impacts identified during the initial planning stages include effects on airspace management and use, noise, safety, air quality, cultural resources, hazardous materials and wastes, soils, water resources, biological resources, land use, infrastructure, socioeconomics and environmental justice and protection of children. The EA will examine the cumulative effects when combined with past, present, and any reasonably foreseeable future actions. In support of this process, we request your input in identifying general or specific issues or areas of concern you believe should be addressed in the EA.

We intend to provide your agency with a copy of the Draft EA when the document is completed. Please inform us if additional copies are needed or if someone else within your agency other than you should receive the Draft EA. We will also provide you with a 36 CFR § 800.4 effects determination after we have completed the historic property identification process.

Please reach out to my point of contact, provided below, on any issues or concerns you have in the development of this EA. We ask your assistance in identifying any issues or concerns of which we may be unaware, particularly those that may be affected by this proposal.

The Air Force point of contact for this project is Mr. Kevin Wakefield, EIAP Program Manager. Please send him your comments and concerns to 3775 South Fifth Street, Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, 85707-3012, or by email or phone at kevin.wakefield.1@us.af.mil or (520) 228-4035. I look forward to receiving any input you may have regarding this endeavor. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this effort.

Sincerely.

CHRISTOPHER L. BREWSTER, PE Flight Chief, Installation Management

Attachment: Summary of the Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives Thank you for consulting with our office. We look forward to continuing Section 106 consultation. When defining the area of potential effects (APE), the APE should adhere to the definition at 36 CFR 800.16: "...the geographical area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist..." This includes horizontal and vertical extents. We recommend that the APE include any new construction needed for the undertaking and any airspace that will see increased use and, per 36 CFR 800.5(2)(v), "increase in the introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features" should historic properties be present. For this undertaking, it is possible that Traditional Cultural Properties, including those of traditional religious and cultural importance to Native American tribes, are present that could be adversely affected by the undertaking. The views of Indian tribes are based on expertise and information not available and/or possessed by our staff, but are critical to informing the Section 106 review process. The Air Force remains responsible for consulting with and considering the views of Indian tribes. Please don't hesitate to contact me if you would like assistance identifying the appropriate Tribes to consult, or review our Government-to-Government Consultation Toolkit at https://sites.google.com/view/az-consultation-toolkit for information on how to determine which Tribes have an interest in the geographical areas.

EP

Erin Davis Arizona State Historic Preservation Office April 18, 2023

Received from Tribal Admin $\frac{3}{2}$ $\left|\frac{33}{23}\right|^{23}$ W E-mailed $\frac{05}{04}$ $\left|\frac{33}{03}\right|^{23}$ W Scanned D5/04/B(it Aut dare)



L

SAN CARLOS APACHE TRIBE Historic Preservation & Archaeology Department P.O. Box 0 San Carlos Arizona 85550 Tel. (928) 475-5797, apachevern@yahoo.com

Tribal Consultation Response Letter

Date: March 23,	2023	
Contact Name:	Scott C. Mills	(520) 228-4035/kevin.wakefield.1@us.af.mil
Company:	npany: Department of the Air Force – Davis-Monthan Air Force	
Address:	3405 South Fifth Street David-Monthan AFB AZ 85707-3012	
Project Name/#:	Environmental Assessment for Davis Monthan Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment	

Dear Sir or Madam:

Under Section 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act, we are replying to the above referenced project. Please see the appropriate marked circle, including the signatures of Vernelda Grant, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), and the concurrence of the Chairman of the San Carlos Apache Tribe:

O NO INTEREST/NO FURTHER CONSULTATION/NO FUTURE UPDATES We defer to the Tribe located nearest to the project area.

CONCURRENCE WITH REPORT FINDINGS & THANK YOU

REQUEST ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

I require additional information in order to provide a finding of effect for this proposed undertaking, i.e. We request a Virtual or In-Project description Map Photos Other

O NO EFFECT

Meeting w/ Vavis- Monthan Dres I have determined that there are no properties of religious and cultural significance to the San Carlos Apache Tribe that are listed on the National Register within the area of potential effect or that the proposed project will have no effect on any such properties that may be present.

O NO ADVERSE EFFECT

Properties of cultural and religious significance within the area of effect have been identified that are eligible for listing in the National Register for which there would be no adverse effect as a result of the proposed project.

O ADVERSE EFFECT

I have identified properties of cultural and religious significance within the area of potential effect that are eligible for listing in the National Register. I believe the proposed project would cause an adverse effect on these properties. Please contact the THPO for further discussion.

We were taught traditionally not to disturb the natural world in a significant way, and that to do so may cause harm to oneself or one's family. Apache resources can be best protected by managing the land to be as natural as it was in pre-1870s settlement times. Please contact the THPO, if there is a change in any portion of the project, especially if Apache cultural resources are found at any phase of planning and construction. Thank you for contacting the San Carlos Anache Tribe, your time and effort is greatly appreciated

TOT CONTERPORTE CITE OFT	Controp 1 ipuelle	THOU, JOHN C	the and enote is sidely	approvince.
DIRECTOR/THPO:			6 And	04/23/23
	Vernelda J. Grant,	Tribal Historic	Preservation Officer	Date
CONCURRENCE:_	Jerry	Kam	fle	5/1/23
	Terry Rambler, Tr.	ibal Chairman		Date

Kevin Groppe

From:	WAKEFIELD, KEVIN L CIV USAF ACC 355 CES/CEIE <kevin.wakefield.1@us.af.mil></kevin.wakefield.1@us.af.mil>
Sent:	Thursday, March 23, 2023 3:28 PM
То:	Kevin Groppe
Cc:	WAKEFIELD, KEVIN L CIV USAF ACC 355 CES/CEIE
Subject:	FW: EA for David-Monthan Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment

Just in from the Tohono O'odham Nation.

v/r kevin

Kevin Wakefield, GS-13, DAFC Environmental Section Chief Base Natural and Cultural Resource Manager EIAP Program Manager 355 CES/CEIE 3775 South Fifth Street Davis-Monthan AFB AZ 85707-3012 Email: kevin.wakefield.1@us.af.mil DSN: 228-4035 Comm: (520) 228-4035

-----Original Message-----From: Peter Steere <Peter.Steere@tonation-nsn.gov> Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2023 1:23 PM To: WAKEFIELD, KEVIN L CIV USAF ACC 355 CES/CEIE <kevin.wakefield.1@us.af.mil> Subject: [Non-DoD Source] EA for David-Monthan Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment

Kevin Wakefield

EIAP Program Manager

The Tohono O'odham Nation has no issues or concerns regarding

The EA for Davis Monthan Fourth Generation Mission Regional Realignment

Peter L. Steere

THPO

Tohono O'odham Nation



White Mountain Apache Tribe Office of Historic Preservation PO Box 1032 Fort Apache, AZ 85926 Ph: (928) 338-3033 Fax: (928) 338-6055

To: Scott C. Mills, Colonel, USAF Davis Monthan AFB

Date: March 23, 2023

Re: EA for Davis-Monthan Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment

The White Mountain Apache Tribe Historic Preservation Office appreciates receiving information on the project dated; <u>March 17, 2023.</u> In regards to this, please refer to the following statement(s) below.

Thank you for allowing the White Mountain Apache tribe the opportunity to review and respond to the above proposed relocation of the 4th Generation missions from Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona.

Please be advised, we have reviewed the consultation letter and the information provided, and we've determined that the project will have "*No Adverse Effect*" to the tribe's cultural heritage resources and/or historic properties.

Thank you for early tribal engagement and consultation, and continued collaborations in protecting and preserving places of cultural and historical importance. We concur with the project report and recommendations.

Sincerely,

Mark Altaha

White Mountain Apache Tribe – THPO Historic Preservation Office



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE 355TH CIVIL ENGINEER SQUADRON (ACC) DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA

December 4, 2023

355 CES/CEIE 3775 South Fifth Street Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ 85707-3012

Ms. Ursula Nelson Interim Director 33 N. Stove Ave., Suite 700 Pima County Department of Environmental Quality Tucson, AZ 85701

MEMORANDUM FOR: STAKEHOLDERS

FROM: 355 Civil Engineer Squadron, Installation Management Flight Chief

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment for Davis-Monthan Air Force Base Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment

Dear Ms. Nelson,

The United States Air Force (Air Force) has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to evaluate the potential impacts associated with the Proposed Action to relocate the 4th Generation (Gen) missions from Nellis Air Force Base (AFB), Nevada, to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona. The Proposed Action to reassign the 4th Gen mission is needed because the current mission sets assigned to Nellis AFB and the Air Force Weapons Center are outpacing the ability to expand resources and capacity.

The Air Force proposes to relocate a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller training, and Guardian Angel operations to Davis-Monthan AFB. There are several other proposed actions at Davis-Monthan AFB unrelated to these relocations that are occurring on approximately the same timelines and are therefore included in the EA analysis. These actions consist of establishing a new Air Force Reserve Command wing overhead structure, assignment of two Civil Air Patrol Cessna 182 aircraft, and the transfer of one RC-26B aircraft from Tucson International Airport.

In accordance with NEPA, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations, and the USAF NEPA regulations, Davis-Monthan AFB is providing the Draft Environmental Assessment and Proposed Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for review via the installation's website at https://www.dm.af.mil/About-DM/Environmental-Stewardship/. Please inform us if a CD copy is needed or if someone else within your agency other than you should receive the Draft EA. Please provide comments on the Draft EA and Proposed FONSI within 30

TRAIN – DEPLOY – WIN RESCUE & ATTACK! days of receipt of this letter to Ms. Barbara Long, NEPA Manager, as my principal point of contact on this consultation. She can be reached at 3775 South Fifth Street, Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, 85707-3012, or by email or phone at <u>barbara.long.3@us.af.mil</u> or (520) 228-4035. I look forward to receiving any input you may have regarding this endeavor. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this effort.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER L. BREWSTER, PE Flight Chief, Installation Management



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE 355TH WING (ACC) DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE ARIZONA

November 3, 2023

Colonel Scott C. Mills, USAF Commander 355th Wing 3405 South Fifth Street Davis-Monthan AFB AZ 85707-3012

Chairman Calvin Johnson Tonto Apache Tribe of Arizona 30 Tonto Apache Reservation Payson AZ 85541

Subject: Environmental Assessment for Davis Monthan Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment

Dear Chairman Johnson

In recent months you should have received a letter, briefly describing the Air Force's proposal to relocate the 4th Generation (Gen) missions from Nellis Air Force Base (AFB), Nevada, to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona. Now, I would like to follow up by inviting the Tonto Apache Tribe of Arizona to engage in government-to-government consultation with Davis-Monthan AFB on the proposal per the National Historic Preservation Act and regulations at 36 CFR Part 800.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations, and Air Force NEPA regulations, Davis-Monthan AFB is providing the Draft Environmental Assessment and Proposed Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for review via the installation's website at <u>https://www.dm.af.mil/About-DM/Environmental-Stewardship/</u>. Please inform us if a hard copy is needed.

The Air Force proposes to relocate a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller (JTAC) training, and Guardian Angel operations to Davis-Monthan AFB. There are several other proposed actions at Davis-Monthan AFB unrelated to these relocations that are occurring on approximately the same timelines and are therefore included in the EA analysis. These actions consist of establishing a new Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) wing overhead structure, assignment of one Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Cessna 182 aircraft, and the transfer of one RC-26B aircraft from Tucson International Airport. The Area of Potential Effect (APE) for this undertaking is defined in the following manner:

- On Davis-Monthan AFB, the direct APE is defined as the area within 50 meters of the proposed projects. The indirect APE on Nellis AFB is defined as the area within 800 meters around the direct APE.
- Outside Davis-Monthan AFB, the APE is defined as the land under the special use airspace that would be used for aircraft training activities. Please refer to Figure 2-2 in the Draft EA.

Pursuant to Section 106 of the NHPA, implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800, and Department of Defense Instruction 4710.02, *DoD Interactions with Federally Recognized Tribes* (2018), we request government-to-government consultation on this Proposed Action. In particular, we invite you, pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.4(a)(4), to provide information on any properties of historic, religious, or cultural significance that may be affected by our proposed undertaking. Regardless of whether the Tonto Apache Tribe of Arizona chooses to consult on this project, the Air Force will comply with the *Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990* (NAGPRA) by informing you of any inadvertent discovery of archaeological or human remains and consulting on their disposition.

I understand that, to date, the Tonto Apache Tribe of Arizona has not identified any properties of religious and cultural significance in the area of the special use airspace that would be used for aircraft training activities. We now invite you to identify any such properties that might be affected by our Proposed Action. Please let us know if any of these properties are present, along with any supporting information on their eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. To ensure that we can make full use of any information you provide, it would be helpful to hear back from you 30 days from receipt of this letter. I have designated Ms. Barbara Long, NEPA Manager, as my principal point of contact on this consultation. She can be reached at 3775 South Fifth Street, Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, 85707-3012, or by email or phone at barbara.long.3@us.af.mil or (520) 228-4035. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely

OTT MILLS, Colonel, USAF

From:	LONG, BARBARA E CIV USAF ACC 355 CES/CEI
То:	incomingAZcorr@fws.gov
Cc:	Kevin Groppe; WAKEFIELD, KEVIN L CIV USAF ACC 355 CES/CEIE
Subject:	Davis-Monthan Air Force Base Realignment EA - USFW Letter
Date:	Monday, December 18, 2023 11:02:20 AM
Attachments:	DMAFB 4th Gen EA USFWS Letter 9-28-2023.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning,

A Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and proposed Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) have been prepared to analyze the potential impacts associated with the relocation of several A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller training, and Guardian Angel operations to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona. The public comment period is currently ongoing.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base requests concurrence with a no effect determination per Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act regarding this proposal.

The consultation letter is attached.

The Draft EA can be downloaded at the following URL: <u>https://www.dm.af.mil/Portals/99/Davis-</u> <u>Monthan%20Realignment%20Draft%20EA%20%28October%202023%29.pdf</u>

Respectfully,

Barbara Long, PMAES, DFAC Cultural/Natural Resources & NEPA Manager 355 CES/CEIE 3775 South Fifth Street Davis-Monthan AFB AZ 85707-3012 Email: <u>barbara.long.3@us.af.mil</u> Comm: 520-228-4035

"To be a friend of nature, you have to communicate with nature. You have to understand the voice of nature." `(Farina,2014)



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE 355TH CIVIL ENGINEER SQUADRON (ACC) DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA

355 CES/CEIE 3775 South Fifth Street Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ 85707-3012

U.S. Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service Arizona Ecological Services Field Office Phoenix AZ 85051

MEMORANDUM FOR: U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

FROM: 355 Civil Engineer Squadron, Installation Management Flight Chief

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment for Davis-Monthan Air Force Base Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment

Dear Sir/Madam,

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base (AFB) requests concurrence with a *no effect* determination per Section 7 of the Endangered Species ct regarding a proposal by the United States Air Force (USAF) to relocate the 4th Generation (Gen) missions from Nellis Air Force Base (AFB), Nevada, to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona.

The Air Force proposes to relocate a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller (JTAC) training, and Guardian Angel operations to Davis-Monthan AFB. There are several other proposed actions at Davis-Monthan AFB unrelated to these relocations that are occurring on approximately the same timelines and are therefore included in the EA analysis. These actions consist of establishing a new Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) wing overhead structure, assignment of two Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Cessna 182 aircraft, and the transfer of one RC-26B aircraft from Tucson International Airport. Existing airspace would be utilized for training.

Threatened, Endangered, and Candidate Species and Critical Habitat

The Region of Influence (ROI) for biological resources is Davis-Monthan AFB and the associated Special Use Airspace. The ROI for biological resources included in the analysis of primary airspace and primary ranges under the Proposed Action includes eight counties in Arizona and New Mexico: Maricopa, Pinal, Yuma, Pima, Cochise, and Santa Cruz counties, Arizona; Hidalgo and Luna counties, New Mexico.

TRAIN – DEPLOY – WIN RESCUE & ATTACK! No federally listed threatened or endangered species have been observed on Davis-Monthan AFB, nor does critical habitat exist within Davis-Monthan AFB. The Installation manages threatened and endangered species proactively to prevent potential listings as well as conserve species that are legally protected or of concern at the state or federal level. The areas designated for construction activities under the Proposed Action have limited suitable habitat for wildlife. The developed portion of Davis-Monthan AFB, in which the projects proposed would be located, supports relatively common wildlife species such as small mammals.

Federally listed threatened, endangered, and/or candidate mammal and bird species that could occur in the Special Use Airspace ROI are presented in **Table 1**. Plant, invertebrate, and fish species are not presented, as the Proposed Action would be unlikely to impact these species.

Name	Scientific Name	Federal Listing Status
Mammals		S. 11
Jaguar	Panthera onca	Endangered
Ocelot	Felis pardalis	Endangered
Sonoran Pronghorn	Antilocapra americana sonoriensis	Endangered
Birds		
California Least Tern	Sterna antillarum browni	Endangered
Masked Bobwhite	Colinus virginianus ridgwayi	Endangered
Mexican Spotted Owl	Strix occidentalis lucida	Threatened
Southwestern Willow Flycatcher	Empidonax traillii extimus	Endangered
Yellow-billed Cuckoo	Coccyzus americanus	Threatened
Yuma Clapper Rail	Rallus longirostris yumanensis	Endangered
Narrow-headed Gartersnake	Thamnophis rufipunctatus	Threatened
Northern Mexican Gartersnake	Thamnophis eques megalops	Threatened
Sonoyta Mud Turtle	Kinosternon sonoriense longifemorale	Endangered
New Mexican Ridge-nosed Rattlesnake	Crotalus willardi	Threatened
Amphibians		
Chiricahua Leopard Frog	Rana chiricahuensis	Threatened
Sonora Tiger Salamander	Ambystoma tigrinum stebbinsi	Endangered

 Table 1.

 Threatened and Endangered Species Associated with the Special Use Airspace

Determination of the Effects of the Proposed Action

Impacts to biological resources occurring under the Special Use Airspace that would be utilized under the Proposed Action could result from overflights and associated noise, the use of munitions and flares, and bird-aircraft collisions. No sonic booms would occur due to the Proposed Action. Wildlife, especially avian species, utilizing the surrounding undeveloped areas underneath the SUA for foraging and breeding would normally be sensitive to increased noise impacts from military aircraft. Although there is variability in responses across species, many birds and wildlife have the ability to habituate to noise and movement from military aircraft, and military aircraft operations have been ongoing at Davis-Monthan AFB for decades and are now part of the natural noise environment. As such, these species would likely not be startled or at risk from aircraft strikes from aircraft flying at higher altitudes. Aircraft noise in the MOAs would have no effect on bird species as the noise levels would not exceed 52 decibels. The listed mammals would potentially only be affected by aircraft overflights if the training activities elicited negative behavioral responses. It is highly unlikely that either aircraft movement or noise emissions, especially at higher altitudes, would elicit a response from mammals. Noise from the proposed action would not exceed 52 dB and would therefore have no effect on the listed mammal species. Aircraft movement would not be visible to mammals unless an individual was at the exact location at the moment in which an aircraft traveling at high speed at a relatively low altitude passed directly overhead. As such, establishment and use of the proposed Special Use Airspace would have no effect on federally listed mammals.

I am requesting your written concurrence with our *no effect* determination. Included in this transmittal is an electronic copy of the Draft EA. The document can also be found at <u>https://www.dm.af.mil/About-DM/Environmental-Stewardship/</u>. Please provide your response within 30 days of receipt of this letter to Ms. Barbara Long, NEPA Manager, as my principal point of contact on this consultation. She can be reached at 3775 South Fifth Street, Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, 85707-3012, or by email or phone at <u>barbara.long.3@us.af.mil</u> or (520) 228-4035. I look forward to receiving any input you may have regarding this endeavor. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this effort.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER L. BREWSTER, PE Flight Chief, Installation Management



White Mountain Apache Tribe Office of Historic Preservation PO Box 1032 Fort Apache, AZ 85926 Ph: (928) 338-3033 Fax: (928) 338-6055

To: Scott Mills, Colonel, USAF – Department of the Air Force
Date: December 31, 2023
Re: EA for Davis Monthan Fourth generation Missions Regional Realignment

The White Mountain Apache Tribe Historic Preservation Office appreciates receiving information on the project dated; <u>November 03, 2023</u>. In regards to this, please refer to the following statement(s) below.

Thank you for allowing the White Mountain Apache tribe the opportunity to review and respond to the above proposal to relocate a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attached Controller training, and Guardian Angel operations to Davis Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona.

Please be advised, we have reviewed the information provided, we have determined the proposed relocation project will have *"No Adverse Effect"* to the tribe's traditional cultural properties and/or historic properties, and concur with proposed project plans.

Thank you for the continued tribal engagement and consultation, and collaborations in protecting and preserving places of cultural and historical importance.

Sincerely,

Mark Altaha

White Mountain Apache Tribe – THPO Historic Preservation Office

Kevin Groppe

From:	Erin Davis <edavis@azstateparks.gov></edavis@azstateparks.gov>
Sent:	Tuesday, January 9, 2024 2:13 PM
То:	barbara.long.3@us.af.mil
Cc:	Kevin Groppe; WAKEFIELD, KEVIN L GS-11 USAF ACC 355 CES/CEIE
Subject:	Re: Draft Environment Assessment (EA)
Attachments:	2023-0348(172702)-DMAFB 4th Gen EA-NAE.pdf

You don't often get email from edavis@azstateparks.gov. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Ms. Long,

SHPO concurrence with No Adverse Effect attached. Please see below for SHPO comments on the draft EA.

- Page 3-61, Lines 18-19: "...the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1960, as amended (54 USC § 300101 et seq.)" is incorrect. The Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act became law in 1974, and has been incorporated into 54 USC § 312501-312508. 54 USC § 300101 et seq. is the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. Both are appropriate to mention for this undertaking.
- 2. Page 3-61, Line 22: recommend deleting "the NHPA and associated regulations (36 CFR Part 800)." and changing to "the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (54 USC § 300101 et seq.; NHPA) and its implementing regulations (36 CFR Part 800)."
- 3. Page 3-62, Lines 22-23: Recommend changing "...within the APE not eligible" to "...within the APE *that Davis-Monthan AFB determined not eligible, with SHPO concurrence*"

Cheers,

Erin Davis, M.A. (she/her/hers) Archaeological Compliance Specialist

Styj?Ugjfxj&xj<u>f;xmutE%f;xyfyjufwpx3lt{</u>ytnsnyfyjhtsxzq/fyts3%

State Historic Preservation Office 1110 W. Washington Street, Suite 100 Phoenix, AZ 85007 602.542.7141 edavis@azstateparks.gov

On Tue, Dec 12, 2023 at 8:51 AM AZSHPO - AZPARKS <<u>azshpo@azstateparks.gov</u>> wrote: SHPO-2023-0348 (172702) - Notice the filename of the letter...It's dated 09-28-23... ------ Forwarded message -------From: LONG, BARBARA E CIV USAF ACC 355 CES/CEI <<u>barbara.long.3@us.af.mil</u>> Date: Mon, Dec 11, 2023 at 3:33 PM Subject: Draft Environment Assessment (EA) To: <u>kleonard@azparks.gov</u> <<u>kleonard@azparks.gov</u>>, <u>edavis@azstateparks.gov</u> <<u>edavis@azstateparks.gov</u>>, <u>azshpo@azstateparks.gov</u> <<u>azshpo@azstateparks.gov</u>> Cc: Kevin Groppe <<u>Kevin.Groppe@easbio.com</u>>, WAKEFIELD, KEVIN L CIV USAF ACC 355 CES/CEIE <<u>kevin.wakefield.1@us.af.mil</u>>

Good afternoon,

A Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and proposed Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) have been prepared to analyze the potential impacts associated with the relocation of a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller training, and Guardian Angel operations to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona. Previous correspondence occurred with the SHPO in March 23 (SHPO-2023-0348 (168267)). The public comment period is currently ongoing.

The consultation letter is attached.

The Draft EA can be downloaded at the following URL: <u>https://www.dm.af.mil/Portals/99/Davis-Monthan%20Realignment%20Draft%20EA%20%28October%202023%29.pdf</u>

NOK & KOMAN LEGAL NOTICE: This e-mail, including any attached files, may contain company confidential and/or privileged information for the sole use of the intended recipients. Any review, use, distribution, or unauthorized disclosure by other(s) is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorized to receive information for the intended recipient), please contact the sender by reply e-mail and delete all copies of this message. Please note that any views or opinion presented in this e-mail are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Natives of Kodiak, Inc., KOMAN Holdings, LLC, or any of their subsidiaries.

Respectfully,

Barbara Long, PMAES, DFAC

Cultural/Natural Resources & NEPA Manager

355 CES/CEIE

3775 South Fifth StreetDarft EA

Davis-Monthan AFB AZ 85707-3012

Email: <u>barbara.long.3@us.af.mil</u>

Comm: 520-228-4035

"To be a friend of nature, you have to communicate with nature.

You have to understand the voice of nature." `(Farina,2014)


SHPO-2023-0348 (172702)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE 355TH CIVIL ENGINEER SQUADRON (ACC) DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA

355 CES/CEIE 3775 South Fifth Street Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ 85707-3012

Ms. Kathryn Leonard State Historic Preservation Office Arizona State Parks & Trails 1110 W Washington St, Suite 100 Phoenix, AZ 85007

MEMORANDUM FOR: ARIZONA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION

FROM: 355 Civil Engineer Squadron, Installation Management Flight Chief

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment for Proposed Davis-Monthan Air Force Base Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment

Dear Ms. Leonard,

A couple of months ago, I sent you a letter briefly describing the U.S. Air Force's (USAF) proposal to relocate the 4th Generation (Gen) missions from Nellis Air Force Base (AFB), Nevada, to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona. Thank you for your comments in response to that letter. Now, per 36 CFR 800.11(e), I would like to provide documentation of our finding of *No* Adverse Effect and respectfully request your concurrence with this determination.

Under the Proposed Action, the Air Force proposes to relocate a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller (JTAC) training, and Guardian Angel operations to Davis-Monthan AFB. There are several other proposed actions at Davis-Monthan AFB unrelated to these relocations that are occurring on approximately the same timelines and are therefore included in the EA analysis. These actions consist of establishing a new Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) wing overhead structure, assignment of two Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Cessna 182 aircraft, and the transfer of one RC-26B aircraft from Tucson International Airport.

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) for this undertaking is defined in the following manner:

 On Davis-Monthan AFB, the direct APE is defined as the area within 50 meters of the proposed projects. The indirect APE on Nellis AFB is defined as the area within 800 meters around the direct APE.

> TRAIN – DEPLOY – WIN RESCUE & ATTACK!

 Outside Davis-Monthan AFB, the APE is defined as the land under the special use airspace that would be used for aircraft training activities. Please refer to Figure 2-2 in the enclosed Draft EA.

The Air Force has prepared a Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations, and Air Force NEPA regulations to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Action.

Davis-Monthan manages 433 buildings constructed prior to 1991. Thirty-nine structures were determined eligible for National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listing and are managed as such for all future undertakings. These eligible architectural resources consist of 11 buildings in the Munition Storage Area (MSA), Hangar 8030, 27 structures within the Titan Missile Complex, and Titan Missile Site 12. No NRHP-listed or NRHP-eligible building is located within the Davis-Monthan direct or indirect APE for the Proposed Action.

Table 1 presents the number of NRHP-listed sites and Native American lands under the special use airspace to be used for training. This training airspace overlies at least part of 10 Arizona counties (Apache, Cochise, Gila, Graham, Maricopa, Navajo, Pima, Pinal, Santa Cruz, and Yuma) and 2 New Mexico counties (Hidalgo and Luna). One-hundred eighteen NRHP-listed properties have been identified under Davis-Monthan AFB airspace. Three Native American tribes—Fort Sill Apache Tribe of Oklahoma, San Carlos Apache, and the Tohono O'odham Nation—own land under the airspace proposed for use. No other known traditional cultural resources have been identified under the airspace associated with the Proposed Action. Mount Graham is a Traditional Cultural Property as identified by the Apache Tribes of Arizona and is located in the Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci Military Operations AreaMOAs.

Airspace Designation	Number of NRHP Properties Under Airspace	Native American Lands Under the Airspace		
Jackal MOA	31	Fort Sill Apache Tribe of Oklahoma and San Carlos Apache		
Outlaw MOA	39	San Carlos Apache		
R-2301E	1	None		
R-2303A/B/C	8	None		
Ruby and Fuzzy MOAs	2	Tohono O'odham Nation		
Sells 1 and Low MOAs; R-2304 & R-2305	10	Tohono O'odham Nation		
Tombstone A/B/C MOA	27	None		

Table 1 NRHP-Listed Sites and Native American Reservation Lands Under Training Airspace

MOA = Military Operations Area: NRHP = National Register of Historic Places

None of the proposed activities would be expected to affect architectural properties and archaeological resources. Implementation of the Proposed Action would result in a small increase in the annual sorties conducted in the airspace proposed for use. However, the increase in noise would be negligible and below 65 dBA. No additional sonic booms would occur. The increase in noise level due to the escalation in HH-60 operations likely would be imperceptible against the background noise from other jet aircraft (e.g., F-16, F-35) operations within the airspaces.

