

Environmental Impact Statement for EA-18G “Growler” Airfield Operations at Naval Air Station Whidbey Island Complex, WA

Volume 1: Main Body of the EIS

September 2018

Prepared for:



**Environmental Impact Statement for EA-18G “Growler” Airfield
Operations at Naval Air Station Whidbey Island Complex
Volume 1
Main Body of the EIS**

September 2018

Prepared by:



United States Department of the Navy

This page intentionally left blank.

Abstract

Designation: Environmental Impact Statement
Title of Proposed Action: Environmental Impact Statement for EA-18G “Growler” Airfield Operations at Naval Air Station Whidbey Island Complex
Project Location: Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, Washington
Lead Agency for the EIS: Department of the Navy
Affected Region: Island County Region, Washington
Action Proponent: United States Fleet Forces, Department of the Navy
Point of Contact: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Atlantic
Attn: Code EV21/SS
6506 Hampton Boulevard
Norfolk, VA 23508
Date: September 2018

The Department of the Navy has prepared this Environmental Impact Statement in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, as implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality regulations and Navy regulations for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act. The Proposed Action would:

- continue and expand existing Growler operations at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island complex, which includes field carrier landing practice by Growler aircraft that occurs at Ault Field and Outlying Landing Field Coupeville
- increase electronic attack capabilities by adding 35 or 36 aircraft to support an expanded U.S. Department of Defense mission for identifying, tracking, and targeting in a complex electronic warfare environment
- construct and renovate facilities at Ault Field to accommodate additional Growler aircraft
- station additional personnel and their family members at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island complex and in the surrounding community

In addition, the Navy will continue all flight operations of other aircraft at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island complex. This Environmental Impact Statement evaluates the potential environmental impacts associated with a No Action Alternative (per Council on Environmental Quality regulations) and three action alternatives. The three alternatives consider options for increasing the number of additional Growler aircraft, as appropriated by Congress, at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island complex. Each alternative contains further analysis of five operational scenarios that involve different distributions of annual field carrier landing practice airfield operations between Ault Field and Outlying Landing Field Coupeville. Each alternative evaluates the effects resulting from each of these five operational scenarios. The Environmental Impact Statement evaluates the potential environmental impacts associated with the following resource areas: airspace, noise, safety, air quality, land use, cultural resources, American Indian traditional resources, biological resources, water resources, socioeconomics, environmental justice, transportation, infrastructure, geological resources, hazardous materials and wastes, climate change and greenhouse gases, as well as the cumulative impacts of the Proposed Action and other local projects.

This page intentionally left blank

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Proposed Action

Beginning as early as 2018, the United States (U.S.) Department of the Navy (Navy), as the lead agency, proposes to:

- continue and expand existing Growler operations at the Naval Air Station (NAS) Whidbey Island complex, which includes field carrier landing practice (FCLP) by Growler aircraft that occurs at Ault Field and Outlying Landing Field (OLF) Coupeville
- increase electronic attack capabilities by adding 35 or 36 aircraft to support an expanded U.S. Department of Defense mission for identifying, tracking, and targeting in a complex electronic warfare environment
- construct and renovate facilities at Ault Field to accommodate additional Growler aircraft
- station additional personnel and their family members at the NAS Whidbey Island complex and in the surrounding community

In addition, the Navy would continue all flight operations of other aircraft at the NAS Whidbey Island complex.

The NAS Whidbey Island complex is located in Island County, Washington, on Whidbey Island, in the northern Puget Sound region. The main air station (Ault Field) is located in the north-central part of the island, adjacent to the City of Oak Harbor. OLF Coupeville is located approximately 10 miles south of Ault Field and is dedicated primarily to FCLP. The NAS Whidbey Island complex includes two additional areas, the Seaplane Base and Lake Hancock. The Seaplane Base is included in this analysis because it contains housing and support facilities that would be used by personnel and their dependents. Section 2.3.2 provides a description of the squadrons and aircraft under consideration for the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action would not impact resources at Lake Hancock; therefore, Lake Hancock will not be discussed further in this analysis.

Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to augment the Navy's existing Electronic Attack community at NAS Whidbey Island by operating additional Growler aircraft as appropriated by Congress. The Navy needs to effectively and efficiently increase electronic attack capabilities in order to counter increasingly sophisticated threats and provide more aircraft per squadron in order to give operational commanders more flexibility in addressing future threats and missions. The need for the Proposed Action is to maintain and expand Growler operational readiness to support national defense requirements under Title 10, United States Code, Section 5062.

Alternatives Considered

In developing the proposed range of alternatives that meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action, the Navy reviewed requirements for Growler squadrons and unit-level squadron training in light of Title 10 responsibilities, existing training requirements and regulations, existing Navy infrastructure, and Chief of Naval Operations guidance to support operating naval forces. Operational factors, including incorporation of Precision Landing Mode and a reduced number of pilots, have been factored into the analysis and reduce FCLP requirements at the NAS Whidbey Island complex when compared to projections in

the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (see Section 1.13 for more details). The Navy also reviewed comments received through the public commenting process. Considerations included:

- the NAS Whidbey Island complex is home to the Navy's Electronic Attack mission, including the training squadron, all U.S.-based squadrons, and substantial infrastructure and training ranges that have been established during the past 45-plus years
- location of suitable airfields that provide for the most realistic training environment
- distance aircraft would have to travel to accomplish training
- expense of duplicating capabilities that already exist at the NAS Whidbey Island complex
- operational readiness and synergy of the small Growler community
- access to training ranges, Special Use Airspace, and military training routes
- effective use of existing infrastructure
- management of aircraft inventories, simulators, maintenance equipment, and logistical support
- effective use of personnel to improve operational responsiveness and readiness
- existing land use and public health and safety concerns

Based on the considerations mentioned above, the Navy is analyzing three alternatives, each of which has five operational scenarios that meet the purpose and need for the Proposed Action, as well as a No Action Alternative, per Council on Environmental Quality regulations. The alternatives consist of force structure and operational changes to support an expanded Department of Defense capacity and include variations of the following factors:

- total number of operational aircraft to be flown
- number of aircraft assigned per squadron
- number of expeditionary squadrons
- number of personnel
- distribution of Growler FCLP operations at Ault Field and OLF Coupeville

Alternatives considered but not carried forward for detailed analysis in this EIS because they did not meet the purpose of and need for the project are described in detail in Section 2.4 (Alternatives Considered but Not Carried Forward for Further Analysis).

Preferred Alternative

The Navy did not identify a Preferred Alternative prior to publication of the Draft EIS in November 2016 because it was evaluating operational and environmental considerations necessary to make that determination. The Navy announced the Preferred Alternative on June 25, 2018, prior to release of the Final EIS, in order to provide timely information to the public once the Preferred Alternative had been identified. Alternative 2, adding 36 Growler aircraft to the NAS Whidbey Island complex, has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. This alternative best meets operational demands by both establishing two new expeditionary squadrons and adding two aircraft to each squadron that operates off aircraft carriers. Further, Scenario A has been identified as the preferred scenario under Alternative 2 for FCLP distribution because it results in the least disruption of other operations at Ault Field, provides the best training for Navy pilots, and impacts the fewest number of residents living in the community. No final decision has yet been made. The ultimate decision with respect to force structure and FCLP

distribution will be made by the Secretary of the Navy or his representative and announced in a Record of Decision no earlier than 30 days following the public release of the Final EIS. For more details on the Preferred Alternative, see Section 2.4.

No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Action would not occur; this means the Navy would not operate additional Growler aircraft and would not add additional personnel at Ault Field, and no construction associated with the Proposed Action would occur. The No Action Alternative would not meet the purpose of or need for the Proposed Action; however, the conditions associated with the No Action Alternative serve as reference points for describing and quantifying the potential impacts associated with the proposed alternatives. For this EIS, the Navy is using the year 2021 as representative of the No Action Alternative because it represents the conditions when projected events at Ault Field affecting aircraft loading, facility and infrastructure assets, personnel levels, and number of aircraft are expected to be fully implemented and complete from previous aircraft home basing, retirement, and other related decisions. Therefore, with these other actions complete, the analysis clearly reflects the impacts of this Proposed Action of adding additional Growler aircraft and personnel and associated construction.