The Air Force therefore requests written concurrence with its finding of *No Adverse Effect* regarding the Proposed Action/Undertaking at Davis-Monthan AFB and associated airspace. Davis-Monthan AFB is providing the Draft Environmental Assessment and Proposed FONSI for review via the installation's website at <u>https://www.dm.af.mil/About-DM/Environmental-Stewardship/</u>. Please note that the Draft EA is found on the right-hand side of the webpage under the heading of *Environmental Assessment*. To ensure the USAF has sufficient time to consider your input in the preparation of the EA, and for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, please provide comments or requests for additional information within 30 days of receipt of this letter to Ms. Barbara Long, NEPA Manager, as my principal point of contact on this consultation. She can be reached at 3775 South Fifth Street, Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, 85707-3012, or by email or phone at <u>barbara.long.3@us.af.mil</u> or (520) 228-4035.

Sincerely

CHRISTOPHER L. BREWSTER, PE Flight Chief, Installation Management

CONCUR. No Adverse Effect. Please see accompanying email for comments on the draft EA.

Erin Davis Archaeological Compliance Specialist Arizona State Historic Preservation Office January 9, 2024



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE Arizona Ecological Services Field Office 9828 North 31st Ave #c3 Phoenix, AZ 85051-2517 Phone: (602) 242-0210 Fax: (602) 242-2513



February 13, 2024

In Reply Refer To: Project Code: 2024-0048614 Project Name: Davis-Monthan Realignment EA

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) is providing this list under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*). The list you have generated identifies threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species, and designated and proposed critical habitat, that *may* occur within the One-Range that has been delineated for the species (candidate, proposed, or listed) and it's critical habitat (designated or proposed) with which your project polygon intersects. These range delineations are based on biological metrics, and do not necessarily represent exactly where the species is located. Please refer to the species information found on ECOS to determine if suitable habitat for the species on your list occurs in your project area.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the habitats upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 *et seq.*), Federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of Federal trust resources and to determine whether projects may affect federally listed species and/or designated critical habitat. A Biological Assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological evaluation similar to a Biological Assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a Biological Assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12. If the Federal action agency determines that listed species or critical habitat may be affected by a federally funded, permitted or authorized activity, the agency must consult with us pursuant to 50 CFR 402. Note that a "may affect" determination includes effects that may not be adverse and that may be beneficial, insignificant, or discountable. An effect exists even if only one individual

or habitat segment may be affected. The effects analysis should include the entire action area, which often extends well outside the project boundary or "footprint." For example, projects that involve streams and river systems should consider downstream affects. If the Federal action agency determines that the action may jeopardize a *proposed* species or may adversely modify *proposed* critical habitat, the agency must enter into a section 7 conference. The agency may choose to confer with us on an action that may affect proposed species or critical habitat.

Candidate species are those for which there is sufficient information to support a proposal for listing. Although candidate species have no legal protection under the Act, we recommend that they be considered in the planning process in the event they become proposed or listed prior to project completion. More information on the regulations (50 CFR 402) and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found in our Endangered Species Consultation Handbook at: https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/endangered-species-consultation-handbook.pdf.

We also advise you to consider species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (16 U.S.C. 703-712) and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (Eagle Act) (16 U.S.C. 668 *et seq.*). The MBTA prohibits the taking, killing, possession, transportation, and importation of migratory birds, their eggs, parts, and nests, except when authorized by the Service. The Eagle Act prohibits anyone, without a permit, from taking (including disturbing) eagles, and their parts, nests, or eggs. Currently 1,026 species of birds are protected by the MBTA, including the western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia hypugaea*). Protected western burrowing owls can be found in urban areas and may use their nest/burrows year-round; destruction of the burrow may result in the unpermitted take of the owl or their eggs.

If a bald eagle or golden eagle nest occurs in or near the proposed project area, our office should be contacted for Technical Assistance. An evaluation must be performed to determine whether the project is likely to disturb or harm eagles. The National Bald Eagle Management Guidelines provide recommendations to minimize potential project impacts to bald eagles (see https://www.fws.gov/law/bald-and-golden-eagle-protection-act and https://www.fws.gov/program/eagle-management).

The Division of Migratory Birds (505/248-7882) administers and issues permits under the MBTA and Eagle Act, while our office can provide guidance and Technical Assistance. For more information regarding the MBTA, BGEPA, and permitting processes, please visit the following web site: <u>https://www.fws.gov/program/migratory-bird-permit.</u> Guidance for minimizing impacts to migratory birds for communication tower projects (e.g. cellular, digital television, radio, and emergency broadcast) can be found at <u>https://www.fws.gov/media/recommended-best-practices-communication-tower-design-siting-construction-operation.</u>

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) may regulate activities that involve streams (including some intermittent streams) and/or wetlands. We recommend that you contact the Corps to determine their interest in proposed projects in these areas. For activities within a National Wildlife Refuge, we recommend that you contact refuge staff for specific information about refuge resources, please visit <u>this link</u> or visit <u>https://www.fws.gov/program/national-</u>

wildlife-refuge-system to locate the refuge you would be working in or around.

If your action is on tribal land or has implications for off-reservation tribal interests, we encourage you to contact the tribe(s) and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) to discuss potential tribal concerns, and to invite any affected tribe and the BIA to participate in the section 7 consultation. In keeping with our tribal trust responsibility, we will notify tribes that may be affected by proposed actions when section 7 consultation is initiated. For more information, please contact our Tribal Coordinator, John Nystedt, at 928/556-2160 or John Nystedt@fws.gov.

We also recommend you seek additional information and coordinate your project with the Arizona Game and Fish Department. Information on known species detections, special status species, and Arizona species of greatest conservation need, such as the western burrowing owl and the Sonoran desert tortoise (*Gopherus morafkai*) can be found by using their Online Environmental Review Tool, administered through the Heritage Data Management System and Project Evaluation Program (https://www.azgfd.com/wildlife-conservation/planning-for-wildlife/project-evaluation-program/).

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. Please include the Consultation Code in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office. If we may be of further assistance, please contact our Flagstaff office at 928/556-2118 for projects in northern Arizona, our general Phoenix number 602/242-0210 for central Arizona, or 520/670-6144 for projects in southern Arizona.

Sincerely, /s/

Heather Whitlaw Field Supervisor Attachment

Attachment(s):

- Official Species List
- USFWS National Wildlife Refuges and Fish Hatcheries
- Bald & Golden Eagles
- Migratory Birds
- Wetlands

OFFICIAL SPECIES LIST

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether

any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:

Arizona Ecological Services Field Office

9828 North 31st Ave #c3 Phoenix, AZ 85051-2517 (602) 242-0210

PROJECT SUMMARY

Project Code:	2024-0048614
Project Name:	Davis-Monthan Realignment EA
Project Type:	Military Development
Project Description:	The Air Force is proposing to relocate the following 4th Gen missions from
	Nellis AFB, Nevada, to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona:
	• 66th Weapons Squadron (66 WPS)
	• A-10 Operational Test (OT) portion of the 422nd Test and Evaluation
	Squadron (422 TES)
	66th Rescue Squadron (66 RQS)
	• 58th Rescue Squadron (58 RQS)
	• 34th Weapons Squadron (34 WPS)
	• 88th Test and Evaluation Squadron (88 TES)
	In order to create capacity at Davis-Monthan AFB to accept the
	aforementioned missions, the Air Force proposes to take the following actions
	with units aiready stationed at Davis-Monthan AFB:
	• Inactivate the 354th Fighter Squadron (354 FS) and retire assigned A-10C aircraft.
	• Downsize the 357th Fighter Squadron (357 FS) and retire some of their A-10 aircraft.
	The A-10 OT portion of the 422 TES would transition in 2024. The HH-60
	Weapons Instructor Course and Test and combat-coded units, to include the 88
	TES, 66 RQS, 58 RQS, 79th Rescue Generation Squadron (RGS), 55 RGS, and the 34 WPS, would move beginning in 2025.

https://www.dm.af.mil/Portals/99/Davis-Monthan%20Realignment%20Draft%20EA%20%28October%202023%29.pdf

Project Location:

The approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: <u>https://www.google.com/maps/@32.157876349999995,-110.83834007926805,14z</u>



ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT SPECIES

There is a total of 11 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.

Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries¹, as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

1. <u>NOAA Fisheries</u>, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

MAMMALS

NAME	STATUS
Ocelot <i>Leopardus (=Felis) pardalis</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4474</u>	Endangered
BIRDS NAME	STATUS
Cactus Ferruginous Pygmy-owl <i>Glaucidium brasilianum cactorum</i> There is final critical habitat for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1225</u>	Threatened
California Least Tern <i>Sternula antillarum browni</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8104</u>	Endangered
Yellow-billed Cuckoo <i>Coccyzus americanus</i> Population: Western U.S. DPS There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3911</u>	Threatened

REPTILES

NAME	STATUS
Sonoyta Mud Turtle <i>Kinosternon sonoriense longifemorale</i> There is final critical habitat for this species.	Endangered
Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7276</u>	

FISHES

NAME	STATUS
Gila Chub <i>Gila intermedia</i>	Endangered
There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat.	
Species profile: <u>https://ecos.tws.gov/ecp/species/51</u>	
Gila Topminnow (incl. Yaqui) Poeciliopsis occidentalis	Endangered
No critical habitat has been designated for this species.	
Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1116</u>	

INSECTS

NAME	STATUS
Monarch Butterfly <i>Danaus plexippus</i>	Candidate
No critical habitat has been designated for this species.	
Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9743</u>	

FLOWERING PLANTS

NAME	STATUS
Arizona Eryngo Eryngium sparganophyllum	Endangered
Population:	
There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat.	
Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/10705</u>	
Huachuca Water-umbel Lilaeopsis schaffneriana var. recurva	Endangered
There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat.	
Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1201</u>	
Pima Pineapple Cactus Coryphantha scheeri var. robustispina	Endangered
No critical habitat has been designated for this species.	
Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4919	

CRITICAL HABITATS

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA UNDER THIS OFFICE'S JURISDICTION.

YOU ARE STILL REQUIRED TO DETERMINE IF YOUR PROJECT(S) MAY HAVE EFFECTS ON ALL ABOVE LISTED SPECIES.

USFWS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE LANDS AND FISH HATCHERIES

Any activity proposed on lands managed by the <u>National Wildlife Refuge</u> system must undergo a 'Compatibility Determination' conducted by the Refuge. Please contact the individual Refuges to discuss any questions or concerns.

THERE ARE NO REFUGE LANDS OR FISH HATCHERIES WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA.

BALD & GOLDEN EAGLES

Bald and golden eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act¹ and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act².

Any person or organization who plans or conducts activities that may result in impacts to bald or golden eagles, or their habitats³, should follow appropriate regulations and consider implementing appropriate conservation measures, as described in the links below. Specifically, please review the <u>"Supplemental Information on Migratory Birds and Eagles"</u>.

- 1. The <u>Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act</u> of 1940.
- 2. The <u>Migratory Birds Treaty Act</u> of 1918.
- 3. 50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)

There are bald and/or golden eagles in your project area.

For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to migratory birds on your list, see the PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY below to see when these birds are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
Bald Eagle Haliaeetus leucocephalus This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1626</u>	Breeds Oct 15 to Aug 31
Golden Eagle Aquila chrysaetos This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1680</u>	Breeds Dec 1 to Aug 31

PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY

The graphs below provide our best understanding of when birds of concern are most likely to be present in your project area. This information can be used to tailor and schedule your project activities to avoid or minimize impacts to birds. Please make sure you read <u>"Supplemental Information on Migratory Birds and Eagles"</u>, specifically the FAQ section titled "Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report" before using or attempting to interpret this report.

Probability of Presence (

Green bars; the bird's relative probability of presence in the 10km grid cell(s) your project overlaps during that week of the year.

Breeding Season (=)

Yellow bars; liberal estimate of the timeframe inside which the bird breeds across its entire range.

Survey Effort (|)

Vertical black lines; the number of surveys performed for that species in the 10km grid cell(s) your project area overlaps.

No Data (–)

A week is marked as having no data if there were no survey events for that week.



Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Eagle Management <u>https://www.fws.gov/program/eagle-management</u>
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds <u>https://www.fws.gov/library/</u> <u>collections/avoiding-and-minimizing-incidental-take-migratory-birds</u>
- Nationwide conservation measures for birds <u>https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/</u> <u>documents/nationwide-standard-conservation-measures.pdf</u>
- Supplemental Information for Migratory Birds and Eagles in IPaC <u>https://www.fws.gov/media/supplemental-information-migratory-birds-and-bald-and-golden-eagles-may-occur-project-action</u>

MIGRATORY BIRDS

Certain birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act¹ and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act².

Any person or organization who plans or conducts activities that may result in impacts to migratory birds, eagles, and their habitats³ should follow appropriate regulations and consider implementing appropriate conservation measures, as described in the links below. Specifically, please review the <u>"Supplemental Information on Migratory Birds and Eagles"</u>.

- 1. The <u>Migratory Birds Treaty Act</u> of 1918.
- 2. The <u>Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act</u> of 1940.
- 3. 50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)

For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to migratory birds on your list, see the PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY below to see when these birds are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
Bald Eagle Haliaeetus leucocephalus This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1626	Breeds Oct 15 to Aug 31
Black-chinned Sparrow Spizella atrogularis This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9447	Breeds Apr 15 to Jul 31
Costa's Hummingbird Calypte costae This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9470	Breeds Jan 15 to Jun 10
Gila Woodpecker <i>Melanerpes uropygialis</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5960</u>	Breeds Apr 1 to Aug 31
Gilded Flicker Colaptes chrysoides This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2960	Breeds May 1 to Aug 10

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
Golden Eagle Aquila chrysaetos This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1680</u>	Breeds Dec 1 to Aug 31
Grace's Warbler <i>Dendroica graciae</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9514</u>	Breeds May 20 to Jul 20
Lawrence's Goldfinch Carduelis lawrencei This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9464</u>	Breeds Mar 20 to Sep 20
Rufous-winged Sparrow <i>Aimophila carpalis</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9508</u>	Breeds Jun 15 to Sep 30
Western Grebe <i>aechmophorus occidentalis</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6743</u>	Breeds Jun 1 to Aug 31
Willet <i>Tringa semipalmata</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/10669</u>	Breeds elsewhere

PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY

The graphs below provide our best understanding of when birds of concern are most likely to be present in your project area. This information can be used to tailor and schedule your project activities to avoid or minimize impacts to birds. Please make sure you read <u>"Supplemental Information on Migratory Birds and Eagles"</u>, specifically the FAQ section titled "Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report" before using or attempting to interpret this report.

Probability of Presence (■)

Green bars; the bird's relative probability of presence in the 10km grid cell(s) your project overlaps during that week of the year.

Breeding Season (=)

Yellow bars; liberal estimate of the timeframe inside which the bird breeds across its entire range.

Survey Effort (|)

Vertical black lines; the number of surveys performed for that species in the 10km grid cell(s) your project area overlaps.

No Data (-)

A week is marked as having no data if there were no survey events for that week.

		probability of	f presence 🧧 br	eeding season	survey effort — no data
SPECIES Bald Eagle Non-BCC Vulnerable	JAN FEB MAR	APR MAY		AUG SEP	OCT NOV DEC
Black-chinned Sparrow BCC Rangewide (CON)	++++ ++++	++++		┼┼┼┼┼┿┿┤	- ++++ ++++ ++++
Costa's Hummingbird BCC - BCR	++++ +++	₽ ₩₩₩ ₩₩₩₩	<mark>┼╉</mark> ╪╪╺╞┿┿┼	**** ****	**** **** ***
Gila Woodpecker BCC - BCR					
Gilded Flicker BCC Rangewide (CON)	+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++	┿┼┿┿ <mark>╋╋╂╂</mark>	╎╎ ╪╪┊╪╪┼╪	<mark>╋╋</mark> ┿┽╎╪┿┥	• ┿╪┿┿ ┼┿┿┿ ┼╪┿┼
Golden Eagle Non-BCC Vulnerable	++++ ++++ ++++	++++	++++++++	++++	- ++++ ++++ <mark>+++</mark> +
Grace's Warbler BCC - BCR	+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++	┼┼┿┼┼┼ <mark>╿╿</mark>		++++	- ++++ ++++ ++++
Lawrence's Goldfinch BCC Rangewide (CON)	┼┼┼┿╺┿┽┿┿╺┿┼ <mark>╋╎</mark>	┿┿┼╂╶┼┼┼╂		┼┼┼┼╶┼┼┿╸	• +## + +++ ++++
Rufous-winged Sparrow BCC Rangewide (CON)	++++ ++++	++++ ++++	+++++	┼┼┼┼╶┼┿┿┥	+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++
Western Grebe BCC Rangewide (CON)	++++++++++	┿┿ ┿┿┿┼┼┼┿	╋┼┼╂╏┼┼╂		· ┼ ┼┼╪ ╪╪┼┼ ┼┼┼ ╪
Willet BCC Rangewide (CON)	++++ ++++	\\##\\ \	++++ ++++	+++++	- +++++ +++++

Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Eagle Management https://www.fws.gov/program/eagle-management
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds <u>https://www.fws.gov/library/</u> <u>collections/avoiding-and-minimizing-incidental-take-migratory-birds</u>
- Nationwide conservation measures for birds <u>https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/</u> <u>documents/nationwide-standard-conservation-measures.pdf</u>
- Supplemental Information for Migratory Birds and Eagles in IPaC <u>https://www.fws.gov/</u> media/supplemental-information-migratory-birds-and-bald-and-golden-eagles-may-occurproject-action

WETLANDS

Impacts to <u>NWI wetlands</u> and other aquatic habitats may be subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, or other State/Federal statutes.

For more information please contact the Regulatory Program of the local <u>U.S. Army Corps of</u> <u>Engineers District</u>.

Please note that the NWI data being shown may be out of date. We are currently working to update our NWI data set. We recommend you verify these results with a site visit to determine the actual extent of wetlands on site.

RIVERINE

- R4SBA
- R4SBAx
- R4SBC

FRESHWATER POND

PUBF

IPAC USER CONTACT INFORMATION

Agency:Air ForceName:Kevin GroppeAddress:31410 PARK PINE LANECity:SPRINGState:TXZip:77386Emailkevin.groppe@easbio.comPhone:2406046869

This page intentionally left blank

APPENDIX B AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS RESOURCES, METHODOLOGIES AND RECORD OF CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY

This page intentionally left blank

Air Quality Analysis Resources, Methodologies and Record of Conformity Applicability

The following information is provided for additional detail on air pollutants evaluated in the Proposed Action air quality impacts analysis and on the methodology used in the impact analysis.

Criteria Pollutants

National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) are currently established for the criteria air pollutants ozone (O3), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), sulfur dioxide (SO2), respirable particulate matter (including particulates equal to or less than 10 microns in diameter [PM10] and particulates equal to or less than 2.5 microns in diameter [PM2.5]), and lead (Pb). The primary NAAQS represent maximum levels of background air pollution that are considered safe, with an adequate margin of safety to protect public health. Secondary NAAQS represent the maximum pollutant concentration necessary to protect vegetation, crops, and other public resources in addition to maintaining visibility standards.

The criteria pollutant O3 is not usually emitted directly into the air but is formed in the atmosphere by photochemical reactions involving sunlight and previously emitted pollutants, or "O3 precursors." These O3 precursors consist primarily of nitrogen oxides (NO_X) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) that are directly emitted from a wide range of emission sources. For this reason, regulatory agencies limit atmospheric O3 concentrations by controlling VOC pollutants (also identified as reactive organic gases) and NO_X.

The USEPA has recognized that particulate matter emissions can have different health effects depending on particle size and, therefore, developed separate NAAQS for coarse particulate matter (PM10) and fine particulate matter (PM2.5). The pollutant PM2.5 can be emitted from emission sources directly as very fine dust and/or liquid mist or formed secondarily in the atmosphere as condensable particulate matter, typically forming nitrate and sulfate compounds. Secondary (indirect) emissions vary by region depending upon the predominant emission sources located there and thus which precursors are considered significant for PM2.5 formation and identified for ultimate control.

The CAA and USEPA delegated responsibility for ensuring compliance with NAAQS to the states and local agencies. As such, each state must develop air pollutant control programs and promulgate regulations and rules that focus on meeting NAAQS and maintaining healthy ambient air quality levels. When a region or area fails to meet a NAAQS for a pollutant, that region is classified as "non-attainment" for that pollutant. In such cases, the affected state must develop a state implementation plan (SIP) that is subject to USEPA review and approval. A SIP is a compilation of regulations, strategies, schedules, and enforcement actions designed to move the state into compliance with all NAAQS. Any changes to the compliance schedule or plan (e.g., new regulations, emissions budgets, controls) must be incorporated into the SIP and approved by USEPA.

Greenhouse Gases (GHGs)

GHG emissions are generated by both natural processes and human activities. The accumulation of GHGs in the atmosphere helps regulate the earth's temperature and contribute to global climate change. Primary GHGs include water vapor, methane, NOx, hydrofluorocarbons, and chlorofluorocarbons. While water vapor is considered a GHG, note that atmospheric temperature controls the amount of water vapor in the air and the other GHGs control the atmospheric temperature. As a result, the amount of water vapor in the air is determined by the amount of other GHGs present in the atmosphere. This is how the greenhouse effect has rapidly increased over the last 100 years –when emissions of CO_2 and other GHGs significantly increased due to man's activities.

Each GHG has an estimated global warming potential (GWP), which is a function of its atmospheric lifetime and its ability to absorb and radiate infrared energy emitted from the earth's surface. The GWP of a particular gas provides a relative basis for calculating its CO2 equivalent (CO2e) or the amount of CO2e to the emissions of that gas. CO2 has a GWP of 1 and is, therefore, the standard by which all other GHGs are measured.

Analytical Methodology

Construction

Construction emissions were quantified based on construction footprints. Equipment selection and duration were based on the South Coast Air Quality Management District construction survey to estimate default phase lengths based on total project acreage. These data are found in Appendix A of the CALEEMOD Users Guide (Trinity Consultants 2021). Additional information used for estimating worker and vendor trips were generated using the same resource.

Truck sizes were selected based on average standards - concrete truck capacity = 9 CY of material

Dump truck sizes vary based on material weight and range from 10-16 CY. 12 CY was used as average capacity for the construction.

Ordnance

Ordnance emissions were calculated via Excel spreadsheet and added to total emissions for SUAs. Data on ordnance emissions were obtained from USEPA's AP-42, Compilation of Air Emission Factors. Data on some munitions were unavailable, primarily bombs and missiles, which are likely fired from higher altitudes. The materials selected were obtained from Sections 15.1 – 15.8 (USEPA 2007- 2009). Ordnance usage was distributed across the SUAs based on the distribution of training sorties. Chaff and flare use would remain unchanged from existing conditions.

HH-60 Helicopters

Helicopter landing, take off and closed pattern emissions were provided by Solutio Environmental. Additionally, engine maintenance runup emissions were calculated via Excel spreadsheet and added to the total emissions for Davis-Monthan AFB. Runups data came from installation personnel performing the activities. Additionally, cruise to and from the SUAs and sortie time in the SUAs were calculated via spreadsheet. The data for these calculations were based on the distance from the installation to the boundary of each applicable MOA, the location of the low altitude training areas within the MOAs and the helicopter speed. The cruise time was applied in two different ways to the impact analysis: because every transit includes Pima County for some duration, the total transit time for helos was conservatively included in the installation emission estimates. In addition, because each MOA is uniquely distant from the installation, their transit times were calculated individually, and the totals for each applied to the MOAs. This ensured that each MOA where nonattainment or maintenance areas existed in the transit path (besides Pima County) were most conservatively evaluated for emission impacts.

Training in the SUAs was based on the net change in annual sorties for each MOA and a standard 2-hour training period within the SUA. Additionally, all sorties were assigned to MOAs where low-altitude training would occur.

A-10C, Cessna 128 and RC-26B Aircraft

Each of these aircraft were evaluated in ACAM. Solutio Environmental provided time in modes (TIMs). For the Cessna 128, a surrogate aircraft, the MQ-9, which uses the TPE331-8 engine, was selected to calculate the TIMs.

Additionally, adjustments made to the aircraft operations included the following:

Activity	A-10C	Cessna 128	RC-26B
Engine warmup (before taxi) - minutes	20	20	20
Preflight runup (immediately before takeoff) - seconds	5	10	10

Jet engine test cell operational changes were captured independently for the A-10C and the RC-26B, as these emissions are exempt from General Conformity regulations. Jet engine test cell data for the A-10C were derived from data provided by installation personnel. The RC-26B jet engine test cell calculation used the default settings in ACAM.

For the A-10C, low altitude flight in the SUAs was calculated based on 30% training time. Generally, sortie (flight) times for the Cessna 128 and the RC-26B aircraft were assumed similar to the other aircraft, with calculations based on a 2-hour duration.

GHG Emissions

Because GHG emission impacts are independent of altitude, the entire flight horizon for all aircraft sorties was estimated using the military settings for each for Cruise operations. For the A-10, high altitude flight transits to/from the SUAs were based on the net change in sorties for each SUA. For the Cessna-182 and RC-26B operations, a standard 2-hour sortie time was used.

A 20-year lifetime horizon was estimated based on the lifespan of the HH-60 and the estimated lifetime of the renovated A-10s. Because these aircraft are the predominant emission sources for the Proposed Action, this timespan was used for all aircraft. Building emissions for the 20-year period were not calculated as too little information is available on what sources could exist and the DAF's plan to become net zero by 2046 cannot be calculated, though emissions would be anticipated to steadily decline over the period.

References

Trinity Consultants. 2021. California Emissions Estimator Model User's Guide, Version 2020.4.0, prepared for California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). May.