Alternative 1

Alternative 1 would expand carrier capabilities by adding three additional aircraft and additional squadron personnel to each of the existing nine carrier squadrons and augmenting the Fleet Replacement Squadron (FRS) with eight additional aircraft and additional squadron personnel (a net increase of 35 aircraft). Alternative 1 would add 335 Navy personnel and 459 dependents to the region.

Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would expand expeditionary and carrier capabilities by establishing two new expeditionary squadrons, adding two additional aircraft and additional squadron personnel to each of the nine existing carrier squadrons, and augmenting the FRS with eight additional aircraft and additional squadron personnel (a net increase of 36 aircraft). Alternative 2 would add 628 Navy personnel and 860 dependents to the region.

Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would expand expeditionary and carrier capabilities by adding three additional aircraft and additional squadron personnel to each of the three existing expeditionary squadrons, adding two additional aircraft and additional squadron personnel to each of the nine existing carrier squadrons, and augmenting the FRS with nine additional aircraft and additional squadron personnel (a net increase of 36 aircraft). Alternative 3 would add 341 Navy personnel and 467 dependents to the region.

In order to determine how the distribution of Growler FCLP operations may affect noise impacts at OLF Coupeville and Ault Field, this EIS evaluates the following five sub-alternatives, which are operational scenarios (analyzing varying distribution of Growler FCLP operations between Ault Field and OLF Coupeville) for each alternative listed above. The percentages depicted are used for general description

of the scenarios. The proposed level of activity for each alternative and associated scenario is quantified in Table 2.3-2.

Scenario A

Twenty percent of all FCLPs would be conducted at Ault Field, and 80 percent of all FCLPs would be conducted at OLF Coupeville.

Scenario B

Fifty percent of all FCLPs would be conducted at Ault Field, and 50 percent of all FCLPs would be conducted at OLF Coupeville.

Scenario C

Eighty percent of all FCLPs would be conducted at Ault Field, and 20 percent of all FCLPs would be conducted at OLF Coupeville.

Scenario D

Thirty percent of all FCLPs would be conducted at Ault Field, and 70 percent of all FCLPs would be conducted at OLF Coupeville.

Scenario E

Seventy percent of all FCLPs would be conducted at Ault Field, and 30 percent of all FCLPs would be conducted at OLF Coupeville.

The above five scenarios (A, B, C, D, and E), in combination with the alternatives, provide a total of 15 alternatives that are fully evaluated in this EIS analysis. The Secretary of the Navy's office will be able to select a final alternative/scenario combination from the range of 15 analyzed in this EIS.

Scenarios are based on the distribution of Growler FCLP between Ault Field and OLF Coupeville. The FCLP percentages for each scenario that are expressed in this analysis are intended to analyze levels of total aircraft operations. FCLPs are not expected to exceed those analyzed in this document. The percentages are not intended to provide a firm division of FCLPs between airfields. The percentages are used for general description of the scenarios; the distribution of FCLPs will be based on the level of activity presented in Table 2.3-2. From a purely operational perspective, the Navy would prefer to use OLF Coupeville for all FCLPs because it more closely replicates the pattern and conditions at sea and therefore provides superior training. However, because the Navy recognizes that noise impacts to the community are an unavoidable adverse effect of the Proposed Action, this EIS analyzes five operational scenarios at the expense of ideal training.