USEPA. 2007 – 2009. AP 42, Fifth Edition, Volume I, Chapter 15: Ordnance Detonation. Accessed at <u>https://www.epa.gov/air-emissions-factors-and-quantification/ap-42-fifth-edition-volume-i-chapter-15-ordnance-1</u>. This page intentionally blank

Emissions Information and Calculations

- Davis-Monthan AFB Ops Summary
- Airspace Ops Summary
- Construction Info
- Ops Personnel Info
- Ordnance Info
- Ordnance Calculations
- HH-60 Maintenance Calculations
- Airspace HH-60 Calculations
- A-10C Engine Maintenance Runups Info
- A-10C Airspace Low Altitude Ops Info
- CO2e Calculations

This Page Intentionally Blank

AIRCRAFT SUMMARY

			Emissi	ons in Tons	per Year		
	NOx	SOx	со	VOC	PM ₁₀	PM2.5	CO ₂ e
A-10C Aircraft							
LTOs	18.6	3.0	46.5	11.1	3.0	2.1	8,297
Closed Patterns	0.01	0.001	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	4.10
Subtotal	18.6	3.0	46.5	11.1	3.0	2.1	8,301
HH-60 Aircraft							
LTOs	31.7	3.0	12.0	0.07	6.9	6.2	9,124
Closed Patterns	3.5	0.3	1.0	0.000	0.7	0.6	951
Cruise within Pima County	7.6	0.7	1.9	0.01	1.7	1.6	2,147
Subtotal	42.8	4.1	15.0	0.1	9.3	8.3	12,222
RC-26B Aircraft							
LTOs	32.3	0.7	7.7	4.3	0.9	0.9	1,162
Cessna-182 Aircraft							
LTOs	0.2	0.03	0.7	0.9	0.1	0.1	89
Total Mobile Source Ops	93.9	7.8	69.9	16.4	13.3	11.4	21,773
De Minimis Threshold	NA	NA	NA	NA	100	NA	NA
Exceedance?					No		
A-10C Engine Test Cell	0.8	0.1	1.0	0.3	0.3	0.2	272
RC-26B Engine Test Cell	0.04	0.004	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.01	11
Total	94.8	7.9	70.9	16.7	13.6	11.6	22,056
Comparative Threshold	100	100	100	100	NA	100	NA
Exceedance?	No	No	No	No		No	No

Note: CO = carbon monoxide; CO2e = carbon dioxide equivalent; LTO = landing take-off cycle area; N/A = not applicable; NO2 = nitrogen dioxide; PM2.5 = particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter; SO2 = sulfur dioxide; SUA = special use airspace; VOC = volatile organic compound

AIRSPACE EMISSIONS SUMMARY

General Conformity applies

Pima and Cochise Counties - General Conformity

	Emissions in Tons per Year						
Tombstone SUA Ops	NO	SOx	со	VOC	PM ₁₀	PM2.5	CO2e
A-10C Sorties	0.9	0.1	0.2	0.011	0.2	0.2	284
HH-60 Sorties	5.4	0.5	1.3	0.005	1.2	1.1	1,511
Ordnance	0.4	-	2.9	-	1.4	0.2	4.45
Total	6.7	0.6	4.4	0.015	2.8	1.6	1,799
HH-60 Transit Emissions To/ From Tombstone	4.4	0.4	1.1	0.004	1.0	0.9	1,247
Tombstone Total Low Altitude Training Emissions	11.1	1.0	5.5	0.02	3.8	2.5	3,047

Pima and Pinal Counties - General Conformity

	Emissions in Tons per Year						
Jackal Low SUA Ops	NO	SOx	со	VOC	PM ₁₀	PM2.5	CO2e
A-10C Sorties	0.7	0.1	0.1	0.01	0.2	0.2	205
HH-60 Sorties	3.9	0.4	0.9	0.003	0.9	0.8	1,087
Ordnance	0.3	-	2.0	-	1.0	0.2	3
Total	4.8	0.4	3.1	0.01	2.0	1.1	1,295
HH-60 Transit Emissions To/ From Jackal Low	1.1	0.1	0.3	0.001	0.3	0.2	315
Total Jackal Low Altitude Training Emissions	5.9	0.5	3.4	0.01	2.3	1.3	1,610

Pima and Greenlee Counties - General Conformity

	Emissions in Tons per Year						
Morenci SUA Ops	NO	SOx	со	VOC	PM ₁₀	PM2.5	CO2e
A-10C Sorties	0.3	0.03	0.1	0.003	0.1	0.1	84
HH-60 Sorties	1.6	0.1	0.4	0.001	0.4	0.3	443
Ordnance	0.1	-	0.8	-	0.4	0.1	1
Total	2.0	0.2	1.3	0.004	0.8	0.5	528
HH-60 Transit Emissions To/ From Morenci	0.9	0.1	0.2	0.001	0.2	0.2	241
Total Morenci Low Altitude Training Emissions	2.8	0.3	1.5	0.01	1.0	0.6	769

Pima and Santa Cruz Counties - General Conformity								
Emissions in Tons per Year								
Fuzzy SUA Ops	NO	SOx	со	VOC	PM ₁₀	PM2.5	CO2e	
A-10C Sorties	0.9	0.1	0.2	0.01	0.2	0.2	258	
HH-60 Sorties	4.8	0.5	1.2	0.004	1.1	1.0	1357	
Ordnance	0.3	-	2.6	-	1.2	0.2	4	
Total	6.0	0.5	4.0	0.01	2.5	1.4	1,619	
HH-60 Transit Emissions To/ From Fuzzy	1.2	0.1	0.3	0.001	0.3	0.2	344	
Total Fuzzy Low Altitude Training Emissions	7.2	0.7	4.3	0.01	2.8	1.6	1,963	
						Total CO2e	7,388	

Note: CO = carbon monoxide; CO2e = carbon dioxide equivalent; MOA = military operations area; N/A = not applicable; NO2 = nitrogen dioxide; PM2.5 = particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter; SO2 = sulfur dioxide; SUA = special use airspace; VOC = volatile organic compound

Davis-Monthan AFB 4th Gen Missions Reg	gional Realignment - Con	struction Calcs						
Construction Period: 4th quarter 2023 - 4t	h quarter 2024		15 mo	nths total			Total Truck Trips	Truck Haul
0.42 worker t	trips/day/1000 SF	From App A of C	ALEEMOD User Guide				202	3 Miles
13 worker t	trips/day on average	2023				Dirt/Debris	g	96
128 worker t	trips/day on average	2024				Concrete, asphalt & gravel	11	.7
			43,560 sf ii	n 1 acre		Materials Delivery		5 4,354
100 ft trench	ning assumed per building	5				Grand Total Truck Trips	21	.8 73
20 mi roun	d trip average assumed fo	or vendors, haul tr	ucks and worker com	mutes		Ave # Truck Trip/Day	3	.6 102
0.1639 daily ver	ndor trips per 1000 sf	from App A of CA	ALEEMOD User Guide			Total acreage	0	.4
Construction of 1 hangar begins in 4th qua	arter 2023; all else begins	in 2024						
Flight Simulator (3)	57.000 sf bldg		12 months constru	uction duratio	n			
	57.000 cf excavat	ion	1.31 ac		0.87 ac			
	2.111 cv excavat	tion	176 trucks of dirt h	auled out				
	1,407 cy concret	te	156 concrete trucks	S		2023	202	23
	704 cv gravel		59 trucks of grave	l hauled in				
	300 ft trenchir	ng	9 Vendor trips			Trenching volume CF	30	00
		0	400			Material removed	1	1 CY
Hangar (3)	93,000 sf bldg		15 months constru	uction duratio	n	Total Bldg SF	31,00	00
	93,000 cf excavat	ion	2.1 ac					
	3,444 cy excavat	tion	287 trucks of dirt h	auled out		area to be graded sf	38,75	0 bldg footprint +25%
	2,296 cy concret	te	255 concrete trucks	s		excavation - out	1,14	18 cy
	1,148 cy gravel		96 trucks of grave	l hauled in		asphalt/conc & gravel - in	1,14	18 cy
	300 ft trenchir	ng	15 Vendor trips					
			653					
Construct LOLAs (14)	44 450 sf concret	٩	6 months constru	uction	1 0 ac		Total Truck Trips	
convert conc cf to bldg cf	1 646 CY soil exc	avation	137 trucks of soil re	emoved	1.0 00		202	4 Miles
divide by 14 to get an equivalent	3.293 CY concre	te	366 conc truck trips	s		Dirt	94	4
bldg size (6.350 sf) for ACAM	1.646 CY gravel		137 dump trucks gr	avel		Concrete, asphalt & gravel	1.71	.5
	400 ft trenchir	ng	7 Vendor trips			Grand Total Truck Trips	2,65	9 53,182
		0	. 648			Ave # Truck Trip/Day	. 1	.0 205
						Materials Delivery	5	1,069
Construct concrete igloos (2)	16,800 SF		9 months constru	uction	0.4 ac			
	622 CY soil exc	cavation	52 trucks of soil re	emoved		Total acreage	7	.8
	948 CY concre	te	105 concrete trucks	S		2024	202	24
	622 CY gravel		52 trucks of grave	l hauled in		Trenching area CF	1,30	00
	200 ft trenchir	ng	3 Vendor trips			Material removed	4	8
			212					су
						Total Bldg SF	227,15	50
Ops and Training (3)	75,000 sf		10 months constru	uction	1.7 ac			
	2,778 cy excavat	tion	231 trucks of dirt h	auled out		area to be graded sf	527,57	76
	2,778 cy concret	te	309 concrete trucks	S		excavation - out	11,32	.6
	1,389 cy gravel		116 trucks of grave	l hauled in		asphalt/concrete & gravel - in	17,14	1 cy
	100 ft trenchir	ng	12 Vendor trips			paving area (inc conc) sf	105,27	'6 cy
			678			# trucks assoc with paving	62	.8
						per day trucks for paving	3	31

Armament Shop	10,000 SF 370 cy excavation 370 cy concrete 185 cy gravel 100 ft trenching	 7 months construction 31 trucks of dirt hauled out 41 concrete trucks 15 trucks of gravel hauled in 2 Vendor trips 89 	0.2 ac
Road extension	0.48 miles long	4 months construction	1.4 ac
for Ops buildings	24 ft wide		
	60,826 SF		
	6,758 sy grading		
	1,502 cy excavation	125 trucks of dirt hauled out	
	751 cy gravel	63 trucks of gravel hauled in	
	751 cy asphalt	63 asphalt trucks	
		10 Vendor trips	

7.8 ac

Using 0.44	acres for 2023	3 construction:		Phase		
	# equip	Hrs/day		duration days	Total hours	
Site Prep	1 day					
Grader		1	8	1	8	
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes		1	8	1	8	
Grading	2 days					
Rubber tired Dozers	,	1	6	3	18	
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes		1	7	3	29	Combine site prep and
Grader		1	6	3	26	grading since ACAM does
Excavator						not account for site prep
Building Construction	100 days					
Cranes		1	4	100	400	
Forklifts		2	6	100	1200	
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes		2	8	100	1600	
Welders						
Generator sets						
Architectural Coating	5 days					
- Air compressors		1	6	5	30	
Paving	5 days					
Pavers		1	7	5	35	
Cement and mortar mixers		4	6	5	120	
Rollers		1	7	5	35	
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes		1	7	5	35	

Using 7	.8 acres for 202	4 construction:		Phase		
	# equip	Hrs/day		duration days Tot	tal dur	Total hours
Site Prep	10 days					
Tractors/Loaders/Backhor	es	4	8	10		320
Rubber tired Doze	rs	3	8	10		240
Grading	30 days	Site Prep and	d G	rading combined		
Rubber tired Doze	rs	4	8	30 Coi	mbine site prep and	960
Tractors/Loaders/Backho	es	4	8	30 gra	ading since ACAM	960
Grad	er	1	8	30 do	es not account for	240
Excavat	or	1	8	30 site	e prep	240
Building Construction	on 230 days					
Cran	es	1	7	230		1610
Forklif	ts	3	8	230		5520
Tractors/Loaders/Backho [,]	es	3	7	230		4830
Welde	rs	1	8	230		1840
Generator se	ets .	1	8	230		1840
Architectural Coatin	ng 20 days					
Air compresso	rs	1	6	20		120
Paving	20 days					
Pave	rs	2	8	20		320
Cement and mortar mixe	rs					
Rolle	rs	2	8	20		320
Tractors/Loaders/Backhor	es					
Paving equipme	nt	2	8	20		320

Unit/Function	Officer Full Time	Officer Part Time	Enlisted Full Time	Enlisted Part Time	Civilian	Total Change from Current Levels
66 WPS	10	-	-	200	2	212
422 TES	5	-	-	-	4	9
66 RQS	56	-	-	569	8	633
58 RQS	22	-	129	-	12	163
34 WPS	13	-	-	18	2	33
88 TES ^a	20	-	37	-	31	88
354 FS	-40	-	-464	-	-1	-505
357 FS	-	-	-	-	-	0
47 FS	-	-	-	-	-	0
CAP Cessna 182	-	-	-	-	-	-
RC-26B	6	3			4	13
	92	3	-298	787	62	646

Davis-Monthan AFB Personnel Changes

489

Ordnance

66 WPS A-10

Weapon or Defensive Countermeasure	Projected Quantity	Reference Used
30-millimeter target practice/high-explosive aircraft cannon ammo	208,800	AP-42, section 15.2.1
2.75-inch rocket target practice/white phosphorous	2,349	AP-42, section 15.6.7
Laser rocket	99	
Illumination rocket	1,566	AP-42, section 15.4
Joint direct attack munition	80	
Laser-guided bomb	107	
Cluster bomb unit	64	
Air-to-ground missile	58	
BDU-33	1,249	
M-206 flares	12,000	AP-42, section 15.8.16
RR-170 chaff	12,000	
66 WPS JTAC		
Ordnance Type	Projected Quantity	
5.56-millimeter ball ammunition	16,620	AP-42, section 15.1.4
5.56-millimeter tracer ammunition	15,720	AP-42, section 15.1.5
5.56-millimeter ultimate training munition	4,860	AP-42, section 15.1.6
7.62-millimeter ammunition	11,400	AP-42, section 15.1.15
9-millimeter ammunition	16,160	AP-42, section 15.1.21
Grenade simulator	44	
40-millimeter smoke round	126	AP-42, section 15.2.7
Smoke grenade	100	AP-42, section 15.5.5
422 TES A-10		
Weapon or Defensive Countermeasure	Projected Quantity	
30-millimeter CTG TP PGU-15A	46,000	AP-42, section 15.2.1
30-millimeter cartridge 2 HEI	11,500	AP-42, section 15.2.1
30-millimeter CTG HEI PGU-13D	11,500	AP-42, section 15.2.1
Illumination rocket	350	AP-42, section 15.4
Joint direct attack munition	46	
Laser-guided bomb	34	

Cluster bomb unit	36	
Air-to-ground missile	48	
Heavy-weight inert bomb	160	
BDU-33	450	
M-206 flares	3000	AP-42, section 15.8.16
RR-170 chaff	900	
Chaff RR-188	3000	
47 EQ		

47 FS

Weapon or Defensive Countermeasure	Projected Quantity
M206 flare	76,825
Chaff RR-188	22,696

Helos - 66 RQS

Weapon or Defensive Countermeasure	Projected Quantity	
.50-caliber machine gun ammunition up to Armor Piercing Incendiary Tracer	297,000	AP-42, section 15.1.27
7.62-millimeter machine gun ammunition	1,587,600	AP-42, section 15.1.15
Chaff	1,920	
Flare	4,000	AP-42, section 15.8.16

Helos - 34 WPS

Weapon or Defensive Countermeasure	Projected Quantity
.50-caliber machine gun ammunition up to Armor Piercing Incendiary Tracer	198,200
7.62-millimeter machine gun ammunition	794,800
HH-60G chaff	4,201
HH-60G flare	2,000
HC-130J chaff	8,400
HC-130J flare	6,720

Helos - 88 TES

Weapon or Defensive Countermeasure	Projected Quantity
.50-caliber machine gun ammunition up to Armor Piercing Incendiary Tracer	59,200
7.62-mm machine gun ammunition	151,000
HH-60W chaff	1,300
HH-60W flare	3,307

Ordnance Detonation Emissions

				lb,	/item				total lbs								
	Number	СО	Nox	PM2.5	PM10	CO2	CH4	Pb	со	Nox	PM2.5	PM10	CO2	CH4	Pb	CO2e	
5.56-millimeter ball ammunition	16,620	0.0016	0.000085	0.000028	0.000039	0.00087	9.7E-06	0.0000051	26.59	1.41	0.47	0.65	14.46	0.16	0.08		
5.56-millimeter tracer ammunitie	15,720	0.0014	0.000065	0.000033	0.000049	0.00075	6.7E-06	0.0000027	22.01	1.02	0.52	0.77	11.79	0.11	0.04		
5.56-millimeter ultimate training munition	4,860	0.0004	0.000019	0.00001	0.000011	0.00032	0.000022	0.0000031	1.94	0.09	0.05	0.05	1.56	0.11	0.02		
7.62-millimeter ammunition	2,544,800	0.0023	0.000097	0.000038	0.000051	0.0012	0.00001	0.0000049	5,853.04	246.85	96.70	129.78	3,053.76	25.45	12.47		
9-millimeter ammunition	16,160	0.00031	0.000015	0.00002	0.000024	0.0002	1.4E-06	0.000068	5.01	0.24	0.32	0.39	3.23	0.02	0.11		
.50-caliber machine gun															I		
ammunition up to Armor		i.															
Piercing Incendiary Tracer	554,400	0.016	0.000033	0.00044	0.00097	0.0092	0.000053	0.000021	8,870.40	18.30	243.94	537.77	5,100.48	29.38	11.64		
30-millimeter ammo, various	277,800	0.00086	0.0002	0.0025	0.0039	0.0044	0.000046	0.000011	238.91	55.56	694.50	1,083.42	1,222.32	12.78	3.06	l	
40-millimeter smoke round	126	0.0026	0.000097	0.00012	0.00014	0.0027	5.4E-06	0.000011	0.33	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.34	0.00	0.00		
2.75-inch rocket target															!		
practice/white phosphorous	2,349	0.53	-	0.17	0.16	4.8	0.0062	0.07	1,244.97	-	399.33	375.84	11,275.20	14.56	164.43		
Smoke grenade	100	0.046	0.001	0.11	0.68	0.033	-	0.00047	4.6	0.10	11	68	3.3	-	0.047		
Illumination rocket	1,916	0.26	0.94	-	3	1.8	-	0.000058	498.16	1801.04	-	5748	3448.8	-	0.111128		
				Total Ann	ual Emissions	8.38	1.06	0.72	3.97	12.07	0.04	0.10	13.10				
34% Tombstone							Tombstone	2.85	0.36	0.25	1.35	4.10	0.01	0.03	4.45		
24% Jackal Low							2.01	0.25	0.17	0.95	2.90	0.01	0.02	3.14			
							10%	Morenci	0.84	0.11	0.07	0.40	1.21	0.00	0.01	1.31	
							31%	Fuzzy	2.60	0.33	0.22	1.23	3.74	0.01	0.03	4.06	

HH-60 Maintenance Ops

Additional Maintenance Activities	Using EFs from USAF 2021 Mobile Source Guide
-----------------------------------	--

				(lb/1000 lb fuel)							Total emissions							
Power setting		Minutes	FFR (Lb/hr)	Nox	Sox	со	VOC	PM10	PM2.5	CO2	Nox	Sox	со	VOC	PM10	PM2.5	CO2	
Ground Idle	Mtnce - 55 RGS	1,120	134	3.36	1.07	46.24	0.5	1.48	1.33	3203.44	8.40	2.68	115.66	1.25	3.70	3.33	8,013	
Ground Idle	Mtnce - 55 RGQ	6,060	134	3.36	1.07	46.24	0.5	1.48	1.33	3203.44	45.47	14.48	625.81	6.77	20.03	18.00	43,355	
Ground Idle	Idle Engine Runs	33,840	134	3.36	1.07	46.24	0.5	1.48	1.33	3203.44	253.94	80.87	3,494.63	37.79	111.85	100.52	242,103	
Flight Idle	Warm up/Cool down	49,200	469	10.95	1.07	5.12	0.02	1.26	1.13	3214.59	4,211.15	411.50	1,969.05	7.69	484.57	434.58	1,236,267	
Ground Idle	Nat'l Prog Mtnce	825	134	3.36	1.07	46.24	0.5	1.48	1.33	3203.44	6.19	1.97	85.20	0.92	2.73	2.45	5,902	
Overspeed	Nat'l Prog Mtnce	75	725	11.43	1.07	2.81	0.01	2.61	2.33	3214.59	10.36	0.97	2.55	0.01	2.37	2.11	2,913	
Ground Idle	Routine Mtnce	10,890	134	3.36	1.07	46.24	0.5	1.48	1.33	3203.44	81.72	26.02	1,124.60	12.16	36.00	32.35	77,911	
Overspeed	Routine Mtnce	990	725	11.43	1.07	2.81	0.01	2.61	2.33	3214.59	136.73	12.80	33.61	0.12	31.22	27.87	38,455	
Total in Tons per Year									2.38	0.28	3.73	0.03	0.35	0.31	827			
Airspace Helo Ops 120 knots = 138.1 mph

Flight	Average One- way Flight time for		Round trip time for	Mission Time in SUA	Mission Time in SUA	Total Time
Destinations	distance (miles)	transit to SUA (min)	transit to SUA (hrs)	(min)	(hrs)	(hrs)
Tombstone MOA	114	99.06	1.65	120	2	3.65
Jackal Low MOA	40	34.76	0.58	120	2	2.58
Morenci MOA	75	65.17	1.09	120	2	3.09
Fuzzy MOA	35	30.41	0.51	120	2	2.51

Elight Phase	Fuel Flow
Fight Phase	Rate (lb/hr)
Flight	725

Elight Destinations	Total Time	#	Fuel Flow				Emis	sions Factors	s (lb/1,000 lb	fuel)				
Fight Destinations	Annual Flights	(hrs)	engines	per engine	NO	SOx	со	voc	PM ₁₀	PM2.5	CO ₂ e	CO2	CH ₄	N ₂ O
Tombstone MOA	324	1.65	2	725	11.43	1.07	2.81	0.01	2.61	2.33	3,215	3,203	0.15	0.03
Jackal Low MOA	233	0.58	2	725	11.43	1.07	2.81	0.01	2.61	2.33	3,215	3,203	0.15	0.03
Morenci MOA	95	1.09	2	725	11.43	1.07	2.81	0.01	2.61	2.33	3,215	3,203	0.15	0.03
Fuzzy MOA	291	0.51	2	725	11.43	1.07	2.81	0.01	2.61	2.33	3,215	3,203	0.15	0.03
											CUICA			

			Flig	ht Phase Em	issions (ton/	GHGS					
			-		-		(ton/yr)				
		Ň	SOx	со	VOC	PM ₁₀	PM2.5	CO2e	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O
	Tombstone	4 42	0.41	1.00	0.00	1.01	0.00	1 247	#	0.06	0.01
	MOA	4.45	0.41	1.09	0.00	1.01	0.90	1,247	#	0.06	0.01
	Jackal Low	1 1 2	0.10	0.27	0.00	0.26	0.22	215	212	0.01	0.00
	MOA	1.12	0.10	0.27	0.00	0.20	0.25	515	515	0.01	0.00
	Morenci MOA	0.86	0.08	0.21	0.00	0.20	0.17	241	240	0.01	0.00
	Fuzzy MOA	1.22	0.11	0.30	0.00	0.28	0.25	344	343	0.02	0.00
Total Transit To/From SUA Emissions	, Tons per Year	7.63	0.71	1.88	0.01	1.74	1.56	2,147			

SUA Flight Activity Net Change in Total Time # Fuel Flow					el Flow Emissions Factors (lb/1,000 lb fuel)									
SOA Flight Activity	Annual Sorties	(hrs)	engines	per engine	NO	SOx	со	voc	PM ₁₀	PM2.5	CO ₂ e	CO2	CH4	N ₂ O
Tombstone MOA	324	2.00	2	725	11.43	1.07	2.81	0.01	2.61	2.33	3,215	3,203	0.15	0.03
Jackal Low MOA	233	2.00	2	725	11.43	1.07	2.81	0.01	2.61	2.33	3,215	3,203	0.15	0.03
Morenci MOA	95	2.00	2	725	11.43	1.07	2.81	0.01	2.61	2.33	3,215	3,203	0.15	0.03
Fuzzy MOA	291	2.00	2	725	11.43	1.07	2.81	0.01	2.61	2.33	3,215	3,203	0.15	0.03
					Flig	tht Phase Em	issions (ton/	yr)		GHGs (ton/yr)				
					NU	SOx	со	VOC	PM ₁₀	PM2.5	CO ₂ e	CO ₂	CH_4	N ₂ O
				Tombstone MOA	5.37	0.50	1.32	0.00	1.23	1.09	1,511	# #	0.07	0.01
				Jackal Low MOA	3.86	0.36	0.95	0.00	0.88	0.79	1,087	# #	0.05	0.01
				Morenci MOA	1.57	0.15	0.39	0.00	0.36	0.32	443	441	0.02	0.00
				Fuzzy MOA	4.82	0.45	1.19	0.00	1.10	0.98	1,357	#	0.06	0.01
		Total Airspa	ce Emissions	, Tons per Year	15.63	1.46	3.84	0.01	3.57	3.19	4,398			

A-10C Maintenance Activities

Additional Mainten	Using EFs f	urce Guide			
Power setting		# engines	Minutes	FFR (Lb/hr)	
Military	A-10 Full Power Runs	2	960	2,710	1,920
Idle	AMARG	2	251	390	502
Idle	A-10 Parking Idle Runs	2	150	390	300
	AFRC ANG Test Center Idle				
Idle	Parking Runs	2	300	390	600

per setting				
				min per
				engine per
	divided	by	64 aircraft	aircraft
1,920	MIL	30 min/air	craft	15.00
1,402	ldle	21.9 min/air	craft	10.95

Total minutes

Jet Engine Test Cell Ops

		-	-	-
Power setting		# engines	Minutes	FFR (Lb/hr)
Military	A-10 Test Cell	1	3,360	2,710
Idle	A-10 Test Cell	1	2520	390
		•		

	divided by	128 engines
MIL	26.25 m	nin/engine
Idle	19.69 m	nin/engine

Airspace A-10C Low Altitude Ops

Flight Destinations	Mission Time in SUA (min)	Total Time (hrs)	Low Altitude tim (min)
Tombstone MOA	120	2.00	36
Jackal Low MOA	120	2.00	36
Morenci MOA	120	2.00	36
Fuzzy MOA	120	2.00	36

Flight Phase	Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr)				
Flight	2,710				

GHG calcs for high altitude cruise (> 3,000 ft AGL)

Flight Destination	Net Change	Total Time	#	Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr) per	Emissions Factor (lb/1,000 lb fuel)	GHGs (ton/yr)
2	in Annual Flights	(hrs)	engines	engine	CO ₂ e	CO₂e
Tombstone MOA	54	26.81	2	2,710	3,234	235
Jackal Low MOA	39	6.79	2	2,710	3,234	60
Morenci MOA	16	5.23	2	2,710	3,234	46
Fuzzy MOA	49	7.47	2	2,710	3,234	65
	158		Total Airspac	e Emissions, 1	Fons per Year	406

High Altitude A-10 Flight to SUAs, net change

Flight Destinations	Net Change in Annual Flights	Average One-way Flight distance (miles)	Round trip time for transit to SUA (min)
Tombstone MOA	54	114	29.79
Jackal Low MOA	39	40	10.45
Morenci MOA	16	75	19.60
Fuzzy MOA	49	35	9.15

158

Sortie duration

					Net change	FFR		CO2	
				Minutes/	sorties/yr	(Lb/hr/	Total Fuel	lb/1000 lb	
	Power setti	ng	# engines	sortie		engine)	Lb	fuel	CO2 tons
A-10C	Military	Cruise	2	120	266	2,710	2,883,440	3,234	4,663

	surrogate aircraft data used								
					Net change	FFR		CO2e	
				Minutes/	sorties/yr	(Lb/hr/	Total Fuel	lb/1000 lb	
	Power set	ting	# engines	sortie†		engine)	Lb	fuel	CO2 tons
Cessna-182	Military	Cruise	1	120	720	458	659,520	3,234	1,066

	Power se	tting	# engines	Minutes/ sortie†	Net change sorties/yr	FFR (Lb/hr/ engine)	Total Fuel Lb	CO2e lb/1000 lb fuel	CO2 tons
RC-26B	Military	Cruise	2	120	720	458	1,319,040	3,234	2,133
† Assumed		-		-				Total CO2e	7,862

Construction and Low Altitude Emissions:	Tons/year
Davis-Monthan AFB airfield ops	22,056
Low Altitude Transit and Airspace Ops	7,388
High Altitude Transit and Sortie Ops	8,268
Personnel	520
Total CO2e for annual aircraft ops	38,232
2023 Construction emissions	110
2024 Construction emissions	784

20-year Lifetime emissions estimate 765,530

This Page Intentionally Blank

Davis-Monthan AFB ACAM ROCA and Detail Report

This Page Intentionally Blank

AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT RECORD OF CONFORMITY ANALYSIS (ROCA)

1. General Information: The Air Force's Air Conformity Applicability Model (ACAM) was used to perform an analysis to assess the potential air quality impact/s associated with the action in accordance with the Air Force Manual 32-7002, Environmental Compliance and Pollution Prevention; the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP, 32 CFR 989); and the General Conformity Rule (GCR, 40 CFR 93 Subpart B). This report provides a summary of the ACAM analysis.

a. Action Location:

Base: DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB State: Arizona County(s): Pima Regulatory Area(s): Rillito, AZ

b. Action Title: Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment, Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona

c. Project Number/s (if applicable):

d. Projected Action Start Date: 10 / 2023

e. Action Description:

The Air Force is proposing to relocate the following 4th Gen missions from Nellis AFB, Nevada, to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona:
66th Weapons Squadron (66 WPS)
•A-10 Operational Test (OT) portion of the 422nd Test and Evaluation Squadron (422 TES)
•66th Rescue Squadron (66 RQS)
•58th Rescue Squadron (58 RQS)
•34th Weapons Squadron (34 WPS)
•88th Test and Evaluation Squadron (88 TES)
In order to create capacity at Davis-Monthan AFB to accept the aforementioned missions, the Air Force proposes to take the following actions with units already stationed at Davis-Monthan AFB:
•Inactivate the 354th Fighter Squadron (354 FS) and retire assigned A-10C aircraft.
•Convert the 357th Fighter Squadron (357 FS) from an active duty flying squadron to an active association with the 47th Fighter Squadron (47 FS), an AFRC A-10 FTU. Some A-10 aircraft assigned to the 357 FS would be retired, others would be reassigned to the 47 FS.

The Air Force also proposes several unrelated actions that are analyzed in this EA due to overlap in the proposed timing: •Beddown CAP Cessna 182. •Relocate RC-26B operations.

f. Point of Contact:

Name:	Lesley Hamilton
Title:	Consultant
Organization:	Stantec GS
Email:	Lesley.Hamilton@cardno-gs.com
Phone Number:	

2. Analysis: Total combined direct and indirect emissions associated with the action were estimated through ACAM on a calendar-year basis for the "worst-case" and "steady state" (net gain/loss upon action fully implemented) emissions. General Conformity under the Clean Air Act, Section 1.76 has been evaluated for the action described above according to the requirements of 40 CFR 93, Subpart B.

Based on the analysis, the requirements of this rule are:

_____ applicable __X__ not applicable

AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT RECORD OF CONFORMITY ANALYSIS (ROCA)

Conformity Analysis Summary:

2023				
Pollutant	Action Emissions	GENERAL CONFORMITY		
	(ton/yr)	Threshold (ton/yr)	Exceedance (Yes or No)	
Rillito, AZ				
VOC	0.406			
NOx	0.286			
СО	0.402			
SOx	0.001			
PM 10	0.063	100	No	
PM 2.5	0.010			
Pb	0.000			
NH3	0.001			
CO2e	101.9			

2024

Pollutant	Action Emissions	GENERAL C	ONFORMITY
	(ton/yr)	Threshold (ton/yr)	Exceedance (Yes or No)
Rillito, AZ			
VOC	2.949		
NOx	2.196		
СО	3.431		
SOx	0.007		
PM 10	5.187	100	No
PM 2.5	0.074		
Pb	0.000		
NH3	0.007		
CO2e	784.1		

2026 - (Steady State)

Pollutant	Action Emissions	GENERAL C	ONFORMITY
	(ton/yr)	Threshold (ton/yr)	Exceedance (Yes or No)
Rillito, AZ			
VOC	16.7		
NOx	94.8		
CO	70.9		
SOx	7.9		
PM 10	13.3	100	No
PM 2.5	11.6		
Pb	0.0		
NH3	0.04		
22,056	22,056		

None of estimated emissions associated with this action are above the conformity threshold values established at 40 CFR 93.153 (b); Therefore, the requirements of the General Conformity Rule are not applicable.

1. General Information

- Action Location

Base:DAVIS-MONTHAN AFBState:ArizonaCounty(s):PimaRegulatory Area(s):Rillito, AZ

- Action Title: Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment, Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona
- Project Number/s (if applicable):

- Projected Action Start Date: 10 / 2023

- Action Purpose and Need:

The Air Force proposes to relocate a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller (JTAC) training, and Guardian Angel operations from Nellis AFB to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona in support of Nellis AFB increase in fighter aircraft. Twol other proposed actions at Davis-Monthan AFB unrelated to the movements described above that are occurring on approximately the same timelines and are therefore included in this analysis. These actions consist of assignment of two Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Cessna 182 aircraft and the transfer of one RC-26B aircraft from the Morris Air National Guard Base (ANGB) located at the Tucson International Airport (Arizona).

- Action Description:

The Air Force is proposing to relocate the following 4th Gen missions from Nellis AFB, Nevada, to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona:

•66th Weapons Squadron (66 WPS)

•A-10 Operational Test (OT) portion of the 422nd Test and Evaluation Squadron (422 TES)

•66th Rescue Squadron (66 RQS)

•58th Rescue Squadron (58 RQS)

•34th Weapons Squadron (34 WPS)

•88th Test and Evaluation Squadron (88 TES)

In order to create capacity at Davis-Monthan AFB to accept the aforementioned missions, the Air Force proposes to take the following actions with units already stationed at Davis-Monthan AFB:

•Inactivate the 354th Fighter Squadron (354 FS) and retire assigned A-10C aircraft.

•Convert the 357th Fighter Squadron (357 FS) from an active duty flying squadron to an active association with the 47th Fighter Squadron (47 FS), an AFRC A-10 FTU. Some A-10 aircraft assigned to the 357 FS would be retired, others would be reassigned to the 47 FS.

The Air Force also proposes several unrelated actions that are analyzed in this EA due to overlap in the proposed timing: •Beddown CAP Cessna 182.

•Relocate RC-26B operations.

- Point of Contact

Name:	Lesley Hamilton
Title:	Consultant
Organization:	Stantec GS
Email:	Lesley.Hamilton@cardno-gs.com
Phone Number:	

- Activity List:

	Activity Type	Activity Title
2.	Construction / Demolition	2023 Construction Activities - construct one hangar
3.	Construction / Demolition	Construction activities - 2024

4.	Aircraft	Preferred Alternative additional A-10C LTOs
5.	Aircraft	Cessna 182 operations
6.	Aircraft	RC-26B Operations
7.	Aircraft	RC-26B jet engine test cell activities
8.	Personnel	Additional Personnel
9.	Aircraft	Additional A-10C Closed Pattern Ops at Davis-Monthan AFB
10.	Aircraft	Additional A-10C Jet Engine Test Cell Activities

Emission factors and air emission estimating methods come from the United States Air Force's Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Stationary Sources, Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Mobile Sources, and Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Transitory Sources.

2. Construction / Demolition

2.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

- Activity Location County: Pima Regulatory Area(s): Rillito, AZ
- Activity Title: 2023 Construction Activities construct one hangar
- Activity Description: Construct 1 hangar
- Activity Start Date

Start Month:10Start Month:2023

- Activity End Date

Indefinite:	False
End Month:	12
End Month:	2023

- Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Total Emissions (TONs)
VOC	0.406190
SO _x	0.000899
NO _x	0.286495
CO	0.402347
PM 10	0.062977

Pollutant	Total Emissions (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.009537
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000748
CO ₂ e	101.9

2.1 Site Grading Phase

2.1.1 Site Grading Phase Timeline Assumptions

- Phase Start Date	
Start Month:	10
Start Quarter:	1
Start Year:	2023

- Phase Duration

Number of Month: 0

Number of Days: 3

2.1.2 Site Grading Phase Assumptions

- General Site Grading Information	
Area of Site to be Graded (ft ²):	38750
Amount of Material to be Hauled On-Site (yd ³):	1148
Amount of Material to be Hauled Off-Site (yd ³):	1148

- Site Grading Default Settings				
Default Settings Used:	No			
Average Day(s) worked per week:	5			

- Construction Exhaust

Equipment Name	Number Of Equipment	Hours Per Day
Dumpers/Tenders Composite	5	1
Graders Composite	1	6
Other Construction Equipment Composite	1	8
Rubber Tired Dozers Composite	1	6
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite	1	7

- Vehicle Exhaust

Average Hauling Truck Capacity (yd ³):	12
Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile):	20

- Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0

- Worker Trips

Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile): 20

- Worker Trips Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	50.00	50.00	0	0	0	0	0

2.1.3 Site Grading Phase Emission Factor(s)

- Construction Exhaust Emission Factors (lb/hour)

Dumpers/Tenders Composite									
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH4	CO ₂ e	
Emission Factors	0.0091	0.0001	0.0581	0.0313	0.0021	0.0021	0.0008	7.6451	
Graders Composite									
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH4	CO ₂ e	
Emission Factors	0.0757	0.0014	0.4155	0.5717	0.0191	0.0191	0.0068	132.91	
Other Construction H	Equipment (Composite							
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH4	CO ₂ e	
Emission Factors	0.0483	0.0012	0.2497	0.3481	0.0091	0.0091	0.0043	122.61	
Rubber Tired Dozers	Composite	;							
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH4	CO ₂ e	
Emission Factors	0.1830	0.0024	1.2623	0.7077	0.0494	0.0494	0.0165	239.49	
Tractors/Loaders/Ba	ckhoes Con	ıposite							
	VOC	SOx	NOx	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO ₂ e	

Emission Factors	0.0364	0.0007	0.2127	0.3593	0.0080	0.0080	0.0032	66.879

- Vehicle Exhaust & Worker Trips Emission Factors (grams/mile)

	VOC	SOx	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	Pb	NH ₃	CO ₂ e
LDGV	000.244	000.001	000.142	003.587	000.004	000.003		000.025	00324.960
LDGT	000.262	000.002	000.240	004.095	000.005	000.005		000.026	00419.031
HDGV	001.016	000.004	001.030	015.716	000.025	000.022		000.052	00911.371
LDDV	000.067	000.001	000.106	003.801	000.003	000.002		000.008	00337.674
LDDT	000.114	000.001	000.251	003.075	000.004	000.003		000.008	00380.587
HDDV	000.131	000.004	002.950	001.694	000.059	000.055		000.033	01314.196
MC	003.171	000.002	000.724	012.920	000.023	000.021		000.053	00388.600

2.1.4 Site Grading Phase Formula(s)

- Fugitive Dust Emissions per Phase

 $PM10_{FD} = (20 * ACRE * WD) / 2000$

PM10_{FD}: Fugitive Dust PM 10 Emissions (TONs)
20: Conversion Factor Acre Day to pounds (20 lb / 1 Acre Day)
ACRE: Total acres (acres)
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Construction Exhaust Emissions per Phase

 $CEE_{POL} = (NE * WD * H * EF_{POL}) / 2000$

CEE_{POL}: Construction Exhaust Emissions (TONs) NE: Number of Equipment WD: Number of Total Work Days (days) H: Hours Worked per Day (hours) EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (lb/hour) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Vehicle Exhaust Emissions per Phase

 $VMT_{VE} = (HA_{OnSite} + HA_{OffSite}) * (1 / HC) * HT$

VMT_{VE}: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles) HA_{OnSite}: Amount of Material to be Hauled On-Site (yd³) HA_{OffSite}: Amount of Material to be Hauled Off-Site (yd³) HC: Average Hauling Truck Capacity (yd³) (1 / HC): Conversion Factor cubic yards to trips (1 trip / HC yd³) HT: Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile/trip)

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{VE} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$

V_{POL}: Vehicle Emissions (TONs)
VMT_{VE}: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds
EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile)
VM: Vehicle Exhaust On Road Vehicle Mixture (%)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Worker Trips Emissions per Phase $VMT_{WT} = WD * WT * 1.25 * NE$

VMT_{WT}: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
WT: Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile)
1.25: Conversion Factor Number of Construction Equipment to Number of Works
NE: Number of Construction Equipment

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{WT} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$

 $\begin{array}{l} V_{POL}: \ Vehicle \ Emissions (TONs) \\ VMT_{WT}: \ Worker \ Trips \ Vehicle \ Miles \ Travel (miles) \\ 0.002205: \ Conversion \ Factor \ grams \ to \ pounds \\ EF_{POL}: \ Emission \ Factor \ for \ Pollutant \ (grams/mile) \\ VM: \ Worker \ Trips \ On \ Road \ Vehicle \ Mixture \ (\%) \\ 2000: \ Conversion \ Factor \ pounds \ to \ tons \end{array}$

2.2 Building Construction Phase

2.2.1 Building Construction Phase Timeline Assumptions

- Phase Start Date Start Month: 10 Start Quarter: 1 Start Year: 2023

- Phase Duration Number of Month: 3 Number of Days: 0

2.2.2 Building Construction Phase Assumptions

- General Building Construction Information

Building Category:	Office or Industrial
Area of Building (ft ²):	31000
Height of Building (ft):	20
Number of Units:	N/A

Building Construction Default Settings
 Default Settings Used: No
 Average Day(s) worked per week: 5

- Construction Exhaust

Equipment Name	Number Of Equipment	Hours Per Day
Cranes Composite	1	4
Forklifts Composite	2	6
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite	2	8

- Vehicle Exhaust

Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile): 20

- Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0

- Worker Trips

Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile): 20

- Worker Trips Vehicle Mixture (%)								
	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC	
POVs	50.00	50.00	0	0	0	0	0	

- Vendor Trips

Average Vendor Round Trip Commute (mile): 20

- Vendor Trips Vehicle Mixture (%)

· enaor in									
	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC		
POVs	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0		

2.2.3 Building Construction Phase Emission Factor(s)

- Construction Exhaust Emission Factors (lb/hour)

Cranes Composite								
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO ₂ e
Emission Factors	0.0754	0.0013	0.5027	0.3786	0.0181	0.0181	0.0068	128.79
Forklifts Composite								
	VOC	SOx	NOx	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH4	CO ₂ e
Emission Factors	0.0258	0.0006	0.1108	0.2145	0.0034	0.0034	0.0023	54.454
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite								
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO ₂ e
Emission Factors	0.0364	0.0007	0.2127	0.3593	0.0080	0.0080	0.0032	66.879

- Vehicle Exhaust & Worker Trips Emission Factors (grams/mile)

	VOC	SOx	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	Pb	NH ₃	CO ₂ e
LDGV	000.244	000.001	000.142	003.587	000.004	000.003		000.025	00324.960
LDGT	000.262	000.002	000.240	004.095	000.005	000.005		000.026	00419.031
HDGV	001.016	000.004	001.030	015.716	000.025	000.022		000.052	00911.371
LDDV	000.067	000.001	000.106	003.801	000.003	000.002		000.008	00337.674
LDDT	000.114	000.001	000.251	003.075	000.004	000.003		000.008	00380.587
HDDV	000.131	000.004	002.950	001.694	000.059	000.055		000.033	01314.196
MC	003.171	000.002	000.724	012.920	000.023	000.021		000.053	00388.600

2.2.4 Building Construction Phase Formula(s)

- Construction Exhaust Emissions per Phase

 $CEE_{POL} = (NE * WD * H * EF_{POL}) / 2000$

CEE_{POL}: Construction Exhaust Emissions (TONs)
NE: Number of Equipment
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
H: Hours Worked per Day (hours)
EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (lb/hour)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Vehicle Exhaust Emissions per Phase

 $VMT_{VE} = BA * BH * (0.42 / 1000) * HT$

VMT_{VE}: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles) BA: Area of Building (ft²) BH: Height of Building (ft)

(0.42 / 1000): Conversion Factor ft³ to trips (0.42 trip / 1000 ft³) HT: Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile/trip)

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{VE} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$

V_{POL}: Vehicle Emissions (TONs)
VMT_{VE}: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds
EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile)
VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Worker Trips Emissions per Phase

 $VMT_{WT} = WD * WT * 1.25 * NE$

VMT_{WT}: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
WT: Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile)
1.25: Conversion Factor Number of Construction Equipment to Number of Works
NE: Number of Construction Equipment

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{WT} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$

 $\begin{array}{l} V_{POL}: \ Vehicle \ Emissions (TONs) \\ VMT_{WT}: \ Worker \ Trips \ Vehicle \ Miles \ Travel (miles) \\ 0.002205: \ Conversion \ Factor \ grams \ to \ pounds \\ EF_{POL}: \ Emission \ Factor \ for \ Pollutant \ (grams/mile) \\ VM: \ Worker \ Trips \ On \ Road \ Vehicle \ Mixture \ (\%) \\ 2000: \ Conversion \ Factor \ pounds \ to \ tons \end{array}$

- Vender Trips Emissions per Phase

VMT_{VT} = BA * BH * (0.38 / 1000) * HT

VMT_{VT}: Vender Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
BA: Area of Building (ft²)
BH: Height of Building (ft)
(0.38 / 1000): Conversion Factor ft³ to trips (0.38 trip / 1000 ft³)
HT: Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile/trip)

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{VT} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$

 V_{POL} : Vehicle Emissions (TONs) VMT_{VT}: Vender Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles) 0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile) VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

2.3 Architectural Coatings Phase

2.3.1 Architectural Coatings Phase Timeline Assumptions

- Phase Start Date Start Month: 12 Start Quarter: 1

Start Year: 2023

- Phase Duration Number of Month: 0 Number of Days: 5

2.3.2 Architectural Coatings Phase Assumptions

- General Architectural Coatings Information Building Category: Non-Residential Total Square Footage (ft²): 31000 Number of Units: N/A
- Architectural Coatings Default Settings
 Default Settings Used: No
 Average Day(s) worked per week: 5
- Worker Trips

Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile): 20

- Worker Trips Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	50.00	50.00	0	0	0	0	0

2.3.3 Architectural Coatings Phase Emission Factor(s)

- Worker Trips Emission Factors (grams/mile)

	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	Pb	\mathbf{NH}_3	CO ₂ e
LDGV	000.244	000.001	000.142	003.587	000.004	000.003		000.025	00324.960
LDGT	000.262	000.002	000.240	004.095	000.005	000.005		000.026	00419.031
HDGV	001.016	000.004	001.030	015.716	000.025	000.022		000.052	00911.371
LDDV	000.067	000.001	000.106	003.801	000.003	000.002		000.008	00337.674
LDDT	000.114	000.001	000.251	003.075	000.004	000.003		000.008	00380.587
HDDV	000.131	000.004	002.950	001.694	000.059	000.055		000.033	01314.196
MC	003.171	000.002	000.724	012.920	000.023	000.021		000.053	00388.600

2.3.4 Architectural Coatings Phase Formula(s)

- Worker Trips Emissions per Phase

 $VMT_{WT} = (1 * WT * PA) / 800$

VMT_{WT}: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
1: Conversion Factor man days to trips (1 trip / 1 man * day)
WT: Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile)
PA: Paint Area (ft²)
800: Conversion Factor square feet to man days (1 ft² / 1 man * day)

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{WT} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$

 V_{POL} : Vehicle Emissions (TONs) VMT_{WT}: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles) 0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile) VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Off-Gassing Emissions per Phase

 $VOC_{AC} = (AB * 2.0 * 0.0116) / 2000.0$

VOC_{AC}: Architectural Coating VOC Emissions (TONs)
BA: Area of Building (ft²)
2.0: Conversion Factor total area to coated area (2.0 ft² coated area / total area)
0.0116: Emission Factor (lb/ft²)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

3. Construction / Demolition

3.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

- Activity Location County: Pima Regulatory Area(s): Rillito, AZ

- Activity Title: Construction activities - 2024

- Activity Description:

Construct flight simulators, hangars, LOLAs, munition igloos, ops and training bldgs, armament shop and road extension for ops bldgs.

- Activity Start Date

Start Month: 1 Start Month: 2024

- Activity End Date

Indefinite:	False
End Month:	11
End Month:	2024

- Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Total Emissions (TONs)
VOC	2.948509
SO _x	0.007004
NO _x	2.195795
CO	3.430942
PM 10	5,187156

Pollutant	Total Emissions (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.074176
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.007370
CO ₂ e	784.1

3.1 Site Grading Phase

3.1.1 Site Grading Phase Timeline Assumptions

```
- Phase Start Date
Start Month: 1
Start Quarter: 1
Start Year: 2024
```

- Phase Duration Number of Month: 0 Number of Days: 30

3.1.2 Site Grading Phase Assumptions

- General Site Grading Information	
Area of Site to be Graded (ft ²):	519638
Amount of Material to be Hauled On-Site (yd ³):	17141
Amount of Material to be Hauled Off-Site (yd ³):	11326
- Site Grading Default Settings	

Site Grading Default Settings	
Default Settings Used:	No
Average Day(s) worked per week:	5

- Construction Exhaust

Equipment Name	Number Of Equipment	Hours Per Day
Excavators Composite	1	5.33
Graders Composite	1	5.33
Rubber Tired Dozers Composite	3	4.44
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite	3	9

- Vehicle Exhaust

Average Hauling Truck Capacity (yd ³):	20
Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile):	20

- Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0

- Worker Trips

Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile): 20

- Worker Trips Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	50.00	50.00	0	0	0	0	0

3.1.3 Site Grading Phase Emission Factor(s)

- Construction Exhaust Emission Factors (lb/hour)

Excavators Composite								
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH4	CO ₂ e
Emission Factors	0.0584	0.0013	0.2523	0.5090	0.0100	0.0100	0.0052	119.71
Graders Composite								
	VOC	SOx	NOx	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH4	CO ₂ e
Emission Factors	0.0714	0.0014	0.3708	0.5706	0.0167	0.0167	0.0064	132.90
Rubber Tired Dozers	s Composite	;						
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH4	CO ₂ e
Emission Factors	0.1747	0.0024	1.1695	0.6834	0.0454	0.0454	0.0157	239.47
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite								
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH4	CO ₂ e
Emission Factors	0.0348	0.0007	0.1980	0.3589	0.0068	0.0068	0.0031	66.875

- Vehicle Exhaust & Worker Trips Emission Factors (grams/mile)

	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	Pb	NH ₃	CO ₂ e
LDGV	000.231	000.001	000.115	003.465	000.004	000.003		000.024	00317.186

LDGT	000.244	000.002	000.203	003.885	000.005	000.005	000.026	00410.214
HDGV	000.985	000.004	000.937	014.893	000.024	000.021	000.052	00918.590
LDDV	000.061	000.001	000.092	003.641	000.002	000.002	000.008	00326.251
LDDT	000.068	000.001	000.140	002.502	000.003	000.003	000.008	00371.496
HDDV	000.115	000.004	002.728	001.627	000.050	000.046	000.033	01283.227
MC	003.169	000.002	000.722	012.803	000.023	000.021	000.053	00388.727

3.1.4 Site Grading Phase Formula(s)

- Fugitive Dust Emissions per Phase

PM10_{FD} = (20 * ACRE * WD) / 2000

PM10_{FD}: Fugitive Dust PM 10 Emissions (TONs)
20: Conversion Factor Acre Day to pounds (20 lb / 1 Acre Day)
ACRE: Total acres (acres)
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Construction Exhaust Emissions per Phase

 $CEE_{POL} = (NE * WD * H * EF_{POL}) / 2000$

CEE_{POL}: Construction Exhaust Emissions (TONs)
NE: Number of Equipment
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
H: Hours Worked per Day (hours)
EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (lb/hour)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Vehicle Exhaust Emissions per Phase

 $VMT_{VE} = (HA_{OnSite} + HA_{OffSite}) * (1 / HC) * HT$

VMT_{VE}: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles) HA_{OnSite}: Amount of Material to be Hauled On-Site (yd³) HA_{OffSite}: Amount of Material to be Hauled Off-Site (yd³) HC: Average Hauling Truck Capacity (yd³) (1 / HC): Conversion Factor cubic yards to trips (1 trip / HC yd³) HT: Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile/trip)

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{VE} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$

V_{POL}: Vehicle Emissions (TONs)
VMT_{VE}: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds
EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile)
VM: Vehicle Exhaust On Road Vehicle Mixture (%)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Worker Trips Emissions per Phase

 $VMT_{WT} = WD * WT * 1.25 * NE$

VMT_{WT}: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
WT: Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile)
1.25: Conversion Factor Number of Construction Equipment to Number of Works
NE: Number of Construction Equipment

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{WT} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$

 V_{POL} : Vehicle Emissions (TONs) VMT_{WT}: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles) 0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile) VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

3.2 Building Construction Phase

3.2.1 Building Construction Phase Timeline Assumptions

- Phase Start Date Start Month: 1 Start Quarter: 1 Start Year: 2024

- Phase Duration Number of Month: 11 Number of Days: 0

3.2.2 Building Construction Phase Assumptions

- General Building Construction Information

Building Category:Office or IndustrialArea of Building (ft²):227150Height of Building (ft):14Number of Units:N/A

Building Construction Default Settings	
Default Settings Used:	No
Average Day(s) worked per week:	5

- Construction Exhaust

Equipment Name	Number Of	Hours Per Day
	Equipment	
Cranes Composite	1	7
Dumpers/Tenders Composite	15	0.5
Forklifts Composite	3	8
Generator Sets Composite	1	8
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite	3	7
Welders Composite	1	8

- Vehicle Exhaust

Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile): 20

- Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0

- Worker Trips

Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile): 20

- Worker Trips Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	50.00	50.00	0	0	0	0	0

- Vendor Trips

Average Vendor Round Trip Commute (mile): 20

- Vendor Trips Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0

3.2.3 Building Construction Phase Emission Factor(s)

- Construction Exhaust Emission Factors (lb/hour)

Cranes Composite										
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO ₂ e		
Emission Factors	0.0715	0.0013	0.4600	0.3758	0.0161	0.0161	0.0064	128.78		
Dumpers/Tenders Composite										
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH4	CO ₂ e		
Emission Factors	0.0091	0.0001	0.0581	0.0313	0.0021	0.0021	0.0008	7.6451		
Forklifts Composite										
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH4	CO ₂ e		
Emission Factors	0.0246	0.0006	0.0973	0.2146	0.0029	0.0029	0.0022	54.451		
Generator Sets Composite										
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH4	CO ₂ e		
Emission Factors	0.0303	0.0006	0.2464	0.2674	0.0091	0.0091	0.0027	61.061		
Tractors/Loaders/Ba	ckhoes Con	iposite								
	VOC	SOx	NOx	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH4	CO ₂ e		
Emission Factors	0.0348	0.0007	0.1980	0.3589	0.0068	0.0068	0.0031	66.875		
Welders Composite										
	VOC	SOx	NOx	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO ₂ e		
Emission Factors	0.0227	0.0003	0.1427	0.1752	0.0059	0.0059	0.0020	25.653		

- Vehicle Exhaust & Worker Trips Emission Factors (grams/mile)

	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	Pb	\mathbf{NH}_3	CO ₂ e
LDGV	000.231	000.001	000.115	003.465	000.004	000.003		000.024	00317.186
LDGT	000.244	000.002	000.203	003.885	000.005	000.005		000.026	00410.214
HDGV	000.985	000.004	000.937	014.893	000.024	000.021		000.052	00918.590
LDDV	000.061	000.001	000.092	003.641	000.002	000.002		000.008	00326.251
LDDT	000.068	000.001	000.140	002.502	000.003	000.003		000.008	00371.496
HDDV	000.115	000.004	002.728	001.627	000.050	000.046		000.033	01283.227
MC	003.169	000.002	000.722	012.803	000.023	000.021		000.053	00388.727

3.2.4 Building Construction Phase Formula(s)

- Construction Exhaust Emissions per Phase

 $CEE_{POL} = (NE * WD * H * EF_{POL}) / 2000$

CEE_{POL}: Construction Exhaust Emissions (TONs) NE: Number of Equipment WD: Number of Total Work Days (days) H: Hours Worked per Day (hours) EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (lb/hour) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Vehicle Exhaust Emissions per Phase

 $VMT_{VE} = BA * BH * (0.42 / 1000) * HT$

VMT_{VE}: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
BA: Area of Building (ft²)
BH: Height of Building (ft)
(0.42 / 1000): Conversion Factor ft³ to trips (0.42 trip / 1000 ft³)
HT: Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile/trip)

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{VE} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$

 V_{POL} : Vehicle Emissions (TONs) VMT_{VE}: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles) 0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile) VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Worker Trips Emissions per Phase

 $VMT_{WT} = WD * WT * 1.25 * NE$

VMT_{WT}: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
WT: Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile)
1.25: Conversion Factor Number of Construction Equipment to Number of Works
NE: Number of Construction Equipment

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{WT} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$

 V_{POL} : Vehicle Emissions (TONs) VMT_{WT}: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles) 0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile) VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Vender Trips Emissions per Phase

 $VMT_{VT} = BA * BH * (0.38 / 1000) * HT$

VMT_{VT}: Vender Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
BA: Area of Building (ft²)
BH: Height of Building (ft)
(0.38 / 1000): Conversion Factor ft³ to trips (0.38 trip / 1000 ft³)
HT: Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile/trip)

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{VT} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$

V_{POL}: Vehicle Emissions (TONs)
VMT_{VT}: Vender Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds
EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile)
VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

3.3 Architectural Coatings Phase

3.3.1 Architectural Coatings Phase Timeline Assumptions

- Phase Start Date Start Month: 11

Start Quarter:1Start Year:2024

- Phase Duration Number of Month: 0 Number of Days: 20

3.3.2 Architectural Coatings Phase Assumptions

- General Architectural Coatings Information Building Category: Non-Residential Total Square Footage (ft²): 220800 Number of Units: N/A
- Architectural Coatings Default Settings
 Default Settings Used: No
 Average Day(s) worked per week: 5

- Worker Trips

Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile): 20

- Worker Trips Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	50.00	50.00	0	0	0	0	0

3.3.3 Architectural Coatings Phase Emission Factor(s)

- Worker Trips Emission Factors (grams/mile)

	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	Pb	NH ₃	CO ₂ e
LDGV	000.231	000.001	000.115	003.465	000.004	000.003		000.024	00317.186
LDGT	000.244	000.002	000.203	003.885	000.005	000.005		000.026	00410.214
HDGV	000.985	000.004	000.937	014.893	000.024	000.021		000.052	00918.590
LDDV	000.061	000.001	000.092	003.641	000.002	000.002		000.008	00326.251
LDDT	000.068	000.001	000.140	002.502	000.003	000.003		000.008	00371.496
HDDV	000.115	000.004	002.728	001.627	000.050	000.046		000.033	01283.227
MC	003.169	000.002	000.722	012.803	000.023	000.021		000.053	00388.727

3.3.4 Architectural Coatings Phase Formula(s)

- Worker Trips Emissions per Phase

 $VMT_{WT} = (1 * WT * PA) / 800$

VMT_{WT}: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
1: Conversion Factor man days to trips (1 trip / 1 man * day)
WT: Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile)
PA: Paint Area (ft²)
800: Conversion Factor square feet to man days (1 ft² / 1 man * day)

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{WT} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$

 V_{POL} : Vehicle Emissions (TONs) VMT_{WT}: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles) 0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile) VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Off-Gassing Emissions per Phase