Summary of Environmental Resources Evaluated in the EIS

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality regulations, and Navy regulations for implementing NEPA specify that an EIS should address those resource areas potentially subject to impacts. In addition, the level of analysis should be commensurate with the anticipated level of environmental impact. This EIS assesses the potential environmental effects of continuing and expanding the existing Growler operations at the NAS Whidbey Island complex, and it analyzes aircraft operations conducted in the vicinity of Ault Field and OLF Coupeville, including the effects of additional military personnel and their families who would move to the area. The following topics are evaluated in this EIS:

- Airspace and Airfield Operations
- Noise Associated with Aircraft Operations (Noise)
- Public Health and Safety
- Air Quality
- Land Use
- Cultural Resources
- American Indian Traditional Resources
- Biological Resources
- Water Resources
- Socioeconomics
- Environmental Justice
- Transportation
- Infrastructure
- Geological Resources
- Hazardous Materials and Wastes
- Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases

Summary of Potential Environmental Consequences of the Action Alternatives and Major Mitigating Actions

Airspace and Airfield Operations. Alternative 1 proposes a net increase of 35 Growler aircraft, while Alternatives 2 and 3 propose a net increase of 36 Growler aircraft. Annual airfield operations at the NAS Whidbey Island complex would increase up to 33 percent (depending on alternative and scenario selected) over the No Action Alternative to support the addition of 35 or 36 new aircraft assigned to Ault Field. The total annual airfield operations at the NAS Whidbey Island complex would range from an increase of approximately 24,500 (Alternative 3, Scenario C) to 27,900 (Alternative 1, Scenario A). The total annual airfield operations at Ault Field would range from an increase of 9,100 (Alternative 1, Scenario A) to 25,000 (Alternatives 1 and 2, Scenario C). The total annual airfield operations at OLF Coupeville would range from a decrease of 200 (Alternatives 2 and 3, Scenario C) to an increase of 18,800 (Alternative 1, Scenario A). Airfield operations may include aircraft arrival and departure, interfacility flights, and closed-loop flights (such as FCLP). These operational levels would be similar to historic flight operations experienced in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s for the NAS Whidbey Island complex, as indicated in Section 1.4. Ault Field and OLF Coupeville meet all the operational requirements and have sufficient capacity under routine operating conditions to support the airfield operations of the additional Growler aircraft proposed under each alternative and scenario. Airfield operations at Ault Field would experience scheduling difficulty under Scenario C and Scenario E of all three of the alternatives because approximately 80 percent and 70 percent of FCLPs would be conducted at Ault Field under those scenarios, respectively. When more FCLPs are flown at Ault Field, other flights and aircraft training operations occurring at Ault Field are restricted or delayed. This would cause more people off base to be affected because training is extended later into the night, and more aircraft are held in larger or extended flight patterns while FCLP is conducted. For more information on airspace and airfield operations, see Sections 3.1 and 4.1.

Noise Associated with Aircraft Operations. The U.S. Department of Defense recommends land use controls beginning at the 65 decibel (dB) day-night average sound level (DNL). This level has been identified in both the Federal Aviation Administration's Part 150 Program and the Department of Defense's Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) Program (including the individual Air Force and Navy programs) as a threshold for land use recommendations. Research has indicated that about 87 percent of the population is not highly annoyed by outdoor sound levels below 65 dB DNL (FICUN [Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise], 1980). Most people are exposed to sound levels of 50 to 55 dB DNL or higher on a daily basis. Therefore, the 65 dB DNL contour is used to help determine compatibility of local land use with military aircraft operations, particularly for land use associated with airfields. There would be new areas that would be located within the 65 dB DNL noise contour that are not currently within the 65 dB DNL noise contour generated by Navy aircraft operations under all alternatives and scenarios. Although some of these areas are over water, others are over land and would therefore result in additional people living within the 65 dB DNL noise contour.

The number of additional people who are estimated to be within the 65 dB DNL noise contour ranges from a high of 1,879 (Alternative 1, Scenario E) to a low of 1,312 (Alternative 3, Scenario A) for the entire NAS Whidbey Island complex. When examining community impacts by individual airfield, Ault Field would have the largest increase of individuals within the 65 dB DNL noise contour under Scenario C, up to 1,312 people (Alternative 1, Scenario C), while the lowest increase would be 109 individuals under Alternative 3, Scenario A. For OLF Coupeville, the largest increase of individuals within the 65 dB DNL noise contour would be under Scenario A, with up to 1,236 people (Alternative 1, Scenario A), while the lowest increase would be 489 individuals under Alternative 2, Scenario C. Therefore, the Proposed Action would have a significant impact on the noise environment as it relates to aircraft operations at the NAS Whidbey Island complex.