 $VOC_{AC} = (AB * 2.0 * 0.0116) / 2000.0$

VOC_{AC}: Architectural Coating VOC Emissions (TONs)
BA: Area of Building (ft²)
2.0: Conversion Factor total area to coated area (2.0 ft² coated area / total area)
0.0116: Emission Factor (lb/ft²)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

3.4 Paving Phase

3.4.1 Paving Phase Timeline Assumptions

Phase Start Date	
Start Month:	11
Start Quarter:	1
Start Year:	2024

- Phase Duration Number of Month: 0 Number of Days: 20

3.4.2 Paving Phase Assumptions

- General Paving Information Paving Area (ft²): 105276
- Paving Default Settings Default Settings Used: No Average Day(s) worked per week: 5

- Construction Exhaust

Equipment Name	Number Of Equipment	Hours Per Day
Cement and Mortar Mixers Composite	2	8
Dumpers/Tenders Composite	31	0.5
Paving Equipment Composite	2	8
Rollers Composite	2	8

- Vehicle Exhaust

Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile): 20

- Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0

- Worker Trips

Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile): 20

- Worker Trips Vehicle Mixture (%)

	F (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)						
	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	50.00	50.00	0	0	0	0	0

3.4.3 Paving Phase Emission Factor(s)

- Construction Exhaust Emission Factors (lb/hour)

Excavators Composit	te							
	VOC	SOx	NOx	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH ₄	CO ₂ e
Emission Factors	0.0584	0.0013	0.2523	0.5090	0.0100	0.0100	0.0052	119.71
Graders Composite								
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH4	CO ₂ e
Emission Factors	0.0714	0.0014	0.3708	0.5706	0.0167	0.0167	0.0064	132.90
Rubber Tired Dozers	s Composite	2						
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH4	CO ₂ e
Emission Factors	0.1747	0.0024	1.1695	0.6834	0.0454	0.0454	0.0157	239.47
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite								
	VOC	SOx	NOx	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CH4	CO ₂ e
Emission Factors	0.0348	0.0007	0.1980	0.3589	0.0068	0.0068	0.0031	66.875

- Vehicle Exhaust & Worker Trips Emission Factors (grams/mile)

				V	9	,			
	VOC	SOx	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	Pb	\mathbf{NH}_3	CO ₂ e
LDGV	000.231	000.001	000.115	003.465	000.004	000.003		000.024	00317.186
LDGT	000.244	000.002	000.203	003.885	000.005	000.005		000.026	00410.214
HDGV	000.985	000.004	000.937	014.893	000.024	000.021		000.052	00918.590
LDDV	000.061	000.001	000.092	003.641	000.002	000.002		000.008	00326.251
LDDT	000.068	000.001	000.140	002.502	000.003	000.003		000.008	00371.496
HDDV	000.115	000.004	002.728	001.627	000.050	000.046		000.033	01283.227
MC	003.169	000.002	000.722	012.803	000.023	000.021		000.053	00388.727

3.4.4 Paving Phase Formula(s)

- Construction Exhaust Emissions per Phase

 $CEE_{POL} = (NE * WD * H * EF_{POL}) / 2000$

CEE_{POL}: Construction Exhaust Emissions (TONs) NE: Number of Equipment WD: Number of Total Work Days (days) H: Hours Worked per Day (hours) EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (lb/hour) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Vehicle Exhaust Emissions per Phase

 $VMT_{VE} = PA * 0.25 * (1 / 27) * (1 / HC) * HT$

 $\begin{array}{l} VMT_{VE}: \ Vehicle \ Exhaust \ Vehicle \ Miles \ Travel \ (miles) \\ PA: \ Paving \ Area \ (ft^2) \\ 0.25: \ Thickness \ of \ Paving \ Area \ (ft) \\ (1 \ / \ 27): \ Conversion \ Factor \ cubic \ feet \ to \ cubic \ yards \ (1 \ yd^3 \ / \ 27 \ ft^3) \\ HC: \ Average \ Hauling \ Truck \ Capacity \ (yd^3) \\ (1 \ / \ HC): \ Conversion \ Factor \ cubic \ yards \ to \ trips \ (1 \ trip \ / \ HC \ yd^3) \end{array}$

HT: Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile/trip)

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{VE} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$

V_{POL}: Vehicle Emissions (TONs)
VMT_{VE}: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds
EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile)
VM: Vehicle Exhaust On Road Vehicle Mixture (%)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Worker Trips Emissions per Phase $VMT_{WT} = WD * WT * 1.25 * NE$

VMT_{WT}: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
WT: Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile)
1.25: Conversion Factor Number of Construction Equipment to Number of Works
NE: Number of Construction Equipment

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{WT} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$

V_{POL}: Vehicle Emissions (TONs)
VMT_{VE}: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds
EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile)
VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Off-Gassing Emissions per Phase

 $VOC_P = (2.62 * PA) / 43560$

VOC_P: Paving VOC Emissions (TONs)
2.62: Emission Factor (lb/acre)
PA: Paving Area (ft²)
43560: Conversion Factor square feet to acre (43560 ft2 / acre)² / acre)

4. Aircraft

4.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

- Add or Remove Activity from Baseline? Add

- Activity Location County: Pima Regulatory Area(s): Rillito, AZ

- Activity Title: Preferred Alternative additional A-10C LTOs

- Activity Description:

Relocate the 66 WPS, 422 TES A-10C OT mission, 66 RQS, 58 RQS, 34 WPS, and 88 TES from Nellis AFB to Davis-Monthan AFB. This alternative would also inactivate the 354 FS and convert the 357 FS to an active association with the 47 FS. This alternative would result in a decrease of 20 PAA A-10C aircraft, but an increase overall in flight operations.

- Activity Start Date

Start Month:	1
Start Year:	2025

- Activity End Date

Indefinite:	Yes
End Month:	N/A
End Year:	N/A

- Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	11.096883
SO _x	2.999115
NO _x	18.640465
CO	46.495928
PM 10	3.049883

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	2.124594
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO ₂ e	8556.3

- Activity Emissions [Flight Operations (includes Trim Test & APU) part]:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	7.636664
SO _x	2.639595
NO _x	11.293595
CO	41.677361
PM 10	2.113360

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	1.217327
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO ₂ e	8296.5

4.2 Aircraft & Engines

4.2.1 Aircraft & Engines Assumptions

- Aircraft & Engine	
Aircraft Designation:	A-10C
Engine Model:	TF34-GE-100
Primary Function:	Combat
Aircraft has After burn:	No
Number of Engines:	2

- Aircraft & Engine Surrogate Is Aircraft & Engine a Surrogate? No Original Aircraft Name: Original Engine Name:

4.2.2 Aircraft & Engines Emission Factor(s)

- Aircraft & Engine Emissions Factors (lb/1000lb fuel)

	Fuel Flow	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	CO ₂ e
Idle	390.00	39.45	1.07	2.10	106.70	8.13	7.32	3234
Approach	920.00	2.19	1.07	5.70	16.30	6.21	5.59	3234
Intermediate	460.00	23.35	1.07	2.60	78.00	8.93	8.04	3234
Military	2710.00	0.12	1.07	10.70	2.20	2.66	2.39	3234
After Burn	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3234

4.3 Flight Operations

4.3.1 Flight Operations Assumptions

- Flight Operations			
Number of Aircraft:		64	
Flight Operation Cycle Type: LTO (Landing and Ta			
Number of Annual Flight Operation Cycles for all Aircraft:			
Number of Annual Trim Test(s) per Aircr	aft:	1	
- Default Settings Used: No			
- Flight Operations TIMs (Time In Mode)			
Taxi [Idle] (mins):	46.33		
Approach [Approach] (mins):	5.46		
Climb Out [Intermediate] (mins):	0.96		
Takeoff [Military] (mins):	1.33		
Takeoff [After Burn] (mins):	0		

Per the Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Mobile Sources, the defaults values for military aircraft equipped with after burner for takeoff is 50% military power and 50% afterburner. (Exception made for F-35 where KARNES 3.2 flight profile was used)

- Trim Test	
Idle (mins):	10.95
Approach (mins):	0
Intermediate (mins):	0
Military (mins):	15
AfterBurn (mins):	0

4.3.2 Flight Operations Formula(s)

- Aircraft Emissions per Mode for Flight Operation Cycles per Year

 $AEM_{POL} = (TIM / 60) * (FC / 1000) * EF * NE * FOC / 2000$

AEM_{POL}: Aircraft Emissions per Pollutant & Mode (TONs)
TIM: Time in Mode (min)
60: Conversion Factor minutes to hours
FC: Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr)
1000: Conversion Factor pounds to 1000pounds
EF: Emission Factor (lb/1000lb fuel)
NE: Number of Engines
FOC: Number of Flight Operation Cycles (for all aircraft)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to TONs

- Aircraft Emissions for Flight Operation Cycles per Year

 $AE_{FOC} = AEM_{IDLE_IN} + AEM_{IDLE_OUT} + AEM_{APPROACH} + AEM_{CLIMBOUT} + AEM_{TAKEOFF}$

AE_{FOC}: Aircraft Emissions (TONs) AEM_{IDLE_IN}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle-In Mode (TONs) AEM_{IDLE_OUT}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle-Out Mode (TONs) AEM_{APPROACH}: Aircraft Emissions for Approach Mode (TONs) AEM_{CLIMBOUT}: Aircraft Emissions for Climb-Out Mode (TONs) AEM_{TAKEOFF}: Aircraft Emissions for Take-Off Mode (TONs)

- Aircraft Emissions per Mode for Trim per Year AEPS_{POL} = (TD / 60) * (FC / 1000) * EF * NE * NA * NTT / 2000

AEPS_{POL}: Aircraft Emissions per Pollutant & Power Setting (TONs)
TD: Test Duration (min)
60: Conversion Factor minutes to hours
FC: Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr)
1000: Conversion Factor pounds to 1000pounds
EF: Emission Factor (lb/1000lb fuel)
NE: Number of Engines
NA: Number of Aircraft
NTT: Number of Trim Test
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to TONs

- Aircraft Emissions for Trim per Year

 $AE_{TRIM} = AEPS_{IDLE} + AEPS_{APPROACH} + AEPS_{INTERMEDIATE} + AEPS_{MILITARY} + AEPS_{AFTERBURN}$

AE_{TRIM}: Aircraft Emissions (TONs) AEPS_{IDLE}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{APPROACH}: Aircraft Emissions for Approach Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{INTERMEDIATE}: Aircraft Emissions for Intermediate Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{MILITARY}: Aircraft Emissions for Military Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{AFTERBURN}: Aircraft Emissions for After Burner Power Setting (TONs)

4.4 Auxiliary Power Unit (APU)

4.4.1 Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) Assumptions

- Default Settings Used: No

- Auxiliary Power Unit (APU)

Number of APU per Aircraft	Operation Hours for Each LTO	Exempt Source?	Designation	Manufacturer
64	1	No	GTCP 36-50	

4.4.2 Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) Emission Factor(s)

- Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) Emission Factor (lb/hr)

Designation	Fuel Flow	VOC	SOx	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CO ₂ e
GTCP 36-50	272.6	0.493	0.289	1.216	3.759	0.131	0.037	910.8

4.4.3 Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) Formula(s)

- Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) Emissions per Year

 $APU_{POL} = APU * OH * LTO * EF_{POL} / 2000$

APU_{POL}: Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) Emissions per Pollutant (TONs)
APU: Number of Auxiliary Power Units
OH: Operation Hours for Each LTO (hour)
LTO: Number of LTOs
EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (lb/hr)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

4.5 Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE)

4.5.1 Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) Assumptions

- Default Settings Used: Yes

- AGE Usage

Number of Annual LTO (Landing and Take-off) cycles for AGE: 266

- Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) (default)

Total Number of	Operation Hours	Exempt	AGE Type	Designation
AGE	for Each LTO	Source?		
1	2	No	Air Compressor	MC-1A - 18.4hp
1	8	No	Bomb Lift	MJ-1B
1	1	No	Generator Set	A/M32A-86D
1	2	No	Heater	H1
1	2	No	Hydraulic Test Stand	MJ-2A
1	2	No	Light Cart	NF-2
1	1	No	Start Cart	A/M32A-60A

4.5.2 Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) Emission Factor(s)

Terospuce Ground Equipment (TGE) Emission Fuetor (10/m)									
Designation	Fuel Flow	VOC	SOx	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CO ₂ e	
MC-1A - 18.4hp	1.1	0.267	0.008	0.419	0.267	0.071	0.068	24.8	
MJ-1B	0.0	3.040	0.219	4.780	3.040	0.800	0.776	141.2	
A/M32A-86D	6.5	0.294	0.046	6.102	0.457	0.091	0.089	147.0	
H1	0.4	0.100	0.011	0.160	0.180	0.006	0.006	8.9	
MJ-2A	0.0	0.190	0.238	3.850	2.460	0.083	0.076	172.0	
NF-2	0.0	0.010	0.043	0.110	0.080	0.010	0.010	22.1	
A/M32A-60A	0.0	0.270	0.306	1.820	5.480	0.211	0.205	221.1	

- Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) Emission Factor (lb/hr)

4.5.3 Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) Formula(s)

- Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) Emissions per Year

 $AGE_{POL} = AGE * OH * LTO * EF_{POL} / 2000$

AGE_{POL}: Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) Emissions per Pollutant (TONs) AGE: Total Number of Aerospace Ground Equipment OH: Operation Hours for Each LTO (hour) LTO: Number of LTOs EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (lb/hr) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

5. Aircraft

5.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

- Add or Remove Activity from Baseline? Add
- Activity Location County: Pima Regulatory Area(s): Rillito, AZ
- Activity Title: Cessna 182 operations

- Activity Description:

Operations from the beddown of the Civil Air Patrol Cessna 182, which would provide better training and increase operations missions that the CAP conducts in support of the Air Force. The MQ-9, with the TPE331 engine was used as a surrogate. Default ACAM settings for engine maintenance, APU and AGE were used for the aircraft ops.

- Activity Start Date

Start Month:	1
Start Year:	2025

- Activity End Date

Indefinite:	Yes
End Month:	N/A
End Year:	N/A

- Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	0.924816
SO _x	0.029266
NO _x	0.218665
CO	0.689404
PM 10	0.061997

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.055743
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO ₂ e	88.5

- Activity Emissions [Flight Operations (includes Trim Test & APU) part]:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)	Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	0.924816	PM 2.5	0.055743
SO _x	0.029266	Pb	0.000000
NO _x	0.218665	NH ₃	0.000000
CO	0.689404	CO ₂ e	88.5
PM 10	0.061997		

5.2 Aircraft & Engines

5.2.1 Aircraft & Engines Assumptions

- Aircraft & Engine	
Aircraft Designation:	MQ-9
Engine Model:	TPE-331
Primary Function:	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle
Aircraft has After burn:	No
Number of Engines:	1

- Aircraft & Engine Surrogate Is Aircraft & Engine a Surrogate? No Original Aircraft Name: Original Engine Name:

5.2.2 Aircraft & Engines Emission Factor(s)

- Aircraft & Engine Emissions Factors (lb/1000lb fuel)

	Fuel Flow	VOC	SOx	NO _x	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	CO ₂ e
Idle	112.00	90.97	1.07	2.86	61.52	2.68	2.41	3234
Approach	250.00	0.74	1.07	9.92	6.96	2.40	2.16	3234
Intermediate	409.00	0.17	1.07	11.86	0.98	1.47	1.32	3234

Military	458.00	0.13	1.07	12.36	0.76	1.75	1.57	3234
After Burn	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3234

5.3 Flight Operations

5.3.1 Flight Operations Assumptions

- Flight Operations		
Number of Aircraft:		2
Flight Operation Cycle Type:	LTO (Landing and Takeoff)	
Number of Annual Flight Operation Cycles	for all Aircraft:	720
Number of Annual Trim Test(s) per Aircraf	ť:	12

- Default Settings Used: No

- Flight Operations TIMs (Time In Mode)	
Taxi [Idle] (mins):	14.6
Approach [Approach] (mins):	5.05
Climb Out [Intermediate] (mins):	1.22
Takeoff [Military] (mins):	1.28
Takeoff [After Burn] (mins):	0

Per the Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Mobile Sources, the defaults values for military aircraft equipped with after burner for takeoff is 50% military power and 50% afterburner. (Exception made for F-35 where KARNES 3.2 flight profile was used)

- Trim Test

Idle (mins):	12
Approach (mins):	27
Intermediate (mins):	9
Military (mins):	12
AfterBurn (mins):	0

5.3.2 Flight Operations Formula(s)

- Aircraft Emissions per Mode for Flight Operation Cycles per Year $AEM_{POL} = (TIM / 60) * (FC / 1000) * EF * NE * FOC / 2000$

AEM_{POL}: Aircraft Emissions per Pollutant & Mode (TONs)
TIM: Time in Mode (min)
60: Conversion Factor minutes to hours
FC: Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr)
1000: Conversion Factor pounds to 1000pounds
EF: Emission Factor (lb/1000lb fuel)
NE: Number of Engines
FOC: Number of Flight Operation Cycles (for all aircraft)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to TONs

- Aircraft Emissions for Flight Operation Cycles per Year

 $AE_{FOC} = AEM_{IDLE IN} + AEM_{IDLE OUT} + AEM_{APPROACH} + AEM_{CLIMBOUT} + AEM_{TAKEOFF}$

AE_{FOC}: Aircraft Emissions (TONs) AEM_{IDLE_IN}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle-In Mode (TONs) AEM_{IDLE_OUT}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle-Out Mode (TONs) AEM_{APPROACH}: Aircraft Emissions for Approach Mode (TONs)

AEM_{CLIMBOUT}: Aircraft Emissions for Climb-Out Mode (TONs) AEM_{TAKEOFF}: Aircraft Emissions for Take-Off Mode (TONs)

- Aircraft Emissions per Mode for Trim per Year

AEPS_{POL} = (TD / 60) * (FC / 1000) * EF * NE * NA * NTT / 2000

AEPS_{POL}: Aircraft Emissions per Pollutant & Power Setting (TONs)
TD: Test Duration (min)
60: Conversion Factor minutes to hours
FC: Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr)
1000: Conversion Factor pounds to 1000pounds
EF: Emission Factor (lb/1000lb fuel)
NE: Number of Engines
NA: Number of Aircraft
NTT: Number of Trim Test
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to TONs

- Aircraft Emissions for Trim per Year

 $AE_{TRIM} = AEPS_{IDLE} + AEPS_{APPROACH} + AEPS_{INTERMEDIATE} + AEPS_{MILITARY} + AEPS_{AFTERBURN}$

AE_{TRIM}: Aircraft Emissions (TONs) AEPS_{IDLE}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{APPROACH}: Aircraft Emissions for Approach Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{INTERMEDIATE}: Aircraft Emissions for Intermediate Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{MILITARY}: Aircraft Emissions for Military Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{AFTERBURN}: Aircraft Emissions for After Burner Power Setting (TONs)

5.4 Auxiliary Power Unit (APU)

5.4.1 Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) Assumptions

- Default Settings Used: Yes

- Auxiliary	Power	Unit ((APU)) ((default)	۱
Truamar y	10000	Unit,	(1 M C)		uciauit	,

Number of APU	Operation Hours	Exempt	Designation	Manufacturer
per Aircraft	for Each LTO	Source?		

5.4.2 Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) Emission Factor(s)

- Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) Emission Factor (lb/hr)								
Designation	Fuel Flow	VOC	SOx	NOx	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CO ₂ e

5.4.3 Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) Formula(s)

- Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) Emissions per Year

 $APU_{POL} = APU * OH * LTO * EF_{POL} / 2000$

APU_{POL}: Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) Emissions per Pollutant (TONs)
APU: Number of Auxiliary Power Units
OH: Operation Hours for Each LTO (hour)
LTO: Number of LTOs
EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (lb/hr)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

5.5 Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE)

5.5.1 Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) Assumptions

- Default Settings Used: Yes

- AGE Usage

Number of Annual LTO (Landing and Take-off) cycles for AGE: 720

- Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) (default)

Total Number of	Operation Hours	Exempt	AGE Type	Designation
AGE	for Each LTO	Source?		

5.5.2 Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) Emission Factor(s)

 - Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) Emission Factor (lb/hr)

 Designation
 Fuel Flow
 VOC
 SOx
 NOx
 CO
 PM 10
 PM 2.5
 CO2e

5.5.3 Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) Formula(s)

- Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) Emissions per Year

 $AGE_{POL} = AGE * OH * LTO * EF_{POL} / 2000$

AGE_{POL}: Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) Emissions per Pollutant (TONs) AGE: Total Number of Aerospace Ground Equipment OH: Operation Hours for Each LTO (hour) LTO: Number of LTOs EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (lb/hr) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

6. Aircraft

6.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

- Add or Remove Activity from Baseline? Add
- Activity Location County: Pima Regulatory Area(s): Rillito, AZ
- Activity Title: RC-26B Operations
- Activity Description:

The RC-26B would be relocated to D-M AFB to create space for an impending large-scale increase in international F-16 training at Morris ANGB.

- Activity Start Date Start Month: 1 Start Year: 2025
- Activity End Date

Indefinite:	Yes
End Month:	N/A
End Year:	N/A
- Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	4.262221
SO _x	0.718088
NO _x	32.279356
СО	7.694320
PM 10	0.903198

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.863924
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO ₂ e	1162.0

- Activity Emissions [Flight Operations (includes Trim Test & APU) part]:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	1.819341
SO _x	0.047735
NO _x	0.333262
CO	1.308853
PM 10	0.101281

& AI UJ partj.	
Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.091057
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO ₂ e	144.3

6.2 Aircraft & Engines

6.2.1 Aircraft & Engines Assumptions

- Aircraft & Engine	
Aircraft Designation:	C-26B
Engine Model:	TPE331-12UA-701G
Primary Function:	General - Turboprop
Aircraft has After burn:	No
Number of Engines:	2

- Aircraft & Engine Surrogate Is Aircraft & Engine a Surrogate? No Original Aircraft Name: Original Engine Name:

6.2.2 Aircraft & Engines Emission Factor(s)

- Aircraft & Engine Emissions Factors (lb/1000lb fuel)

	Fuel Flow	VOC	SOx	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CO ₂ e
Idle	112.00	90.97	1.07	2.86	61.52	2.68	2.41	3234
Approach	250.00	0.74	1.07	9.92	6.96	2.40	2.16	3234
Intermediate	409.00	0.17	1.07	11.86	0.98	1.47	1.32	3234
Military	458.00	0.13	1.07	12.36	0.76	1.75	1.57	3234
After Burn	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3234

6.3 Flight Operations

6.3.1 Flight Operations Assumptions

- Flight Operations		
Number of Aircraft:		1
Flight Operation Cycle Type:	LTO (Landing and Takeoff)	
Number of Annual Flight Operation Cycles	for all Aircraft:	720
Number of Annual Trim Test(s) per Aircraf	ft:	12

- Default Settings Used: No

Flight Operations TIMs (Time In Mode)	
Taxi [Idle] (mins):	14.6
Approach [Approach] (mins):	3.03
Climb Out [Intermediate] (mins):	1.36
Takeoff [Military] (mins):	1.05
Takeoff [After Burn] (mins):	0

Per the Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Mobile Sources, the defaults values for military aircraft equipped with after burner for takeoff is 50% military power and 50% afterburner. (Exception made for F-35 where KARNES 3.2 flight profile was used)

Trim Test	
Idle (mins):	12
Approach (mins):	27
Intermediate (mins):	9
Military (mins):	12
AfterBurn (mins):	0

6.3.2 Flight Operations Formula(s)

- Aircraft Emissions per Mode for Flight Operation Cycles per Year AEM_{POL} = (TIM / 60) * (FC / 1000) * EF * NE * FOC / 2000

AEM_{POL}: Aircraft Emissions per Pollutant & Mode (TONs)
TIM: Time in Mode (min)
60: Conversion Factor minutes to hours
FC: Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr)
1000: Conversion Factor pounds to 1000pounds
EF: Emission Factor (lb/1000lb fuel)
NE: Number of Engines
FOC: Number of Flight Operation Cycles (for all aircraft)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to TONs

- Aircraft Emissions for Flight Operation Cycles per Year

 $AE_{FOC} = AEM_{IDLE_{IN}} + AEM_{IDLE_{OUT}} + AEM_{APPROACH} + AEM_{CLIMBOUT} + AEM_{TAKEOFF}$

AE_{FOC}: Aircraft Emissions (TONs) AEM_{IDLE_IN}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle-In Mode (TONs) AEM_{IDLE_OUT}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle-Out Mode (TONs) AEM_{APPROACH}: Aircraft Emissions for Approach Mode (TONs) AEM_{CLIMBOUT}: Aircraft Emissions for Climb-Out Mode (TONs) AEM_{TAKEOFF}: Aircraft Emissions for Take-Off Mode (TONs)

- Aircraft Emissions per Mode for Trim per Year

 $AEPS_{POL} = (TD / 60) * (FC / 1000) * EF * NE * NA * NTT / 2000$

AEPS_{POL}: Aircraft Emissions per Pollutant & Power Setting (TONs)
TD: Test Duration (min)
60: Conversion Factor minutes to hours
FC: Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr)
1000: Conversion Factor pounds to 1000pounds
EF: Emission Factor (lb/1000lb fuel)
NE: Number of Engines
NA: Number of Aircraft

NTT: Number of Trim Test

2000: Conversion Factor pounds to TONs

- Aircraft Emissions for Trim per Year

 $AE_{TRIM} = AEPS_{IDLE} + AEPS_{APPROACH} + AEPS_{INTERMEDIATE} + AEPS_{MILITARY} + AEPS_{AFTERBURN}$

AE_{TRIM}: Aircraft Emissions (TONs) AEPS_{IDLE}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{APPROACH}: Aircraft Emissions for Approach Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{INTERMEDIATE}: Aircraft Emissions for Intermediate Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{MILITARY}: Aircraft Emissions for Military Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{AFTERBURN}: Aircraft Emissions for After Burner Power Setting (TONs)

6.4 Auxiliary Power Unit (APU)

6.4.1 Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) Assumptions

- Default Settings Used: Yes

- Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) (default)

, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i				
Number of APU	Operation Hours	Exempt	Designation	Manufacturer
per Aircraft	for Each LTO	Source?		

6.4.2 Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) Emission Factor(s)

- Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) Emission Factor (lb/hr)								
Designation	Fuel Flow	VOC	SOx	NOx	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CO ₂ e

6.4.3 Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) Formula(s)

- Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) Emissions per Year

 $APU_{POL} = APU * OH * LTO * EF_{POL} / 2000$

APU_{POL}: Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) Emissions per Pollutant (TONs)
APU: Number of Auxiliary Power Units
OH: Operation Hours for Each LTO (hour)
LTO: Number of LTOs
EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (lb/hr)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

6.5 Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE)

6.5.1 Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) Assumptions

- Default Settings Used: Yes

- AGE Usage

Number of Annual LTO (Landing and Take-off) cycles for AGE: 720

- Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) (default)

Total Number of AGE	Operation Hours for Each LTO	Exempt Source?	AGE Type	Designation
1	10	No	Air Compressor	MC-1A - 18.4hp
1	1	No	Air Conditioner	MA-3D - 120hp

1	11	No	Generator Set	A/M32A-86D
1	1	No	Heater	H1
1	3	No	Hydraulic Test Stand	MJ-2A
1	10	No	Light Cart	NF-2
1	0.25	No	Start Cart	A/M32A-60A

6.5.2 Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) Emission Factor(s)

Actospace Ground Equipment (AGE) Emission Factor (10/m)								
Designation	Fuel Flow	VOC	SOx	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CO ₂ e
MC-1A - 18.4hp	1.1	0.267	0.008	0.419	0.267	0.071	0.068	24.8
MA-3D - 120hp	7.1	0.053	0.050	4.167	0.317	0.109	0.105	161.7
A/M32A-86D	6.5	0.294	0.046	6.102	0.457	0.091	0.089	147.0
H1	0.4	0.100	0.011	0.160	0.180	0.006	0.006	8.9
MJ-2A	0.0	0.190	0.238	3.850	2.460	0.083	0.076	172.0
NF-2	0.0	0.010	0.043	0.110	0.080	0.010	0.010	22.1
A/M32A-60A	0.0	0.270	0.306	1.820	5.480	0.211	0.205	221.1

- Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) Emission Factor (lb/hr)

6.5.3 Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) Formula(s)

- Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) Emissions per Year

 $AGE_{POL} = AGE * OH * LTO * EF_{POL} / 2000$

AGE_{POL}: Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) Emissions per Pollutant (TONs) AGE: Total Number of Aerospace Ground Equipment OH: Operation Hours for Each LTO (hour) LTO: Number of LTOs EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (lb/hr) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

7. Aircraft

7.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

- Add or Remove Activity from Baseline? Add
- Activity Location County: Pima Regulatory Area(s): NOT IN A REGULATORY AREA

- Activity Title: RC-26B jet engine test cell activities

- Activity Description:

Default ACAM settings for RC-26B jet engine test cell activities for 1 aircraft - stationary source operations.

- Activity Start Date Start Month: 1 Start Year: 2025
- Activity End Date

Indefinite:	Yes
End Month:	N/A
End Year:	N/A

- Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	0.025713
SO _x	0.003696
NO _x	0.036478
CO	0.027489
PM 10	0.006966

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.006261
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO ₂ e	11.2

7.2 Aircraft & Engines

7.2.1 Aircraft & Engines Assumptions

- Aircraft & Engine	
Aircraft Designation:	C-26B
Engine Model:	TPE331-12UA-701G
Primary Function:	General - Turboprop
Aircraft has After burn:	No
Number of Engines:	2
-	

- Aircraft & Engine Surrogate Is Aircraft & Engine a Surrogate? No Original Aircraft Name: Original Engine Name:

7.2.2 Aircraft & Engines Emission Factor(s)

- Aircraft & Engine Emissions Factors (lb/1000lb fuel)

	Fuel Flow	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CO ₂ e
Idle	112.00	90.97	1.07	2.86	61.52	2.68	2.41	3234
Approach	250.00	0.74	1.07	9.92	6.96	2.40	2.16	3234
Intermediate	409.00	0.17	1.07	11.86	0.98	1.47	1.32	3234
Military	458.00	0.13	1.07	12.36	0.76	1.75	1.57	3234
After Burn	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3234

7.3 Aircraft Engine Test Cell

7.3.1 Aircraft Engine Test Cell Assumptions

- Engine Test Cell Total Number of Aircraft Engines Tested Annually: 2
- Default Settings Used: Yes

- Annual Run-ups / Test Durations	
Annual Run-ups (Per Aircraft Engine):	12 (default)
Idle Duration (mins):	12 (default)
Approach Duration (mins):	27 (default)
Intermediate Duration (mins):	9 (default)
Military Duration (mins):	12 (default)
After Burner Duration (mins):	0 (default)

7.3.2 Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emission Factor(s)

- See Aircraft & Engines Emission Factor(s)

7.3.3 Aircraft Engine Test Cell Formula(s)

- Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emissions per Pollutant & Power Setting (TONs) TestCellPS_{POL} = (TD / 60) * (FC / 1000) * EF * NE * ARU / 2000

TestCellPS_{POL}: Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emissions per Pollutant & Power Setting (TONs) TD: Test Duration (min) 60: Conversion Factor minutes to hours FC: Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr) 1000: Conversion Factor pounds to 1000pounds EF: Emission Factor (lb/1000lb fuel) NE: Total Number of Engines (For All Aircraft) ARU: Annual Run-ups (Per Aircraft Engine) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to TONs

- Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emissions per Year

 $TestCellPS_{IDLE} + TestCellPS_{APPROACH} + TestCellPS_{INTERMEDIATE} + TestCellPS_{MILITARY} + TestCellPS_{AFTERBURN}$

TestCell: Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emissions (TONs) TestCellPS_{IDLE}: Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emissions for Idle Power Setting (TONs) TestCellPS_{APPROACH}: Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emissions for Approach Power Setting (TONs) TestCellPS_{INTERMEDIATE}: Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emissions for Intermediate Power Setting (TONs) TestCellPS_{MILITARY}: Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emissions for Military Power Setting (TONs) TestCellPS_{AFTERBURN}: Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emissions for After Burner Power Setting (TONs)

8. Personnel

8.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

- Add or Remove Activity from Baseline? Add

- Activity Location County: Pima Regulatory Area(s): Rillito, AZ

- Activity Title: Additional Personnel
- Activity Description:

Proposed action would result in an overall increase of 646 personnel.

- Activity Start Date Start Month: 1 Start Year: 2025

- Activity End Date

Indefinite:	Yes
End Month:	N/A
End Year:	N/A

- Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	0.399804
SO _x	0.002300
NO _x	0.225239
CO	5.247089
PM 10	0.007034

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.006448
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.036463
CO ₂ e	520.0

8.2 Personnel Assumptions

- Number of Personnel	
Active Duty Personnel:	95
Civilian Personnel:	62
Support Contractor Personnel:	0
Air National Guard (ANG) Personnel:	0
Reserve Personnel:	489
- Default Settings Used: Yes	

- Average Personnel Round Trip Commute (mile): 20 (default)

- Personnel Work Schedule	
Active Duty Personnel:	5 Days Per Week (default)
Civilian Personnel:	5 Days Per Week (default)
Support Contractor Personnel:	5 Days Per Week (default)
Air National Guard (ANG) Personnel:	4 Days Per Week (default)
Reserve Personnel:	4 Days Per Month (default)

8.3 Personnel On Road Vehicle Mixture

- On Road Vehicle Mixture (%)

On Roud Venicle Mixed C (70)							
	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	37.55	60.32	0	0.03	0.2	0	1.9
GOVs	54.49	37.73	4.67	0	0	3.11	0

8.4 Personnel Emission Factor(s)

- On Road Vehicle Emission Factors (grams/mile)

	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	Pb	NH ₃	CO ₂ e
LDGV	000.221	000.001	000.100	003.291	000.004	000.003		000.024	00309.498
LDGT	000.230	000.002	000.178	003.679	000.005	000.005		000.026	00401.828
HDGV	000.960	000.004	000.856	014.076	000.024	000.021		000.051	00923.477
LDDV	000.058	000.001	000.086	003.577	000.003	000.002		000.008	00314.547
LDDT	000.064	000.001	000.129	002.423	000.003	000.003		000.008	00365.414
HDDV	000.101	000.004	002.540	001.568	000.042	000.039		000.032	01254.683
MC	003.166	000.002	000.720	012.654	000.023	000.021		000.053	00388.847

8.5 Personnel Formula(s)

- Personnel Vehicle Miles Travel for Work Days per Year $VMT_P = NP \mbox{ * } WD \mbox{ * } AC$

VMT_P: Personnel Vehicle Miles Travel (miles/year) NP: Number of Personnel WD: Work Days per Year

AC: Average Commute (miles)

- Total Vehicle Miles Travel per Year

 $VMT_{Total} = VMT_{AD} + VMT_{C} + VMT_{SC} + VMT_{ANG} + VMT_{AFRC}$

VMT_{Total}: Total Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
VMT_{AD}: Active Duty Personnel Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
VMT_C: Civilian Personnel Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
VMT_{SC}: Support Contractor Personnel Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
VMT_{ANG}: Air National Guard Personnel Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
VMT_{AFRC}: Reserve Personnel Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)

- Vehicle Emissions per Year

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{Total} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$

 V_{POL} : Vehicle Emissions (TONs) VMT_{Total}: Total Vehicle Miles Travel (miles) 0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds EF_{POL}: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile) VM: Personnel On Road Vehicle Mixture (%) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

9. Aircraft

9.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

- Add or Remove Activity from Baseline? Add
- Activity Location County: Pima Regulatory Area(s): Rillito, AZ
- Activity Title: Additional A-10C Closed Pattern Ops at Davis-Monthan AFB

- Activity Description: Additional A-10C Closed Pattern Ops at Davis-Monthan AFB

- Activity Start Date Start Month: 1

Start Year: 2025

- Activity End Date

Indefinite:	Yes
End Month:	N/A
End Year:	N/A

- Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	0.005295
SO _x	0.001341
NO _x	0.009113
СО	0.023843
PM 10	0.006474

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.005825
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO ₂ e	4.1

- Activity Emissions [Test Cell part]:					
Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)				
VOC	0.000000				
SO _x	0.000000				
NO _x	0.000000				
СО	0.000000				
PM 10	0.000000				

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.000000
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO ₂ e	0.0

9.2 Aircraft & Engines

9.2.1 Aircraft & Engines Assumptions

- Aircraft & Engine	
Aircraft Designation:	A-10C
Engine Model:	TF34-GE-100
Primary Function:	Combat
Aircraft has After burn:	No
Number of Engines:	2
5	

- Aircraft & Engine Surrogate Is Aircraft & Engine a Surrogate? No Original Aircraft Name: Original Engine Name:

9.2.2 Aircraft & Engines Emission Factor(s)

- Aircraft & Engine Emissions Factors (lb/1000lb fuel)

The cruit & Englite Emissions Fuctors (10/100010 fuct)								
	Fuel Flow	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CO ₂ e
Idle	390.00	39.45	1.07	2.10	106.70	8.13	7.32	3234
Approach	920.00	2.19	1.07	5.70	16.30	6.21	5.59	3234
Intermediate	460.00	23.35	1.07	2.60	78.00	8.93	8.04	3234
Military	2710.00	0.12	1.07	10.70	2.20	2.66	2.39	3234
After Burn	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3234

9.3 Flight Operations

9.3.1 Flight Operations Assumptions

- Flight Operations		
Number of Aircraft:		64
Flight Operation Cycle Type:	CP (Close Pattern)	
Number of Annual Flight Operation Cy	cles for all Aircraft:	23
Number of Annual Trim Test(s) per Air	·craft:	0

- Default Settings Used: No

- Flight Operations TIMs (Time In Mode)	
Taxi [Idle] (mins):	0
Approach [Approach] (mins):	1.66
Climb Out [Intermediate] (mins):	0.96
Takeoff [Military] (mins):	0.48
Takeoff [After Burn] (mins):	0

Per the Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Mobile Sources, the defaults values for military aircraft equipped with after burner for takeoff is 50% military power and 50% afterburner. (Exception made for F-35 where KARNES 3.2 flight profile was used)

- Trim Test Idle (mins): Approach (mins): 0 Intermediate (mins): 0 Military (mins): 0 AfterBurn (mins):

9.3.2 Flight Operations Formula(s)

- Aircraft Emissions per Mode for Flight Operation Cycles per Year $AEM_{POL} = (TIM / 60) * (FC / 1000) * EF * NE * FOC / 2000$

0

0

AEM_{POL}: Aircraft Emissions per Pollutant & Mode (TONs) TIM: Time in Mode (min) 60: Conversion Factor minutes to hours FC: Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr) 1000: Conversion Factor pounds to 1000pounds EF: Emission Factor (lb/1000lb fuel) NE: Number of Engines FOC: Number of Flight Operation Cycles (for all aircraft) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to TONs

- Aircraft Emissions for Flight Operation Cycles per Year

 $AE_{FOC} = AEM_{IDLE IN} + AEM_{IDLE OUT} + AEM_{APPROACH} + AEM_{CLIMBOUT} + AEM_{TAKEOFF}$

AE_{FOC}: Aircraft Emissions (TONs) AEMIDLE IN: Aircraft Emissions for Idle-In Mode (TONs) AEMIDLE OUT: Aircraft Emissions for Idle-Out Mode (TONs) AEMAPPROACH: Aircraft Emissions for Approach Mode (TONs) AEM_{CLIMBOUT}: Aircraft Emissions for Climb-Out Mode (TONs) AEM_{TAKEOFF}: Aircraft Emissions for Take-Off Mode (TONs)

- Aircraft Emissions per Mode for Trim per Year

 $AEPS_{POL} = (TD / 60) * (FC / 1000) * EF * NE * NA * NTT / 2000$

AEPS_{POL}: Aircraft Emissions per Pollutant & Power Setting (TONs) TD: Test Duration (min) 60: Conversion Factor minutes to hours FC: Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr) 1000: Conversion Factor pounds to 1000pounds EF: Emission Factor (lb/1000lb fuel) NE: Number of Engines NA: Number of Aircraft NTT: Number of Trim Test 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to TONs

- Aircraft Emissions for Trim per Year

 $AE_{TRIM} = AEPS_{IDLE} + AEPS_{APPROACH} + AEPS_{INTERMEDIATE} + AEPS_{MILITARY} + AEPS_{AFTERBURN}$

AE_{TRIM}: Aircraft Emissions (TONs) AEPS_{IDLE}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle Power Setting (TONs)

AEPS_{APPROACH}: Aircraft Emissions for Approach Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{INTERMEDIATE}: Aircraft Emissions for Intermediate Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{MILITARY}: Aircraft Emissions for Military Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{AFTERBURN}: Aircraft Emissions for After Burner Power Setting (TONs)

10. Aircraft

10.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

- Add or Remove Activity from Baseline? Add
- Activity Location County: Pima Regulatory Area(s): Rillito, AZ
- Activity Title: Additional A-10C Jet Engine Test Cell Activities

- Activity Description:

Additional Jet Engine Test Cell Activities - Stationary Source

- Activity Start Date

Start Month:	1
Start Year:	2025

- Activity End Date

Indefinite:	Yes
End Month:	N/A
End Year:	N/A

- Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	0.332242
SO _x	0.089956
NO _x	0.829117
CO	1.040920
PM 10	0.268434

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.241312
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO ₂ e	271.9

10.2 Aircraft & Engines

10.2.1 Aircraft & Engines Assumptions

Aircraft & Engine	
Aircraft Designation:	A-10C
Engine Model:	TF34-GE-100
Primary Function:	Combat
Aircraft has After burn:	No
Number of Engines:	2

- Aircraft & Engine Surrogate	
Is Aircraft & Engine a Surrogate?	No
Original Aircraft Name:	
Original Engine Name:	

10.2.2 Aircraft & Engines Emission Factor(s)

			(
	Fuel Flow	VOC	SOx	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CO ₂ e
Idle	390.00	39.45	1.07	2.10	106.70	8.13	7.32	3234
Approach	920.00	2.19	1.07	5.70	16.30	6.21	5.59	3234
Intermediate	460.00	23.35	1.07	2.60	78.00	8.93	8.04	3234
Military	2710.00	0.12	1.07	10.70	2.20	2.66	2.39	3234
After Burn	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3234

- Aircraft & Engine Emissions Factors (lb/1000lb fuel)

10.3 Aircraft Engine Test Cell

10.3.1 Aircraft Engine Test Cell Assumptions

- Engine Test Cell Total Number of Aircraft Engines Tested Annually: 128

- Default Settings Used: Yes

Annual Run-ups / Test Durations	
Annual Run-ups (Per Aircraft Engine):	1 (default)
Idle Duration (mins):	19.69 (default)
Approach Duration (mins):	0 (default)
Intermediate Duration (mins):	0 (default)
Military Duration (mins):	26.25 (default)
After Burner Duration (mins):	0 (default)

10.3.2 Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emission Factor(s)

- See Aircraft & Engines Emission Factor(s)

10.3.3 Aircraft Engine Test Cell Formula(s)

- Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emissions per Pollutant & Power Setting (TONs)

TestCellPS_{POL} = (TD / 60) * (FC / 1000) * EF * NE * ARU / 2000

TestCellPS_{POL}: Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emissions per Pollutant & Power Setting (TONs) TD: Test Duration (min) 60: Conversion Factor minutes to hours FC: Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr) 1000: Conversion Factor pounds to 1000pounds EF: Emission Factor (lb/1000lb fuel) NE: Total Number of Engines (For All Aircraft) ARU: Annual Run-ups (Per Aircraft Engine) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to TONs

- Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emissions per Year

 $TestCellPS_{IDLE} + TestCellPS_{APPROACH} + TestCellPS_{INTERMEDIATE} + TestCellPS_{MILITARY} + TestCellPS_{AFTERBURN}$

TestCell: Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emissions (TONs) TestCellPS_{IDLE}: Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emissions for Idle Power Setting (TONs) TestCellPS_{APPROACH}: Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emissions for Approach Power Setting (TONs) TestCellPS_{INTERMEDIATE}: Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emissions for Intermediate Power Setting (TONs) TestCellPS_{MILITARY}: Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emissions for Military Power Setting (TONs)

TestCellPS_{AFTERBURN}: Aircraft Engine Test Cell Emissions for After Burner Power Setting (TONs)

This Page Intentionally Blank

Fuzzy MOA ACAM ROCA and Detail Report

This Page Intentionally Blank

1. General Information: The Air Force's Air Conformity Applicability Model (ACAM) was used to perform an analysis to assess the potential air quality impact/s associated with the action in accordance with the Air Force Manual 32-7002, Environmental Compliance and Pollution Prevention; the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP, 32 CFR 989); and the General Conformity Rule (GCR, 40 CFR 93 Subpart B). This report provides a summary of the ACAM analysis.

a. Action Location:

Base: DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB State: Arizona County(s): Santa Cruz Regulatory Area(s): Nogales, AZ

b. Action Title: Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment, Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona

c. Project Number/s (if applicable):

d. Projected Action Start Date: 1 / 2025

e. Action Description:

The Tombstone, Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci and Ruby/Fuzzy Military Operations Areas (MOAs) are accessible for training within 125 miles of Davis-Monthan AFB. A-10C and HH-60 aircraft would fly to Fuzzy MOA to train. Additional low altitude (below 3000 ft AGL) flight for A-10C and HH-60 are analyzed.

f. Point of Contact:

Name:	Lesley Hamilton
Title:	Consultant
Organization:	Stantec GS
Email:	Lesley.Hamilton@cardno-gs.com
Phone Number:	

2. Analysis: Total combined direct and indirect emissions associated with the action were estimated through ACAM on a calendar-year basis for the "worst-case" and "steady state" (net gain/loss upon action fully implemented) emissions. General Conformity under the Clean Air Act, Section 1.76 has been evaluated for the action described above according to the requirements of 40 CFR 93, Subpart B.

Based on the analysis, the requirements of this rule are:

_____ applicable __X__ not applicable

Conformity Analysis Summary:

2026 - (Steady State)			
Pollutant	Action Emissions	GENERAL CONFORMITY	
	(ton/yr)	Threshold (ton/yr)	Exceedance (Yes or No)
Nogales, AZ			
VOC	0.01		
NOx	7.2		
СО	4.3		
SOx	0.7		
PM 10	2.8	100	No
PM 2.5	1.6	100	No

Pb	0.000	
NH3	0.000	
CO2e	1,963	

None of estimated emissions associated with this action are above the conformity threshold values established at 40 CFR 93.153 (b); Therefore, the requirements of the General Conformity Rule are not applicable.

Lesley Hamilton, Consultant

DATE

1. General Information

- Action Location

Base:DAVIS-MONTHAN AFBState:ArizonaCounty(s):Santa CruzRegulatory Area(s):Nogales, AZ

- Action Title: Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment, Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona
- Project Number/s (if applicable):
- Projected Action Start Date: 1 / 2025

- Action Purpose and Need:

The Air Force proposes to relocate a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller (JTAC) training, and Guardian Angel operations from Nellis AFB to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona in support of Nellis AFB increase in fighter aircraft. Twol other proposed actions at Davis-Monthan AFB unrelated to the movements described above that are occurring on approximately the same timelines and are therefore included in this analysis. These actions consist of assignment of two Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Cessna 182 aircraft and the transfer of one RC-26B aircraft from the Morris Air National Guard Base (ANGB) located at the Tucson International Airport (Arizona).

- Action Description:

The Tombstone, Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci and Ruby/Fuzzy Military Operations Areas (MOAs) are accessible for training within 125 miles of Davis-Monthan AFB. A-10C and HH-60 aircraft would fly to Fuzzy MOA to train. Additional low altitude (below 3000 ft AGL) flight for A-10C is analyzed.

- Point of Contact	
Name:	Lesley Hamilton
Title:	Consultant
Organization:	Stantec GS
Email:	Lesley.Hamilton@cardno-gs.com
Phone Number:	

- Activity List:

Activity Type		Activity Title		
2.	Aircraft	Low altitude A-10C sortie time in Fuzzy MOA		

Emission factors and air emission estimating methods come from the United States Air Force's Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Stationary Sources, Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Mobile Sources, and Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Transitory Sources.

2. Aircraft

2.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

- Add or Remove Activity from Baseline? Add
- Activity Location
 - County: Santa Cruz

Regulatory Area(s): Nogales, AZ

- Activity Title: Low altitude A-10C sortie time in Fuzzy MOA

- Activity Description:

Time spent at 3000 feet or below while training in Tombstone MOA

- Activity Start Date Start Month: 1

Start Year: 2025

- Activity End Date

Indefinite:	Yes
End Month:	N/A
End Year:	N/A

- Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	0.009561
SO _x	0.085251
NO _x	0.852512
CO	0.175283
PM 10	0.211933

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.190421
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO ₂ e	257.7

- Activity Emissions [Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) part]:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	0.000000
SO _x	0.000000
NO _x	0.000000
CO	0.000000
PM 10	0.000000

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.000000
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO ₂ e	0.0

2.2 Aircraft & Engines

2.2.1 Aircraft & Engines Assumptions

Aircraft & Engine	
Aircraft Designation:	A-10C
Engine Model:	TF34-GE-100
Primary Function:	Combat
Aircraft has After burn:	No
Number of Engines:	2

- Aircraft & Engine Surrogate Is Aircraft & Engine a Surrogate? No Original Aircraft Name: Original Engine Name:

2.2.2 Aircraft & Engines Emission Factor(s)

- Aircraft & Engine Emissions Factors (lb/1000lb fuel)

			(
	Fuel Flow	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CO ₂ e
Idle	390.00	39.45	1.07	2.10	106.70	8.13	7.32	3234
Approach	920.00	2.19	1.07	5.70	16.30	6.21	5.59	3234

Intermediate	460.00	23.35	1.07	2.60	78.00	8.93	8.04	3234
Military	2710.00	0.12	1.07	10.70	2.20	2.66	2.39	3234
After Burn	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3234

2.3 Flight Operations

2.3.1 Flight Operations Assumptions

- Flight Operations		
Number of Aircraft:		49
Flight Operation Cycle Type:	LFP (Low Flight Pattern)	
Number of Annual Flight Operation Cyc	les for all Aircraft:	49
Number of Annual Trim Test(s) per Airc	craft:	0

- Default Settings Used: No

- Flight Operations TIMs (Time In Mode)	
Taxi [Idle] (mins):	0
Approach [Approach] (mins):	0
Climb Out [Intermediate] (mins):	0
Takeoff [Military] (mins):	36
Takeoff [After Burn] (mins):	0

Per the Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Mobile Sources, the defaults values for military aircraft equipped with after burner for takeoff is 50% military power and 50% afterburner. (Exception made for F-35 where KARNES 3.2 flight profile was used)

- Trim Test

Idle (mins):	0
Approach (mins):	0
Intermediate (mins):	0
Military (mins):	0
AfterBurn (mins):	0

2.3.2 Flight Operations Formula(s)

- Aircraft Emissions per Mode for Flight Operation Cycles per Year $AEM_{POL} = (TIM / 60) * (FC / 1000) * EF * NE * FOC / 2000$

AEM_{POL}: Aircraft Emissions per Pollutant & Mode (TONs)
TIM: Time in Mode (min)
60: Conversion Factor minutes to hours
FC: Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr)
1000: Conversion Factor pounds to 1000pounds
EF: Emission Factor (lb/1000lb fuel)
NE: Number of Engines
FOC: Number of Flight Operation Cycles (for all aircraft)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to TONs

- Aircraft Emissions for Flight Operation Cycles per Year

 $AE_{FOC} = AEM_{IDLE_IN} + AEM_{IDLE_OUT} + AEM_{APPROACH} + AEM_{CLIMBOUT} + AEM_{TAKEOFF}$

AE_{FOC}: Aircraft Emissions (TONs) AEM_{IDLE_IN}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle-In Mode (TONs) AEM_{IDLE_OUT}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle-Out Mode (TONs)

AEM_{APPROACH}: Aircraft Emissions for Approach Mode (TONs) AEM_{CLIMBOUT}: Aircraft Emissions for Climb-Out Mode (TONs) AEM_{TAKEOFF}: Aircraft Emissions for Take-Off Mode (TONs)

- Aircraft Emissions per Mode for Trim per Year

AEPS_{POL} = (TD / 60) * (FC / 1000) * EF * NE * NA * NTT / 2000

AEPS_{POL}: Aircraft Emissions per Pollutant & Power Setting (TONs) TD: Test Duration (min) 60: Conversion Factor minutes to hours FC: Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr) 1000: Conversion Factor pounds to 1000pounds EF: Emission Factor (lb/1000lb fuel) NE: Number of Engines NA: Number of Aircraft NTT: Number of Trim Test 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to TONs

- Aircraft Emissions for Trim per Year

 $AE_{TRIM} = AEPS_{IDLE} + AEPS_{APPROACH} + AEPS_{INTERMEDIATE} + AEPS_{MILITARY} + AEPS_{AFTERBURN}$

AE_{TRIM}: Aircraft Emissions (TONs) AEPS_{IDLE}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{APPROACH}: Aircraft Emissions for Approach Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{INTERMEDIATE}: Aircraft Emissions for Intermediate Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{MILITARY}: Aircraft Emissions for Military Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{AFTERBURN}: Aircraft Emissions for After Burner Power Setting (TONs) Jackal Low MOA ACAM ROCA and Detail Report

This Page Intentionally Blank

1. General Information: The Air Force's Air Conformity Applicability Model (ACAM) was used to perform an analysis to assess the potential air quality impact/s associated with the action in accordance with the Air Force Manual 32-7002, Environmental Compliance and Pollution Prevention; the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP, 32 CFR 989); and the General Conformity Rule (GCR, 40 CFR 93 Subpart B). This report provides a summary of the ACAM analysis.

a. Action Location:

Base: DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB
State: Arizona
County(s): Graham; Pinal
Regulatory Area(s): West Central Pinal, AZ; Hayden (Pinal County), AZ; Hayden AZ; Miami, AZ;
Phoenix, AZ; San Manual (Pinal County), AZ; Phoenix-Mesa, AZ; West Pinal, AZ

b. Action Title: Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment, Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona

c. Project Number/s (if applicable):

d. Projected Action Start Date: 1 / 2025

e. Action Description:

The Tombstone, Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci and Ruby/Fuzzy Military Operations Areas (MOAs) are accessible for training within 125 miles of Davis-Monthan AFB. A-10C and HH-60 aircraft would fly to Jackal Low MOA to train. Low altitude (below 3000 ft AGL) flight for A-10C and HH-60 are analyzed.

f. Point of Contact:

Name:	Lesley Hamilton
Title:	Consultant
Organization:	Stantec GS
Email:	Lesley.Hamilton@cardno-gs.com
Phone Number:	

2. Analysis: Total combined direct and indirect emissions associated with the action were estimated through ACAM on a calendar-year basis for the "worst-case" and "steady state" (net gain/loss upon action fully implemented) emissions. General Conformity under the Clean Air Act, Section 1.76 has been evaluated for the action described above according to the requirements of 40 CFR 93, Subpart B.

Based on the analysis, the requirements of this rule are:

_____ applicable __X__ not applicable

Conformity Analysis Summary:

2026 - (Steady State)			
Pollutant	Action Emissions GENERAL CONFORMITY		ONFORMITY
	(ton/yr)	Threshold (ton/yr)	Exceedance (Yes or No)
West Central Pinal, AZ			
VOC	0.01	100	No
NOx	5.9		No
СО	3.4		
SOx	0.5	100	No

PM 10	2.3	100	No
PM 2.5	1.3	100	No
Pb	0.000	100	No
NH3	0.000	100	No
CO2e	1,610		
Hayden (Pinal County), AZ			
VOC	0.01		
NOx	5.9		
CO	3.4		
SOx	0.5	100	No
PM 10	2.3		
PM 2.5	1.3		
Pb	0.02	25	No
NH3	0.000		
CO2e	1,610		
Hayden AZ	0.01		
VOC	0.01		
	5.9		
<u>co</u>	3.4		
SUX DM 10	0.5	100	N
PM 10	2.3	100	INO
	1.3	25	N-
PD NH2	0.02	25	INO
	0.000		
Miami AZ	1,010		
VOC	0.01		
NOv	5.0		
CO	3.4		
SOx	0.5		
PM 10	23	100	No
PM 2.5	13	100	110
Ph	0.000		
NH3	0.000		
CO2e	1.610		
Phoenix, AZ			
VOC	0.01		
NOx	5.9		
СО	3.4		
SOx	0.5		
PM 10	2.3	70	No
PM 2.5	1.3		
Pb	0.000		
NH3	0.000		
CO2e	1,610		
San Manual (Pinal County),	, AZ	r	
VOC	0.01		
NOx	5.9		
CO	3.4		
SOx	0.5	100	No
PM 10	2.3		
PM 2.5			
DI	1.5		
Pb	0.000		

CO2e	1,610				
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ	Phoenix-Mesa, AZ				
VOC	0.01	100	No		
NOx	5.9	100	No		
СО	3.4				
SOx	0.5				
PM 10	2.3				
PM 2.5	1.3				
Pb	0.000				
NH3	0.000				
CO2e	1,610				
West Pinal, AZ					
VOC	0.01				
NOx	5.9				
СО	3.4				
SOx	0.5				
PM 10	2.3	100	No		
PM 2.5	1.3				
Pb	0.000				
NH3	0.000				
CO2e	1,610				
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ					
VOC	0.01	100	No		
NOx	5.9	100	No		
СО	3.4				
SOx	0.5				
PM 10	2.3				
PM 2.5	1.3				
Pb	0.000				
NH3	0.000				
CO2e	1,610				

None of estimated emissions associated with this action are above the conformity threshold values established at 40 CFR 93.153 (b); Therefore, the requirements of the General Conformity Rule are not applicable.