Additionally, supplemental metrics were used to identify potential impacts from noise exposure that could be realized under the alternatives. These include additional events of indoor and outdoor speech interference, an increase in the number of events causing classroom/learning interference, an increase in the probability of awakening, and an increase in the population that may be vulnerable to a potential hearing loss of 5 dB or more.

It is NAS Whidbey Island Commanding Officer's policy to conduct required training and operational flights with as minimal impact as possible, including noise, on surrounding communities. All aircrews using NAS Whidbey Island are responsible for the safe conduct of their mission while complying with published course rules, established noise-abatement procedures, and good common sense. Each aircrew must be familiar with the noise profiles of its aircraft and is expected to minimize noise impacts without compromising operational and safety requirements. Specific noise-abatement procedures and policy are outlined in Sections 3.2 and 4.2, and Appendix H, with procedures listed in NAS Whidbey Island's Air Operations Manual. The NAS Whidbey Island Air Operations Manual is periodically reviewed and updated as necessary to reflect changes to procedures and operations. For more information on noise from aircraft operations, see Sections 3.2 and 4.2.

Public Health and Safety. Increased operations increase the potential for flight incidents and bird-animal aircraft strike hazard, but existing management strategies would manage risk. Scenarios with high numbers of operations at OLF Coupeville may require the development of Accident Potential Zones (APZs) through the AICUZ update process, including Alternative 1, Scenario A; Alternative 1, Scenario B; Alternative 1, Scenario D; Alternative 2, Scenario A; Alternative 2, Scenario B; Alternative 2, Scenario D;

Alternative 3, Scenario A; Alternative 3, Scenario B; and Alternative 3, Scenario D. Conceptual APZs are presented for the purpose of analyzing potential land use impacts of the Proposed Action (see Section 4.3.2.3). At this time, no decision has been made with regard to additional APZs. The Navy will perform an AICUZ Update upon completion of this EIS and share official recommendations with the community.

Under Executive Order 13045, Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks to Children, the Navy identifies that there would be an increase in the number of children (19 years of age and younger) within the noise contours under all alternatives and scenarios; the increase in the number of children likely to be affected by the greater than 65 dB DNL contours would range from a low of 230 children under Alternative 3, Scenario A, to a high of 440 children under Alternative 1, Scenario C, under the average year. Based on the limited scientific literature available, there is no proven positive correlation between noise-related events and physiological changes in children. Additionally, the aircraft noise associated with the alternatives is intermittent; therefore, the Navy does not anticipate any significant, disproportionate health impacts to children caused by aircraft noise. Unless there is a place where children congregate within an APZ, such as a school, there is not a disproportionate safety risk to children residing in that APZ. There are no schools located within the existing or conceptual APZs at Ault Field and OLF Coupeville under any of the alternatives or scenarios; therefore, there is no disproportionate environmental health and safety risk to children as a result of possible aircraft mishaps. For more information on public health and safety, see Sections 3.3 and 4.3.

Air Quality. Potential impacts to air quality from implementation of the Proposed Action when compared to the No Action Alternative would be similar between all three action alternatives and five scenarios but greatest under Alternative 2, Scenario A. For air emissions, the difference in aircraft emissions between the scenarios within each alternative is more distinctive than the differences in aircraft emissions between the alternatives. For all three alternatives, Scenario A, the option to conduct 80 percent of FCLPs at OLF Coupeville and 20 percent of FCLPs at Ault Field, would result in the greatest increase in emissions.