Lesley Hamilton, Consultant

DATE

1. General Information

Action Location

Base: DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB
State: Arizona
County(s): Graham; Pinal
Regulatory Area(s): West Central Pinal, AZ; Hayden (Pinal County), AZ; Hayden AZ; Miami, AZ;
Phoenix, AZ; San Manual (Pinal County), AZ; Phoenix-Mesa, AZ; West Pinal, AZ

- Action Title: Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment, Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona

- Project Number/s (if applicable):
- Projected Action Start Date: 1 / 2025

- Action Purpose and Need:

The Air Force proposes to relocate a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller (JTAC) training, and Guardian Angel operations from Nellis AFB to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona in support of Nellis AFB increase in fighter aircraft. Twol other proposed actions at Davis-Monthan AFB unrelated to the movements described above that are occurring on approximately the same timelines and are therefore included in this analysis. These actions consist of assignment of two Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Cessna 182 aircraft and the transfer of one RC-26B aircraft from the Morris Air National Guard Base (ANGB) located at the Tucson International Airport (Arizona).

- Action Description:

The Tombstone, Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci and Ruby/Fuzzy Military Operations Areas (MOAs) are accessible for training within 125 miles of Davis-Monthan AFB. A-10C and HH-60 aircraft would fly to Jackal Low MOA to train. Low altitude (below 3000 ft AGL) flight for A-10C is analyzed.

- Point of Contact	
Name:	Lesley Hamilton
Title:	Consultant
Organization:	Stantec GS
Email:	Lesley.Hamilton@cardno-gs.com
Phone Number:	

- Activity List:

	Activity Type	Activity Title
2.	Aircraft	Low altitude A-10C sortie time in Jackal Low MOA

Emission factors and air emission estimating methods come from the United States Air Force's Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Stationary Sources, Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Mobile Sources, and Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Transitory Sources.

2. Aircraft

2.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

- Add or Remove Activity from Baseline? Add
- Activity Location

County: Graham; Pinal

Regulatory Area(s): West Central Pinal, AZ; Hayden (Pinal County), AZ; Hayden AZ; Miami, AZ; Phoenix, AZ; San Manual (Pinal County), AZ; Phoenix-Mesa, AZ; West Pinal, AZ; Phoenix-Mesa, AZ

- Activity Title: Low altitude A-10C sortie time in Jackal Low MOA

- Activity Description:

Time spent at 3000 feet or below while training in Tombstone MOA.

- Activity Start Date

Start Month:	1
Start Year:	2025

- Activity End Date

Indefinite:	Yes
End Month:	N/A
End Year:	N/A

- Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	0.007610
SO _x	0.067853
NO _x	0.678530
CO	0.139511
PM 10	0.168681

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.151559
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO ₂ e	205.1

- Activity Emissions [Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) part]:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	0.000000
SO _x	0.000000
NO _x	0.000000
СО	0.000000
PM 10	0.000000

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.000000
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO ₂ e	0.0

2.2 Aircraft & Engines

2.2.1 Aircraft & Engines Assumptions

- Aircraft & Engine

Aircraft Designation:	A-10C
Engine Model:	TF34-GE-100
Primary Function:	Combat
Aircraft has After burn:	No
Number of Engines:	2

- Aircraft & Engine Surrogate Is Aircraft & Engine a Surrogate? No Original Aircraft Name: Original Engine Name:

2.2.2 Aircraft & Engines Emission Factor(s)

- Aircraft & Engine Emissions Factors (lb/1000lb fuel)

	Fuel Flow	VOC	SOx	NO _x	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	CO ₂ e
Idle	390.00	39.45	1.07	2.10	106.70	8.13	7.32	3234

Approach	920.00	2.19	1.07	5.70	16.30	6.21	5.59	3234
Intermediate	460.00	23.35	1.07	2.60	78.00	8.93	8.04	3234
Military	2710.00	0.12	1.07	10.70	2.20	2.66	2.39	3234
After Burn	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3234

2.3 Flight Operations

2.3.1 Flight Operations Assumptions

- Flight Operations				
Number of Aircraft:		39		
Flight Operation Cycle Type: LFP (Low Flight Pattern)				
Number of Annual Flight Operation Cycles for all Aircraft: Number of Annual Trim Test(s) per Aircraft:				
- Flight Operations TIMs (Time In Mode)				
Taxi [Idle] (mins):	0			
Approach [Approach] (mins):	0			
Climb Out [Intermediate] (mins):	0			
Takeoff [Military] (mins):	36			
Takeoff [After Burn] (mins):	0			

Per the Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Mobile Sources, the defaults values for military aircraft equipped with after burner for takeoff is 50% military power and 50% afterburner. (Exception made for F-35 where KARNES 3.2 flight profile was used)

Trim Test	
Idle (mins):	0
Approach (mins):	0
Intermediate (mins):	0
Military (mins):	0
AfterBurn (mins):	0

2.3.2 Flight Operations Formula(s)

- Aircraft Emissions per Mode for Flight Operation Cycles per Year $AEM_{POL} = (TIM / 60) * (FC / 1000) * EF * NE * FOC / 2000$

AEM_{POL}: Aircraft Emissions per Pollutant & Mode (TONs)
TIM: Time in Mode (min)
60: Conversion Factor minutes to hours
FC: Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr)
1000: Conversion Factor pounds to 1000pounds
EF: Emission Factor (lb/1000lb fuel)
NE: Number of Engines
FOC: Number of Flight Operation Cycles (for all aircraft)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to TONs

- Aircraft Emissions for Flight Operation Cycles per Year

 $AE_{FOC} = AEM_{IDLE_IN} + AEM_{IDLE_OUT} + AEM_{APPROACH} + AEM_{CLIMBOUT} + AEM_{TAKEOFF}$

AE_{FOC}: Aircraft Emissions (TONs) AEM_{IDLE IN}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle-In Mode (TONs)

AEM_{IDLE_OUT}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle-Out Mode (TONs) AEM_{APPROACH}: Aircraft Emissions for Approach Mode (TONs) AEM_{CLIMBOUT}: Aircraft Emissions for Climb-Out Mode (TONs) AEM_{TAKEOFF}: Aircraft Emissions for Take-Off Mode (TONs)

- Aircraft Emissions per Mode for Trim per Year

 $AEPS_{POL} = (TD / 60) * (FC / 1000) * EF * NE * NA * NTT / 2000$

AEPS_{POL}: Aircraft Emissions per Pollutant & Power Setting (TONs)
TD: Test Duration (min)
60: Conversion Factor minutes to hours
FC: Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr)
1000: Conversion Factor pounds to 1000pounds
EF: Emission Factor (lb/1000lb fuel)
NE: Number of Engines
NA: Number of Aircraft
NTT: Number of Trim Test
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to TONs

- Aircraft Emissions for Trim per Year

 $AE_{TRIM} = AEPS_{IDLE} + AEPS_{APPROACH} + AEPS_{INTERMEDIATE} + AEPS_{MILITARY} + AEPS_{AFTERBURN}$

AE_{TRIM}: Aircraft Emissions (TONs) AEPS_{IDLE}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{APPROACH}: Aircraft Emissions for Approach Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{INTERMEDIATE}: Aircraft Emissions for Intermediate Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{MILITARY}: Aircraft Emissions for Military Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{AFTERBURN}: Aircraft Emissions for After Burner Power Setting (TONs) This Page Intentionally Blank

Morenci MOA ACAM ROCA and Detail Report

This Page Intentionally Blank

1. General Information: The Air Force's Air Conformity Applicability Model (ACAM) was used to perform an analysis to assess the potential air quality impact/s associated with the action in accordance with the Air Force Manual 32-7002, Environmental Compliance and Pollution Prevention; the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP, 32 CFR 989); and the General Conformity Rule (GCR, 40 CFR 93 Subpart B). This report provides a summary of the ACAM analysis.

a. Action Location: DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB Base: State: Arizona County(s): Greenlee; Graham Regulatory Area(s): Morenci (Greenlee County), AZ

b. Action Title: Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment, Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona

c. Project Number/s (if applicable):

d. Projected Action Start Date: 1 / 2025

e. Action Description:

The Tombstone, Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci and Ruby/Fuzzy Military Operations Areas (MOAs) are accessible for training within 125 miles of Davis-Monthan AFB. A-10C and HH-60 aircraft would fly to Morenci MOA to train. Additional low altitude (below 3000 ft AGL) flight for A-10C and HH-60 are analyzed.

f. Point of Contact:

Name:	Lesley Hamilton
Title:	Consultant
Organization:	Stantec GS
Email:	Lesley.Hamilton@cardno-gs.com
Phone Number:	

2. Analysis: Total combined direct and indirect emissions associated with the action were estimated through ACAM on a calendar-year basis for the "worst-case" and "steady state" (net gain/loss upon action fully implemented) emissions. General Conformity under the Clean Air Act, Section 1.76 has been evaluated for the action described above according to the requirements of 40 CFR 93, Subpart B.

Based on the analysis, the requirements of this rule are:

applicable X not applicable

Conformity Analysis Summary:

2026 - (Steady State)				
Pollutant	Action Emissions (ton/yr)	GENERAL CONFORMITY		
		Threshold (ton/yr)	Exceedance (Yes or No)	
Morenci (Greenlee County),	AZ			
VOC	0.01			
NOx	2.8			
СО	1.5			
SOx	0.3	100	No	
PM 10	1.0			
PM 2.5	0.6			
Pb	0.000			
NH3	0.000			
CO2e	769			

None of estimated emissions associated with this action are above the conformity threshold values established at 40 CFR 93.153 (b); Therefore, the requirements of the General Conformity Rule are not applicable.

Lesley Hamilton, Consultant

DATE
1. General Information

- Action Location

Base:DAVIS-MONTHAN AFBState:ArizonaCounty(s):Greenlee; GrahamRegulatory Area(s):Morenci (Greenlee County), AZ

- Action Title: Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment, Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona
- Project Number/s (if applicable):
- Projected Action Start Date: 1 / 2025

- Action Purpose and Need:

The Air Force proposes to relocate a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller (JTAC) training, and Guardian Angel operations from Nellis AFB to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona in support of Nellis AFB increase in fighter aircraft. Twol other proposed actions at Davis-Monthan AFB unrelated to the movements described above that are occurring on approximately the same timelines and are therefore included in this analysis. These actions consist of assignment of two Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Cessna 182 aircraft and the transfer of one RC-26B aircraft from the Morris Air National Guard Base (ANGB) located at the Tucson International Airport (Arizona).

- Action Description:

The Tombstone, Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci and Ruby/Fuzzy Military Operations Areas (MOAs) are accessible for training within 125 miles of Davis-Monthan AFB. A-10C and HH-60 aircraft would fly to Morenci MOA to train. Additional low altitude (below 3000 ft AGL) flight for A-10C is analyzed.

- Point of Contact

Name:	Lesley Hamilton
Title:	Consultant
Organization:	Stantec GS
Email:	Lesley.Hamilton@cardno-gs.com
Phone Number:	

- Activity List:

Activity Type		Activity Title
2.	Aircraft	Low altitude A-10C sortie time in Morenci MOA

Emission factors and air emission estimating methods come from the United States Air Force's Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Stationary Sources, Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Mobile Sources, and Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Transitory Sources.

2. Aircraft

2.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

- Add or Remove Activity from Baseline? Add

- Activity Location

County: Greenlee; Graham Regulatory Area(s): Morenci (Greenlee County), AZ

Low altitude A-10C sortie time in Morenci MOA - Activity Title:

- Activity Description:

Time spent at 3000 feet or below while training in Tombstone MOA

- Activity Start Date

Start Month:	1
Start Year:	2025

- Activity End Date

Indefinite:	Yes
End Month:	N/A
End Year:	N/A

- Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	0.003122
SO _x	0.027837
NO _x	0.278371
CO	0.057235
PM 10	0.069203

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.062178
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO ₂ e	84.1

- Activity Emissions [Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) part]:

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)		Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	0.000000		PM 2.5	0.000000
SO _x	0.000000		Pb	0.000000
NO _x	0.000000		NH ₃	0.000000
CO	0.000000		CO ₂ e	0.0
PM 10	0.000000			

2.2 Aircraft & Engines

2.2.1 Aircraft & Engines Assumptions

- Aircraft & Engine Aircraft Designation: A-10C **Engine Model:** TF34-GE-100 **Primary Function:** Combat Aircraft has After burn: No Number of Engines: 2
- Aircraft & Engine Surrogate Is Aircraft & Engine a Surrogate? No **Original Aircraft Name: Original Engine Name:**

2.2.2 Aircraft & Engines Emission Factor(s)

- Aircraft & Engine Emissions Factors (lb/1000lb fuel)

	Fuel Flow	VOC	SO _x	NO _x	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5	CO ₂ e
Idle	390.00	39.45	1.07	2.10	106.70	8.13	7.32	3234
Approach	920.00	2.19	1.07	5.70	16.30	6.21	5.59	3234
Intermediate	460.00	23.35	1.07	2.60	78.00	8.93	8.04	3234
Military	2710.00	0.12	1.07	10.70	2.20	2.66	2.39	3234

After Burn	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3234
2.3 Flight Operations2.3.1 Flight Operations Assumptions								
- Flight Operations Number of Aircraft: 16 Flight Operation Cycle Type: LFP (Low Flight Pattern)								
Number	of Annual Fli	ght Operation	on Cycles fo	r all Aircraf	t:	16		
Number	of Annual Tri	im Test(s) p	er Aircraft:			0		
- Default Sett	- Default Settings Used: No							
- Flight Oper	ations TIMs (Time In Mo	de)					
Taxi [Idl	e] (mins):			0				
Approac	h [Approach]	(mins):		0				
Climb O	ut [Intermedia	ate] (mins):		0				
Takeoff	[Military] (mi	ns):		36				
Takeoff	[After Burn] (mins):		0				

Per the Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Mobile Sources, the defaults values for military aircraft equipped with after burner for takeoff is 50% military power and 50% afterburner. (Exception made for F-35 where KARNES 3.2 flight profile was used)

- Trim Test

Idle (mins):	0
Approach (mins):	0
Intermediate (mins):	0
Military (mins):	0
AfterBurn (mins):	0

2.3.2 Flight Operations Formula(s)

- Aircraft Emissions per Mode for Flight Operation Cycles per Year AEM_{POL} = (TIM / 60) * (FC / 1000) * EF * NE * FOC / 2000

AEM_{POL}: Aircraft Emissions per Pollutant & Mode (TONs)
TIM: Time in Mode (min)
60: Conversion Factor minutes to hours
FC: Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr)
1000: Conversion Factor pounds to 1000pounds
EF: Emission Factor (lb/1000lb fuel)
NE: Number of Engines
FOC: Number of Flight Operation Cycles (for all aircraft)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to TONs

- Aircraft Emissions for Flight Operation Cycles per Year

 $AE_{FOC} = AEM_{IDLE_IN} + AEM_{IDLE_OUT} + AEM_{APPROACH} + AEM_{CLIMBOUT} + AEM_{TAKEOFF}$

AE_{FOC}: Aircraft Emissions (TONs) AEM_{IDLE_IN}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle-In Mode (TONs) AEM_{IDLE_OUT}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle-Out Mode (TONs) AEM_{APPROACH}: Aircraft Emissions for Approach Mode (TONs) AEM_{CLIMBOUT}: Aircraft Emissions for Climb-Out Mode (TONs)

AEM_{TAKEOFF}: Aircraft Emissions for Take-Off Mode (TONs)

- Aircraft Emissions per Mode for Trim per Year

 $AEPS_{POL} = (TD / 60) * (FC / 1000) * EF * NE * NA * NTT / 2000$

AEPS_{POL}: Aircraft Emissions per Pollutant & Power Setting (TONs)
TD: Test Duration (min)
60: Conversion Factor minutes to hours
FC: Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr)
1000: Conversion Factor pounds to 1000pounds
EF: Emission Factor (lb/1000lb fuel)
NE: Number of Engines
NA: Number of Aircraft
NTT: Number of Trim Test
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to TONs

- Aircraft Emissions for Trim per Year

 $AE_{TRIM} = AEPS_{IDLE} + AEPS_{APPROACH} + AEPS_{INTERMEDIATE} + AEPS_{MILITARY} + AEPS_{AFTERBURN}$

AE_{TRIM}: Aircraft Emissions (TONs) AEPS_{IDLE}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{APPROACH}: Aircraft Emissions for Approach Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{INTERMEDIATE}: Aircraft Emissions for Intermediate Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{MILITARY}: Aircraft Emissions for Military Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{AFTERBURN}: Aircraft Emissions for After Burner Power Setting (TONs) Tombstone MOA ACAM ROCA and Detail Report

This Page Intentionally Blank

AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT RECORD OF CONFORMITY ANALYSIS (ROCA)

1. General Information: The Air Force's Air Conformity Applicability Model (ACAM) was used to perform an analysis to assess the potential air quality impact/s associated with the action in accordance with the Air Force Manual 32-7002, Environmental Compliance and Pollution Prevention; the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP, 32 CFR 989); and the General Conformity Rule (GCR, 40 CFR 93 Subpart B). This report provides a summary of the ACAM analysis.

a. Action Location:
Base: DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB
State: Arizona
County(s): Cochise
Regulatory Area(s): Paul Spur/Douglas (Cochise County), AZ; Douglas (Cochise County), AZ

b. Action Title: Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment, Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona

c. Project Number/s (if applicable):

d. Projected Action Start Date: 1 / 2025

e. Action Description:

The Tombstone, Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci and Ruby/Fuzzy Military Operations Areas (MOAs) are accessible for training within 125 miles of Davis-Monthan AFB. A-10C and HH-60 aircraft would fly to Tombstone MOA to train. Low altitude (below 3000 ft AGL) flight for A-10C and HH-60 are analyzed.

f. Point of Contact:

Name:	Lesley Hamilton
Title:	Consultant
Organization:	Stantec GS
Email:	Lesley.Hamilton@cardno-gs.com
Phone Number:	

2. Analysis: Total combined direct and indirect emissions associated with the action were estimated through ACAM on a calendar-year basis for the "worst-case" and "steady state" (net gain/loss upon action fully implemented) emissions. General Conformity under the Clean Air Act, Section 1.76 has been evaluated for the action described above according to the requirements of 40 CFR 93, Subpart B.

Based on the analysis, the requirements of this rule are:

_____ applicable __X__ not applicable

Conformity Analysis Summary:

2020 - (Steady State)							
Pollutant	Action Emissions	GENERAL CONFORMITY					
	(ton/yr)	Threshold (ton/yr)	Exceedance (Yes or No)				
Paul Spur/Douglas (Cochise	e County), AZ						
VOC	0.02						
NOx	11.1						
СО	5.5						
SOx	1.0						
PM 10	3.8	100	No				
PM 2.5	2.5						
Pb	0.000						

2026 - (Steady State)

AIR CONFORMITY APPLICABILITY MODEL REPORT RECORD OF CONFORMITY ANALYSIS (ROCA)

NH3	0.000		
CO2e	3,047		
Douglas (Cochise County),	AZ		
VOC	0.02		
NOx	11.1		
СО	5.5	100	No
SOx	1.0	100	No
PM 10	3.8		
PM 2.5	2.5		
Pb	0.000		
NH3	0.000		
CO2e	3,047		

None of estimated emissions associated with this action are above the conformity threshold values established at 40 CFR 93.153 (b); Therefore, the requirements of the General Conformity Rule are not applicable.

Lesley Hamilton, Consultant

DATE

1. General Information

Action Location Base: DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB State: Arizona County(s): Cochise Regulatory Area(s): Paul Spur/Douglas (Cochise County), AZ; Douglas (Cochise County), AZ

- Action Title: Fourth Generation Missions Regional Realignment, Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona
- Project Number/s (if applicable):
- Projected Action Start Date: 1 / 2025

- Action Purpose and Need:

The Air Force proposes to relocate a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller (JTAC) training, and Guardian Angel operations from Nellis AFB to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona in support of Nellis AFB increase in fighter aircraft. Twol other proposed actions at Davis-Monthan AFB unrelated to the movements described above that are occurring on approximately the same timelines and are therefore included in this analysis. These actions consist of assignment of two Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Cessna 182 aircraft and the transfer of one RC-26B aircraft from the Morris Air National Guard Base (ANGB) located at the Tucson International Airport (Arizona).

- Action Description:

The Tombstone, Outlaw/Jackal/Morenci and Ruby/Fuzzy Military Operations Areas (MOAs) are accessible for training within 125 miles of Davis-Monthan AFB. A-10C and HH-60 aircraft would fly to Tombstone MOA to train. Low altitude (below 3000 ft AGL) flight for A-10C is analyzed.

- Point of Contact

Name:	Lesley Hamilton
Title:	Consultant
Organization:	Stantec GS
Email:	Lesley.Hamilton@cardno-gs.com
Phone Number:	

- Activity List:

	Activity Type	Activity Title
2.	Aircraft	Low altitude A-10C sortie time in Tombstone MOA

Emission factors and air emission estimating methods come from the United States Air Force's Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Stationary Sources, Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Mobile Sources, and Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Transitory Sources.

2. Aircraft

2.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

- Add or Remove Activity from Baseline? Add

```
- Activity Location
```

```
County: Cochise
```

Regulatory Area(s): Douglas (Cochise County), AZ; Paul Spur/Douglas (Cochise County), AZ

- Activity Title: Low altitude A-10C sortie time in Tombstone MOA

- Activity Description:

Time spent at 3000 feet or below while training in Tombstone MOA

- Activity Start Date

Start Month:	1
Start Year:	2025

- Activity End Date

Indefinite:	Yes
End Month:	N/A
End Year:	N/A

- Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
VOC	0.010536
SO _x	0.093950
NO _x	0.939503
CO	0.193169
PM 10	0.233559

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.209852
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO ₂ e	284.0

- Activity Emissions [Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) part]:

Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)	Р
VOC	0.000000	PM 2
SO _x	0.000000	Pb
NO _x	0.000000	NH ₃
CO	0.000000	CO ₂ e
PM 10	0.000000	

···· · · ·	
Pollutant	Emissions Per Year (TONs)
PM 2.5	0.000000
Pb	0.000000
NH ₃	0.000000
CO ₂ e	0.0

2.2 Aircraft & Engines

_

2.2.1 Aircraft & Engines Assumptions

Aircraft & Engine	
Aircraft Designation:	A-10C
Engine Model:	TF34-GE-100
Primary Function:	Combat
Aircraft has After burn:	No
Number of Engines:	2

- Aircraft & Engine Surrogate Is Aircraft & Engine a Surrogate? No Original Aircraft Name: Original Engine Name:

2.2.2 Aircraft & Engines Emission Factor(s)

PM 2.5 **Fuel Flow** VOC **NO**_x CO **PM 10** CO₂e **SO**_x Idle 390.00 39.45 1.07 2.10 106.70 8.13 7.32 3234 920.00 2.19 1.07 5.70 16.30 6.21 5.59 3234 Approach Intermediate 460.00 23.35 1.07 2.60 78.00 8.93 8.04 3234 Military 2710.00 0.12 1.07 10.70 2.20 2.66 2.39 3234

- Aircraft & Engine Emissions Factors (lb/1000lb fuel)

After Burn	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3234
2.3 Flight Operations2.3.1 Flight Operations Assumptions								
- Flight Operations Number of Aircraft: 54 Flight Operation Cycle Type: LFP (Low Flight Pattern)								
Number Number	Number of Annual Flight Operation Cycles for all Aircraft:54Number of Annual Trim Test(s) per Aircraft0							
- Default Settings Used: No								
- Flight Oper	ations TIMs (Time In Mo	de)	0				
Taxi [ldl	e] (mins):	<i>.</i>		0				
Approac	h [Approach]	(mins):		0				
Climb O	ut [Intermedia	ate] (mins):		0				
Takeoff	[Military] (mi	ns):		36				
Takeoff	[After Burn] (mins):		0				

Per the Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Mobile Sources, the defaults values for military aircraft equipped with after burner for takeoff is 50% military power and 50% afterburner. (Exception made for F-35 where KARNES 3.2 flight profile was used)

- Trim Test

Idle (mins):	0
Approach (mins):	0
Intermediate (mins):	0
Military (mins):	0
AfterBurn (mins):	0

2.3.2 Flight Operations Formula(s)

- Aircraft Emissions per Mode for Flight Operation Cycles per Year AEM_{POL} = (TIM / 60) * (FC / 1000) * EF * NE * FOC / 2000

AEM_{POL}: Aircraft Emissions per Pollutant & Mode (TONs)
TIM: Time in Mode (min)
60: Conversion Factor minutes to hours
FC: Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr)
1000: Conversion Factor pounds to 1000pounds
EF: Emission Factor (lb/1000lb fuel)
NE: Number of Engines
FOC: Number of Flight Operation Cycles (for all aircraft)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to TONs

- Aircraft Emissions for Flight Operation Cycles per Year

 $AE_{FOC} = AEM_{IDLE IN} + AEM_{IDLE OUT} + AEM_{APPROACH} + AEM_{CLIMBOUT} + AEM_{TAKEOFF}$

AE_{FOC}: Aircraft Emissions (TONs) AEM_{IDLE_IN}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle-In Mode (TONs) AEM_{IDLE_OUT}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle-Out Mode (TONs) AEM_{APPROACH}: Aircraft Emissions for Approach Mode (TONs) AEM_{CLIMBOUT}: Aircraft Emissions for Climb-Out Mode (TONs)

AEM_{TAKEOFF}: Aircraft Emissions for Take-Off Mode (TONs)

- Aircraft Emissions per Mode for Trim per Year

 $AEPS_{POL} = (TD / 60) * (FC / 1000) * EF * NE * NA * NTT / 2000$

AEPS_{POL}: Aircraft Emissions per Pollutant & Power Setting (TONs) TD: Test Duration (min) 60: Conversion Factor minutes to hours FC: Fuel Flow Rate (lb/hr) 1000: Conversion Factor pounds to 1000pounds EF: Emission Factor (lb/1000lb fuel) NE: Number of Engines NA: Number of Aircraft NTT: Number of Trim Test 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to TONs

- Aircraft Emissions for Trim per Year

 $AE_{TRIM} = AEPS_{IDLE} + AEPS_{APPROACH} + AEPS_{INTERMEDIATE} + AEPS_{MILITARY} + AEPS_{AFTERBURN}$

AE_{TRIM}: Aircraft Emissions (TONs) AEPS_{IDLE}: Aircraft Emissions for Idle Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{APPROACH}: Aircraft Emissions for Approach Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{INTERMEDIATE}: Aircraft Emissions for Intermediate Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{MILITARY}: Aircraft Emissions for Military Power Setting (TONs) AEPS_{AFTERBURN}: Aircraft Emissions for After Burner Power Setting (TONs)

APPENDIX C PUBLIC NOTICES

This page intentionally left blank

TUCSON WEEKLY

VOL. 38 | NO. 48 **II.) INWFFK1**

CONTENTS

COMEDY



Comic David Fitzsimmons delivers his last punchline

MUSIC



A human flower? It must be "Selling England by the Pound"

MUSIC

The Tucson Weekly is available free of charge in Pima County, limited to one copy per reader. Additional copies of th current issue of the Tucson Weekly may be purchased for \$1, payable at the Tucson Weekly office in advance. To find out where you can pick up a free copy of the Tucson Weekly, please visit Tucson Weekly, com

ADMINISTRATION Steve T. Strickbine, Publisher

Michael Hiatt, Vice President

Tyler Vondrak. Associate Publisher. tyler@tucsonlocalmedia.com

Claudine Sowards, Accounting, claudine@tucsonlocalmedia.com

FDITORIAI

Christina Fuoco-Karasinski, Executive Editor, christina@tucsonlocalmedia.com

Karen Schaffner, Staff Reporter, kschaffner@tucsonlocalmedia.com

CONTRIBUTORS

Brian Box Brown, Rob Brezsny, Eva Halvax, Annie Holub, Veronica Kuffel, Laura Latzko, Anya Lotun, Andy Mosier, Linda Ray, Aari Ruben, Brian Smith, Jen Sorensen

PRODUCTION

Courtney Oldham, Production/Design Supervisor, production@timeslocalmedia.com

Amber Johnson, Graphic Designer, aiohnson@timeslocalmedia.com

CIRCULATION

Aaron Kolodny, Circulation Director, aaron@timeslocalmedia.com

ADVERTISING

TLMSales@TucsonLocalMedia.com

Kristin Chester, Account Executive, kristin@tucsonlocalmedia.com

NATIONAL ADVERTISING

Zac Revnolds, Director of National Advertising zac@timeslocalmedia.com

Tucson Weekly® is published every Thursday by Times Media Group at 3275 W.Ina Rd., Ste. 160, Tucson, Arizona. Address all editorial, business and production correspondence to: Tucson Weekly, 3275 W.Ina Rd., Ste. 160, Tucson, Arizona 85741. Phone: (520) 797-4384, FAX (520) 575-8891, Member of the Association of Alternative Newsmedia (AAN). The Tucson Weekly® and Best of Tucson® are registered trademarks of Times Media Group. Publisher has the right to refuse any advertisement at his or her discretion



Copyright: The entire contents of Tucson Weekly are Copyright Times TUCSONIOCAIMEDIA YOUR COMMUNITY DELIVERED

Tucson Weekly is distributed by AZ Integrated Media, a circulation company owned & operated by Times Media Group. The public is limited to one copy per reader. For circulation services, please contact Aaron Kolodny at aaron@timeslocalmedia.com



To start or stop delivery of the paper, please visit https://timespublications.com/tucson/ or call 480-898-7901 To receive your free online edition subscription, please visit: https://www.tucsonlocalmedia.com/newsletter/signup/

PUBLIC NOTICE NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND PROPOSED FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR THE FOURTH GENERATION REGIONAL REALIGNMENT, DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA

A Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and proposed Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) have been prepared to analyze the potential impacts associated with the relocation of a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller training, and Guardian Angel operations to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona. The EA, prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality regulations, and Air Force instructions implementing NEPA; evaluates potential impacts of the alternative actions on the environment including the No-Action Alternative. Based on this analysis, the Air Force has prepared a proposed FONSI.

The Draft EA and proposed FONSI are available for review at the following locations: Himmel Park Library - 1035 N. Treat Avenue Tucson, AZ 85716 Quincie Douglas Library - 1585 East 36th Street Tucson, AZ 85713

PRIVACY ADVISORY NOTICE

This Draft EA and proposed FONSI are provided for public comment in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the President's Council on Environmental Quality NEPA Regulations (40 CFR §1500-1508), and 32 CFR §989, the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP). The EIAP provides an opportunity for public input on Air Force decision-making, allows the public to offer inputs on alternative ways for the Air Force to accomplish what it is proposing, and solicits comments on the Air Force's analysis of environmental effects.

Public comment allows the Air Force to make better, informed decisions. Letters or other written or oral comments provided may be published in the EA. As required by law, comments provided will be addressed in the EA and made available to the public. Providing personal information is voluntary. Any personal information provided will be used only to identify your desire to make a statement during the public comment portion of any public meetings or hearings or to fulfill requests for copies of the EA and associated documents. Private addresses will be compiled to develop a mailing list for those requesting copies of the EA; however only the names of the individuals making comments and specific comments will be disclosed. Personal home addresses and phone numbers will not be published in the EA.



If you like bringing well-being to others

become a massage therapist! \$2999 Tuition

7 Months to a New Career

INSTITUTE of MASSAGE

- Hybrid 700 hour program
- Full Scholarships Available
- Book a School Tour Now

520-528-9404 Tucson@valoried.com www.valoried.com



Southall brings a good time and country music to Tucson



Medicare Advantage

Plans designed with your health in mind.

Discover the variety of benefits and services available through Cigna Healthcare Medicare Advantage.

Did you know that Cigna Healthcaresm Medicare Advantage plans offer all the coverage of Original Medicare plus added benefits to support your health and well-being? Plans in your area may include benefits,* like:

- Up to \$1,260 off your annual¹ Part B premium³
- Up to \$2,000 annual maximum for covered dental services with \$0 or low copays
- Up to \$340 over-the-counter annual allowance¹

Act Now: the Annual Enrollment Period ends December 7.

*Benefits, features and/or devices vary by plan/service area. Limitations, exclusions, and restrictions may apply. Contact the plan for more information. ¹Annual amount based on possible monthly or quarterly amounts. ³Cigna Healthcare will reduce your monthly Part B premium based on the plan's specific benefit amount. Cigna Healthcare products and services are provided exclusively by or through operating subsidiaries of The Cigna Group. The Cigna names, logos, and marks, including THE CIGNA GROUP and CIGNA HEALTHCARE are owned by Cigna Intellectual Property, Inc. Subsidiaries of The Cigna Group contract with Medicare to offer Medicare Advantage HMO and PPO plans and Part D Prescription Drug Plans (PDP) in select states, and with select State Medicaid programs. Enrollment in a Cigna Healthcare product depends on contract renewal. © 2023 Cigna Healthcare. 979013 08/23 A PA 4208

877.603.9154 (TTY 711) 7 days a week, 8 am to 8 pm cignamedicareAZ.com



ELAINE S. POVICH

Stateline.org

In 2016, California Democratic state Assemblymember Sharon Quirk-Silva sat with then-California Gov. Jerry Brown at an event where he signed baseball-type cards featuring the image of his dog, Colusa.

But many of the recipients of the cards couldn't read his cursive signature, Quirk-Silva recalled, much to the Democratic governor's dismay. "The governor asked me what I did" before becoming a legislabring back cursive writing."

After seven years of trying, she finally succeeded.

Last month, the California Leg-

islature unanimously passed and schools, Quirk-Silva said. Democratic Gov. Gavin Newsom signed a law requiring the teaching of cursive or "joined italics" handwriting in grades one through six.

While grandparents' sprawling handwriting on birthday cards or treasured family recipes may spring to mind when many younger people think of cursive, some educators today think it's a skill worth reviving even – or maybe especially - in an age when most kids spend hours every day on their smartphones. But others tor, she remembered. "I said I was think students already have too a teacher, and he said, 'You have to many subjects to master and that their fingers belong on keyboards.

Some California teachers already were teaching cursive, but not usually in under-resourced ioned."

She argued cursive is valuable to read historical documents, increases writing speed and has become a popular way for teachers to make sure students are not using artificial intelligence to craft their written work.

Teaching cursive in public schools waned after the Common Core standards, which most states adopted, didn't include cursive in the recommended curriculum. Critics of cursive requirements say time in the classroom could be better spent on new skills such as coding and keyboarding. And Quirk-Silva recalled that some younger lawmakers called the looping writing style "old-fash-

some success in bringing it back, pointing to studies that show a link between cursive and cognitive abilities, including helping with reading and writing disabilities such as dyslexia and dysgraphia.

In May, New Hampshire Republican Gov. Chris Sununu signed a ifornia. bill requiring schools to teach cursive and multiplication tables.

More than 20 states have implemented state directives to teach cursive in the past decade or so, according to Connie Slone, founder to teachers and schools.

A few others don't require cursive, but instead encourage it without specific mandates, according

Supporters recently have had to the Zaner-Bloser company, another cursive instructional vendor.

> But critics of teaching cursive remain skeptical. There's "not much evidence that cursive matters," said Morgan Polikoff, an associate professor of education at the University of Southern Cal-

"If you are going to spend time on some indication of written communication, keyboarding skills are more important," Polikoff said. "In the scheme of educational policies, I'm not sure there's a single topic of MyCursive.com, a company that I care less about. We've fallen beprovides cursive learning materials hind during COVID, we're dealing with chronic absenteeism, student mental health is in crisis, and we're spending time on cursive? That's what we're mandating?"

ASSOCIATED PRESS

years, the massive, mostly intact dinosaur skeleton that came to be known as Sue the T-rex was Tyrannosaurus rex specimen disat the center of a legal battle. covered and the most complete. The latest dispute involves who inherits what's left of the money generated by the sale of Sue.

Fossil hunters discovered the skeleton in 1990 on property owned by Maurice and Darlene Williams that sits on the Cheyenne River Reservation in South KELO-TV reported. Dakota. Because of the location on the reservation, the discovery Darlene Williams had two wills, led to years of court battles over according to records filed in Linownership rights.

Eventually, the couple were able to claim the rights, and they all of her children and grandchilmade \$7.6 million from the auc-

SIOUX FALLS, S.D. - For museum's website says that at more than 40 feet long and 13 feet tall at the hip, Sue is the largest

> Maurice Williams died in 2011. Darlene Williams later moved to Sioux Falls, South Dakota, where she died in December 2020. The couple had four children and three of the siblings are involved in a court dispute over the estate,

At the center of the dispute: coln County, South Dakota. The first one, signed in 2017, included dren, and listed daughter Sandra witnesses in the room due to tion of Sue – now on display at Williams Luther as the person in COVID-19 restrictions.

Chicago's Field Museum. The charge of settling the estate and making sure the will was carried out.

But a second will dated Nov. 25,2020 -less than three weeks before Darlene Williams died designated Luther as the sole heir and executor. The document also cited Darlene Williams as saying that she had lived with her children at odds for too long, and she hoped that in her death they would find peace and become a family again.

Another daughter, Jacqueline Schwartz, questioned whether the second will was legal. She said her mother was critically ill and in hospice care when she signed the document without



TERESA CRAWFORD, ASSOCIATED PRESS

Garth Dallman, center, and Bill Kouchie, right, both from the dinosaur restoration firm Research Casting International, Ltd., begin dismantling Sue, the Tyrannosaurus rex, Feb. 5, 2018, on display at Chicago's Field Museum.

ASSOCIATED PRESS

LONDON – An alternative healer who advocates a technique of a woman at one of his workshops in England seven years ago.

ielle Carr-Gomm, Wiltshire Police said.

British police first sought to arknown as "slapping therapy" was rest Xiao in 2019. He was detained charged Thursday over the death after being extradited from Australia.

Xiao promotes paida lajin therin the October 2016 death of Dan- tensibly to release toxins from the the world.

body. Patients often end up with bruises or bleeding. The technique has its roots in Chinese medicine, but critics say it has no scientific basis.

Xiao, who is originally from China and runs the Califor-Hongchi Xiao was charged with apy, in which patients are slapped nia-based Pailala Institute, has manslaughter by gross negligence or slap themselves repeatedly, os- led paida lajin workshops around

Carr-Gomm, 71, died at Cleeve dles. House country hotel in western England while attending a workshop run by Xiao.

Carr-Gomm's son Matthew said after her death that she had sought "alternative methods of treating and dealing with her diinject insulin due to a fear of nee- southwest England, on Friday.

"I know she was desperate to try and cure herself of this disease." he said. "She always maintained a healthy lifestyle and was adamant that nothing would stop her from living a full life."

Police said Xiao, 60, is due abetes" because she struggled to to appear in court in Salisbury,

PUBLIC NOTICE

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY

AVISO PÚBLICO

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND PROPOSED FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR THE FOURTH GENERATION REGIONAL REALIGNMENT, **DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA**

A Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and proposed Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) have been prepared to analyze the potential impacts associated with the relocation of a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller training, and Guardian Angel operations to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona. The EA, prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality regulations, and Air Force instructions implementing NEPA: evaluates potential impacts of the alternative actions on the environment including the No-Action Alternative. Based on this analysis, the Air Force has prepared a proposed FONSI.

The Draft EA and proposed FONSI are available for review at the following locations:

- Himmel Park Library 1035 N. Treat Avenue Tucson, AZ 85716
- Quincie Douglas Library 1585 East 36th Street Tucson, AZ 85713

Electronic copies of the documents can also be found on the Davis-Monthan AFB website at https://www.dm.af.mil/About-DM/Environmental-Stewardship/. You are encouraged to submit comments through January 9, 2024. Please provide any comments within 30 days of the date of this Notice of Availability. Comments should be provided to Mr. Kevin Wakefield, EIAP Program Manager. Please send him your comments and concerns to 3775 South Fifth Street, Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, 85707-3012, or by email or phone at

kevin.wakefield.1@us.af.mil or (520) 228-4035.

PRIVACY ADVISORY NOTICE

This Draft EA and proposed FONSI are provided for public comment in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the President's Council on Environmental Quality NEPA Regulations (40 CFR §1500-1508), and 32 CFR §989, the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP). The EIAP provides an opportunity for public input on Air Force decision-making, allows the public to offer inputs on alternative ways for the Air Force to accomplish what it is proposing, and solicits comments on the Air Force's analysis of environmental effects.

Public comment allows the Air Force to make better, informed decisions. Letters or other written or oral comments provided may be published in the EA. As required by law, comments provided will be addressed in the EA and made available to the public. Providing personal information is voluntary. Any personal information provided will be used only to identify your desire to make a statement during the public comment portion of any public meetings or hearings or to fulfill requests for copies of the EA and associated documents. Private addresses will be compiled to develop a mailing list for those requesting copies of the EA; however only the names of the individuals making comments and specific comments will be disclosed. Personal home addresses and phone numbers will not be published in the EA.

AVISU DE DISPUNIBILID PROYECTO DE EVALUACIÓN AMBIENTAL Y **PROPUESTA DE HALLAZGO DE IMPACTO NO SIGNIFICATIVO PARA** REALINEAMIENTO REGIONAL DE CUARTA GENERACIÓN, **BASE AÉREA DAVIS-MONTHAN, ARIZONA**

Se ha preparado un Proyecto de Evaluación Ambiental (EA) y una propuesta de Determinación de Impacto No Significativo (FONSI) para analizar los posibles impactos potenciales asociados con la reubicación de una serie de aeronaves y misiones A-10, aeronaves y misiones HH-60, entrenamiento de Controladores de Ataque Terminal Conjunto y operaciones de Ángeles Guardianes a Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona. La EA, preparada de acuerdo con la Ley Nacional de Política Medioambiental (NEPA), la normativa del Consejo de Calidad Medioambiental y las instrucciones del Ejército del Aire para la aplicación de la NEPA, evalúa los impactos potenciales de las acciones alternativas sobre el medio ambiente, incluida la Alternativa de No Acción. Sobre la base de este análisis, el Ejército del Aire ha elaborado una propuesta de FONSI. El Proyecto de EA y el FONSI propuesto están disponibles para su revisión en los

siguientes lugares:

• Himmel Park Library - 1035 N. Treat Avenue Tucson, AZ 85716

• Quincie Douglas Library - 1585 East 36th Street Tucson, AZ 85713.

También se pueden encontrar copias electrónicas de los documentos en el sitio web de la AFB Davis-Monthan en https://www.dm.af.mil/About-DM/Environmental-Stewardship/. Se le invita a enviar comentarios antes de 9 de enero de 2024. Por favor, proporcione cualquier comentario dentro de los 30 días siguientes a la fecha de este Aviso de Disponibilidad. Los comentarios deben ser enviados al Sr. Kevin Wakefield, Gerente del Programa EIAP. Por favor, envíele sus comentarios e inquietudes a 3775 South Fifth Street, Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, 85707-3012, o por correo electrónico o teléfono a kevin.wakefield.1@us.af.mil o (520) 228-4035.

AVISO DE PRIVACIDAD

Este proyecto de EA y el FONSI propuesto se proporcionan para comentarios públicos de conformidad con la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el Consejo Presidencial de Normas de Calidad Ambiental de NEPA (40 CFR §1500-1508), y 32 CFR §989, el Proceso de Análisis de impacto Ambiental (EIAP). El EIAP ofrece una oportunidad para que el público haga aportes sobre la toma de decisiones de la Fuerza Aérea, permite al público ofrecer aportes sobre formas alternativas para que la Fuerza Aérea logre lo que propone, y solicita comentarios sobre el análisis de los efectos ambientales por parte de la Fuerza Aérea.

Los comentarios del público permiten a la Fuerza Aérea tomar mejores decisiones informadas. Las cartas u otros comentarios escritos u orales facilitados pueden publicarse en la EA. Según lo requiera la ley, los comentarios proporcionados se abordarán en la EA y se pondrán a disposición del público. Proporcionar información personal es un acto voluntario. Cualquier información personal proporcionada será utilizada únicamente para identificar su deseo de hacer una declaración durante la porción de comentario público de cualquier reunión o audiencia pública o para cumplir con las solicitudes de copias de la EA y documentos asociados. Se recopilarán direcciones privadas para elaborar una lista de correo para los que soliciten copias de la EA; sin embargo, sólo se revelarán los nombres de los individuos que hagan comentarios, y los comentarios específicos. Las direcciones personales de la casa y los números de teléfono no serán publicados en la EA.



ARIEL SCHALIT, ASSOCIATED PRESS

Israeli soldiers look at photos Friday of people killed and taken captive by Hamas militants during their violent Oct. 7 rampage through the Nova music festival in southern Israel.

JULIA FRANKEL **Associated Press**

JERUSALEM – Israel's military was aware of Hamas' plan to launch an attack on Israeli soil over a year before the devastating Oct. 7 operation that killed hundreds of people, The New York Times reported Friday.

It was the latest in a series of warnings that Hamas was plotting the attack, which triggered a war against the Islamic militant group that has devastated the Gaza Strip.

The Times said Israeli officials were in possession of a 40-page battle plan, code-named "Jericho Wall," that detailed a hypothetical Hamas attack on southern Israeli communities.

was obtained by Israel, but the article said that it had been translated indicating it may have been in Arabic and directly intercepted man-silhouetted paper targets. from Hamas.

The Israeli military declined to comment on the report, saying it was "currently focused on eliminating the threat from the terrorist organization Hamas."

"Questions of this kind will be looked into in a later stage," it said.

officials, the report said, though Benjamin Netanyahu or other top leaders had seen it.

The document predicted that Hamas would bombard Israel with rockets, use drones to disable the months leading up to the attack. Israel's security and surveillance abilities at the border wall, and take over southern communities and military bases. Another 2016 Israeli defense memo obtained by the Times said Hamas intended to take hostages back to Gaza.

The Oct. 7 attack - in which

1,200 people were killed and 240 people were abducted and taken to Gaza – would uncannily mirror the one outlined in the battle plan. But Israeli officials had brushed off the plan, the report said, dismissing it as "aspirational" rather than something that could practically take place, the report said.

The report comes amid pubsigns that top Israeli command- lic fury toward the government ers either ignored or played down of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu for failing to prevent an attack that appears to have been preceded by numerous warning signs.

The attack was planned in plain sight. A month before the assault, Hamas posted a video to social media showing fighters using explosives to blast through a replica of the border gate, sweep in on pickup It was unclear how the document trucks and then move building by building through a full-scale reconstruction of an Israeli town, firing automatic weapons at hu-

> In the video, the militants destroyed mock-ups of the wall's concrete towers and a communications antenna, just as they would do for real on Oct. 7.

Adding to public outrage over the military's apparent negligence, the Israeli media has reported that mil-The document was seen by many itary officials dismissed warnings Israeli military and intelligence from female border spotters who warned that they were witnessing it was unclear if Prime Minister Hamas' preparations for the attack. According to the media reports, the young women reported seeing Hamas drones and attempts to knock out Israeli border cameras in

> Netanyahu has stopped short of apologizing for the attack, and has said that determining blame will have to come after the war is waged. Critics say he is attempting to escape responsibility for myriad intelligence failures leading to the deadliest day in Israeli history.

FOSTER KLUG **Associated Press**

world's most heavily armed border, dozens of South Korean and U.S. combat engineers build a armored vehicles across a lake, all within easy range of North Korean artillery.

have staged annual drills like this recent one to deter aggression from North Korea. The alli-

confident that Washington would CHEORWON, South Korea protect them if Pyongyang ever – Not far from the big green acted on its dream of unifying the majority of South Koreans – rule.

Until now.

North Korea's repeated threats pontoon bridge to ferry tanks and to launch nuclear weapons at its enemies and its tests of missiles designed for pinpoint strikes on U.S. cities have made South Ko-For seven decades, the allies reans lose faith in America's vow to defend their country.

The fear is that a U.S. president would hesitate to use nuclear curity guard in Seoul, said of the ance with the United States has weapons to defend South Korea allowed South Korea to build a while knowing North Korea could

powerful democracy, its citizens retaliate with a nuclear strike killing millions of Americans.

Frequent polls show a strong mountains that stand along the Korean Peninsula under its own between 70% and 80% in some surveys – support their nation acquiring atomic weapons or urging Washington to bring back the tactical nuclear weapons it removed from the South in the early 1990s.

> "I think one day they can abandon us and go their own way if that better serves their national interests," Kim Bang-rak, a se-

> > Please see NUCLEAR, Page A5

Trump

From A3

A spokesman for Trump's campaign did not respond to multiple requests for comment about what authority Trump might use to pursue his plans.

Congress passed the act in 1792, just four years after the Constitution was ratified. Nunn said it's an amalgamation of different statutes enacted between then and little in the way of local law enforcement.

"It is a law that in many ways was created for a country that doesn't exist anymore," he said.

It also is one of the most substantial exceptions to the Posse Comitatus Act, which generally enforcement purposes.

Trump has spoken openly about his plans should he win the presidency, including using the military at the border and in cities struggling with violent crime. His plans also have included using the miliprimary candidates such as Florida Gov. Ron DeSantis and Nikki Haley, the former U.N. ambassador and South Carolina governor.

The threats have raised questions about the meaning of military oaths, presidential power and who his approach.

Trump already has suggested he might bring back retired Army Lt. Gen. Michael Flynn, who served briefly as Trump's national security adviser and twice pleaded guilty to lying to the FBI during election. In the 2022 midterms, its Russian influence probe before being pardoned by Trump. Flynn suggested in the aftermath of the 2020 election that Trump could 40 proclamations invoking the law,



ANDREW HARNIK, ASSOCIATED PRESS

the 1870s, a time when there was Surrounded by Army cadets, President Donald Trump watches the 121st Army-Navy Football Game on Dec. 12, 2020, in Michie Stadium at the U.S. Military Academy in West Point, N.Y. His recent statements raise questions about how he might use the military if he wins another term.

> the military in some states to help for the same crisis, Nunn said. rerun the election.

Attempts to invoke the Insurprohibits using the military for law rection Act and use the military for domestic policing would likely elicit pushback from the Pentagon, where the new chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is Gen. Charles Q. Brown. He was one of the eight members of the Joint Chiefs who signed a memo to military persontary against foreign drug cartels, a nel in the aftermath of the Jan. 6, view echoed by other Republican 2021, attack on the U.S. Capitol. The memo emphasized the oaths they took and called the events of that day, which were intended to stop certification of Democrat Joe Biden's victory over Trump, "sedition and insurrection."

Trump and his party neverthe-Trump could appoint to support less retain wide support among those who have served in the military. AP VoteCast, an in-depth survey of more than 94,000 voters nationwide, showed that 59% of U.S. military veterans voted for Trump in the 2020 presidential 57% of military veterans supported Republican candidates.

Presidents have issued a total of

seize voting machines and order some of those done multiple times Lyndon Johnson invoked it three times - in Baltimore, Chicago and Washington - in response to the unrest in cities after the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Ir. in 1968.

During the Civil Rights era, Presidents Johnson, John F. Kennedy and Dwight Eisenhower used the law to protect activists and students desegregating schools. Eisenhower sent the 101st Airborne to Little Rock, Arkansas, to protect Black students integrating Central High School after that state's governor activated the National Guard to keep the students out.

George H.W. Bush was the last president to use the Insurrection Act, a response to riots in Los Angeles in 1992 after the acquittal of the white police officers who beat Black motorist Rodney King in an incident that was videotaped.

Repeated attempts to invoke the act in a new Trump presidency could put pressure on military leaders, who could face consequences for their actions even if done at the direction of the president.

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND PROPOSED FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR THE FOURTH GENERATION REGIONAL REALIGNMENT. **DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA**

A Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and proposed Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) have been prepared to analyze the potential impacts associated with the relocation of a number of A-10 aircraft and missions, HH-60 aircraft and missions, Joint Terminal Attack Controller training, and Guardian Angel operations to Davis-Monthan AFB. Arizona. The EA. prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality regulations, and Air Force instructions implementing NEPA; evaluates potential impacts of the alternative actions on the environment including the No-Action Alternative. Based on this analysis, the Air Force has prepared a proposed FONSI.

The Draft EA and proposed FONSI are available for review at the following locations:

- Himmel Park Library 1035 N. Treat Avenue Tucson, AZ 85716
- Quincie Douglas Library 1585 East 36th Street Tucson, AZ 85713

Electronic copies of the documents can also be found on the Davis-Monthan AFB website at https://www.dm.af.mil/About-DM/Environmental-Stewardship/. You are encouraged to submit comments through January 9, 2024. Please provide any comments within 30 days of the date of this Notice of Availability. Comments should be provided to Mr. Kevin Wakefield, EIAP Program Manager. Please send him your comments and concerns to 3775 South Fifth Street, Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, 85707-3012, or by email or phone at

kevin.wakefield.1@us.af.mil or (520) 228-4035.

PRIVACY ADVISORY NOTICE

This Draft EA and proposed FONSI are provided for public comment in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the President's Council on Environmental Quality NEPA Regulations (40 CFR §1500-1508), and 32 CFR §989, the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP). The EIAP provides an opportunity for public input on Air Force decision-making, allows the public to offer inputs on alternative ways for the Air Force to accomplish what it is proposing, and solicits comments on the Air Force's analysis of environmental effects.

Public comment allows the Air Force to make better, informed decisions. Letters or other written or oral comments provided may be published in the EA. As required by law, comments provided will be addressed in the EA and made available to the public. Providing personal information is voluntary. Any personal information provided will be used only to identify your desire to make a statement during the public comment portion of any public meetings or hearings or to fulfill requests for copies of the EA and associated documents. Private addresses will be compiled to develop a mailing list for those requesting copies of the EA; however only the names of the individuals making comments and specific comments will be disclosed. Personal home addresses and phone numbers will not be published in the EA.

AVISO DE DISPONIBILIDAD PROYECTO DE EVALUACIÓN AMBIENTAL Y **PROPUESTA DE HALLAZGO DE IMPACTO NO SIGNIFICATIVO PARA REALINEAMIENTO REGIONAL DE CUARTA GENERACIÓN, BASE AÉREA DAVIS-MONTHAN. ARIZONA**

Se ha preparado un Proyecto de Evaluación Ambiental (EA) y una propuesta de Determinación de Impacto No Significativo (FONSI) para analizar los posibles impactos potenciales asociados con la reubicación de una serie de aeronaves y misiones A-10, aeronaves y misiones HH-60, entrenamiento de Controladores de Ataque Terminal Conjunto y operaciones de Ángeles Guardianes a Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona. La EA, preparada de acuerdo con la Ley Nacional de Política Medioambiental (NEPA), la normativa del Consejo de Calidad Medioambiental y las instrucciones del Ejército del Aire para la aplicación de la NEPA, evalúa los impactos potenciales de las acciones alternativas sobre el medio ambiente, incluida la Alternativa de No Acción. Sobre la base de este análisis, el Ejército del Aire ha elaborado una propuesta de FONSI. El Proyecto de EA y el FONSI propuesto están disponibles para su revisión en los siguientes lugares:

- Himmel Park Library 1035 N. Treat Avenue Tucson, AZ 85716
- Quincie Douglas Library 1585 East 36th Street Tucson, AZ 85713.

También se pueden encontrar copias electrónicas de los documentos en el sitio web de la AFB Davis-Monthan en https://www.dm.af.mil/About-DM/Environmental-Stewardship/. Se le invita a enviar comentarios antes de 9 de enero de 2024. Por favor, proporcione cualquier comentario dentro de los 30 días siguientes a la fecha de este Aviso de Disponibilidad. Los comentarios deben ser enviados al Sr. Kevin Wakefield, Gerente del Programa EIAP. Por favor, envíele sus comentarios e inquietudes a 3775 South Fifth Street, Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, 85707-3012, o por correo electrónico o teléfono a kevin.wakefield.1@us.af.mil o (520) 228-4035.

AVISO DE PRIVACIDAD

Este proyecto de EA y el FONSI propuesto se proporcionan para comentarios públicos de conformidad con la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA), el Consejo Presidencial de Normas de Calidad Ambiental de NEPA (40 CFR §1500-1508), y 32 CFR §989, el Proceso de Análisis de impacto Ambiental (EIAP). El EIAP ofrece una oportunidad para que el público haga aportes sobre la toma de decisiones de la Fuerza Aérea, permite al público ofrecer aportes sobre formas alternativas para que la Fuerza Aérea logre lo que propone, y solicita comentarios sobre el análisis de los efectos ambientales por parte de la Fuerza Aérea.

Los comentarios del público permiten a la Fuerza Aérea tomar mejores decisiones informadas. Las cartas u otros comentarios escritos u orales facilitados pueden publicarse en la EA. Según lo requiera la ley, los comentarios proporcionados se abordarán en la EA y se pondrán a disposición del público. Proporcionar información personal es un acto voluntario. Cualquier información personal proporcionada será utilizada únicamente para identificar su deseo de hacer una declaración durante la porción de comentario público de cualquier reunión o audiencia pública o para cumplir con las solicitudes de copias de la EA y documentos asociados. Se recopilarán direcciones privadas para elaborar una lista de correo para los que soliciten copias de la EA; sin embargo, sólo se revelarán los nombres de los individuos que hagan comentarios, y los comentarios específicos. Las direcciones personales de la casa y los números de teléfono no serán publicados en la EA.