Construction impacts would be minor and temporary, and would not result in significant impacts on air quality. Operations would result in an increase in stationary and mobile emissions sources. Increased stationary sources would be covered under the existing NAS Whidbey Island air operating permit and would have no significant impact. Changes in mobile emissions are not subject to permit requirements or emission thresholds; however, these emissions contribute to regional emission totals and may affect compliance with National Ambient Air Quality Standards. The region is currently in attainment for all National Ambient Air Quality Standards, and the Northwest Clean Air Agency continues to monitor ambient air emission levels to confirm continued compliance. For more information on air quality, see Sections 3.4 and 4.4.

Land Use. Each of the alternatives would result in an increase in the land area within the projected greater than 65 dB DNL noise contours (range of 9 percent to 18 percent). There would be an increase in residential land use within the greater than 65 dB DNL noise contour as compared to the No Action Alternative, ranging from an increase of 5 percent to 11 percent at Ault Field to an increase of 22 to 51 percent at OLF Coupeville.

Under all alternatives and scenarios, the Proposed Action would have no impact to on-station land use, on-station land use controls, or regional land use, but it would have an impact on regional land use controls. Land within the conceptual APZs at OLF Coupeville would increase under Scenarios A, B, and D of each alternative. Conceptual APZs at OLF Coupeville would impact 503 acres of residential land under

Scenarios A, B, and D under all three alternatives, if adopted by the local municipality with authority regarding land use controls. If warranted and depending upon the alternative and scenario selected, the APZs could be updated by completing an AICUZ Update and coordinating with local communities to provide appropriate new land use recommendations as necessary, which could impact regional land-use controls.

Implementation of the Proposed Action would result in moderate impacts on wilderness recreation and management at Williamson Rocks, an uninhabited rock formation closed to the public that is included in the San Juan Island Wilderness, part of the San Juan Island National Wildlife Refuge. Williamson Rocks is in proximity to a busy marina and Rosario Strait, which is a U.S. Coast Guard Regulated Navigation Area due to the amount of vessel traffic through this passage. Implementation of the Proposed Action would increase average annual noise levels at Williamson Rocks under all alternatives and would result in reduced opportunities for visitors by boat to experience natural soundscapes associated with the rocks and surrounding waters. The Proposed Action also may impact the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's ability to manage Williamson Rocks to protect wilderness values. Although visitors are currently exposed to noise from existing aircraft operations, the proposed increase in Growler operations would increase the occurrence of intrusive noise at and near this area, which would result in fewer or limited opportunities for visitors to experience solitude and primitive recreational activities and would likely negatively affect visitors' perceptions of these areas as retaining their primeval, natural character. Impacts to visitor experience and wilderness character would be intermittent over the long term, occurring only when aircraft are operating in the area.

Overall, implementation of the Proposed Action at NAS Whidbey Island would result in localized significant impacts to recreation as a result of increased noise exposure at Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve, various county and municipal parks and recreational areas, and private recreational facilities under some alternatives and scenarios when aircraft are operating in the area. Impacts on other parks and recreational areas would predominantly be long term and minor or moderate at individual locations as a result of varying degrees of increased noise exposure. Depending on the location of the park, different scenarios may result in few to no noise impacts as a result of the number of Growler operations occurring at either Ault Field or OLF Coupeville. Noise impacts would be intermittent over the long term, occurring only when aircraft are operating in the area. The Proposed Action may result in increased demand for parks and recreation areas as a result of personnel and their families moving into the region; however, impacts resulting from this increased demand would be minor.

Cultural Resources. Archaeological resources, architectural resources, cemeteries, and traditional cultural properties were evaluated with regard to direct and indirect effects under NEPA and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA). Direct effects were considered within areas on the installation where cultural resources could be affected by ground disturbance, demolition, or alteration. Indirect effects were considered for on- and off-station¹ areas within the 65 dB DNL noise contours and within the Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve. Indirect effects constitute those that result from construction (on station) at Ault Field or from aircraft operations (on and off station) occurring at both Ault Field and OLF Coupeville. They include effects from

¹ "On station" refers to those areas within Ault Field and OLF Coupeville. "Off station" refers to those resources located outside these areas and, for the cultural resources discussion, that also are within the area of potential effects.

the introduction of visual, atmospheric, and/or auditory (noise and vibration) elements that occur during construction or when aircraft are seen or heard flying in the vicinity of a resource.

As evaluated under NEPA, minimal to no direct or indirect impacts would result to known or intact archaeological resources during construction and operation. With regard to architectural resources, moderate to no direct and indirect impacts would occur. Direct impacts during construction would occur to and in proximity to Building 2737 (Hangar 12) and the taxiways, and for the demolition of Building 115; however, the hangar, taxiways, and Building 115 have been determined not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Indirect impacts, including visual, atmospheric, and/or auditory impacts, may be experienced in the immediate proximity of construction activities on Ault Field and in those areas on and off station within the 65 dB DNL noise contours and within Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve during aircraft operations. Minimal indirect impacts are anticipated to occur with the operation of the additional Growler aircraft or from the new construction and expansion of facilities on station.

Minimal to moderate indirect impacts are anticipated to occur to off-station historic resources during aircraft operations. Under Scenario A (for all alternatives), resources that are closer to OLF Coupeville may experience a higher level of visual, atmospheric, and/or auditory impact and more frequent occurrences of aircraft appearances, noise, and vibration than those located elsewhere due to the increased FCLPs at OLF Coupeville for this scenario as compared to Scenarios B, C, D, and E. Under Scenario B, resources that are closer to both Ault Field and OLF Coupeville may experience a higher level of impact. Under Scenario C, resources that are closer to Ault Field (and not OLF Coupeville) may experience a higher level of impact and OLF Coupeville a lower level of impact. Under Scenario D, resources that are closer to OLF Coupeville (and not Ault Field) may experience a higher level of impact and Ault Field a lower level of impact. Under Scenario E, resources that are closer to Ault Field (and not OLF Coupeville) may experience a higher level of impact and OLF Coupeville a lower level of impact.

No known cemeteries or human burial grounds are located within Ault Field; therefore, no direct impacts would occur. Off-station cemeteries would be indirectly impacted in a manner similar to architectural resources. No known traditional cultural properties have been identified within the areas evaluated for this analysis; therefore, no impacts would occur to these cultural resources.

Under NEPA, no significant impacts would occur to cultural resources, including archaeological sites, architectural buildings and structures, cemeteries, and traditional cultural properties.

In accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA, the Navy has determined that the proposed undertaking will result in "Historic Properties Adversely Affected." The increased frequency of noise exposure results in adverse indirect effects to characteristics of the Central Whidbey Island Historic District that currently make it eligible for the NRHP. Although the effects are intermittent, the proposed undertaking would result in an increased occurrence of noise exposure affecting certain cultural landscape components in the historic district—specifically, the perceptual qualities of five locations that contribute to the significance of the landscapes. The Navy finds no other adverse effects to historic properties from the proposed undertaking. The Navy is consulting with the Washington State Historic Preservation Office, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, tribes, and consulting parties regarding the development of a Memorandum of Agreement to mitigate adverse effects. A full list of consulting parties is provided in Section 3.6.2.6. For more information on cultural resources, see Sections 3.6 and 4.6.

American Indian Traditional Resources. The implementation of the Proposed Action at NAS Whidbey Island should not result in significant impacts to known American Indian traditional resources because there would be no change to current tribal access and no additional potential to impact known traditional resources in the study area. In accordance with executive orders and U.S. Department of Defense and Navy policies, the Navy invited government-to-government consultation with the following federally recognized tribes that could potentially be affected by the Proposed Action and evaluated whether such consultation was desired:

- Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe
- Lummi Tribe of the Lummi Reservation
- Samish Indian Nation
- Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians of Washington
- Suquamish Indian Tribe of the Port Madison Reservation
- Swinomish Indian Tribal Community
- Tulalip Tribes of Washington
- Upper Skagit Indian Tribe

The Swinomish Indian Tribal Community requested government-to-government consultation on the Proposed Action on December 13, 2016. The Navy responded to the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community via email on December 20, 2016, and via letter on December 21, 2016. Additional correspondence occurred in June of 2017. The Swinomish Indian Tribal Community subsequently withdrew its request on September 27, 2017. No other requests for government-to-government consultation were received. For more information on American Indian traditional resources, see Sections 3.7 and 4.7.

Biological Resources. Minimal habitat loss from construction activities would not significantly impact terrestrial wildlife because construction is within the urban/industrial area of the installation and has habitat of poor quality and would not impact marine habitat. Animals in the study area are already exposed to high levels of aircraft operations and other human disturbances, and the Proposed Action would result in some additional sensory disturbance impacts, particularly from noise. Wildlife inhabiting the study area throughout the year increase the risk of a strike, but with the continued implementation of a bird-animal aircraft strike hazard plan, the Proposed Action would not significantly impact local wildlife populations. For Endangered Species Act listed species, the Proposed Action may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, the bull trout, green sturgeon, eulachon, Chinook salmon, Hood Canal summer-run chum, steelhead, bocaccio rockfish, yelloweye rockfish, Southern Resident killer whale, and humpback whale. The National Marine Fisheries Service concurred with the finding that the Proposed Action is not likely to adversely affect endangered or threatened marine mammals and fish, respectively, on July 20, 2017, and April 23, 2018. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) concluded in its June 14, 2018, Biological Opinion that the Proposed Action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the marbled murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*) and may affect but is not likely to adversely affect the bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*). As required by the terms and conditions associated with the Incidental Take Statement, the Navy will submit an annual report to the USFWS describing Growler flight operations from the previous year. For Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA)-protected species, U.S. Department of Defense installations are not exempt from “take”; however, under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), the impacts of stressors from the Proposed Action would not result in a significant adverse effect on migratory bird populations. During

construction, there would be no adverse effects of the Proposed Action on Migratory Bird Treaty Act-protected species because birds would be largely avoided and any effects minimized such that they would not rise to the level of take. For more information on biological resources, see Sections 3.8 and 4.8. Pursuant to the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Proposed Action would not result in the unintentional taking (e.g., harassment) of marine mammals incidental to the activity.

Water Resources. There would be no significant impacts on water resources from construction activities or operation of new aircraft. No construction would extend to a depth that may impact groundwater resources, and there would be a minimal increase in demand for groundwater. Although fuel or other chemicals could be spilled during construction, implementation of best management practices (BMPs), such as immediate cleanup of these spills, would prevent any infiltration into the underlying groundwater. There would be no direct impact on water quality because construction would not be occurring within resource areas. Potential indirect impacts on water quality due to 2 acres of new impervious surface at Ault Field (a 1-percent increase over existing conditions) would slightly increase stormwater flow. Impacts would be minimized and avoided through implementation of BMPs. For more information on water resources, see Sections 3.9 and 4.9.

Socioeconomics. The Proposed Action would have minor impacts on the local and regional population, ranging from a net increase of 794 people under Alternative 1 to 1,488 people under Alternative 2. Construction impacts would result in temporary and positive impacts to the local economy. There would be up to \$122.5 million in direct construction expenditures, up to 839 projected short-term employment positions from construction activities, and an additional 335 (Alternative 1) to 628 (Alternative 2) personnel and their households in the region spending money. An additional \$12.2 million (Alternative 1) to \$21.4 million (Alternative 2) in payroll would also be injected into the regional economy from military members' salaries. The increase in local government tax receipts would range from \$222,000 in Island County and \$96,000 in Skagit County under Alternative 1 to \$415,000 in Island County and \$181,000 in Skagit County under Alternative 2. Between 335 (Alternative 1) and 628 (Alternative 2) households would relocate to the area. In 2017, a housing study completed for the NAS Whidbey Island complex found that there was a surplus of 54 acceptable family housing units in the area but a deficit of 914 unaccompanied personnel housing units. Under all three alternatives, the regional housing supply may not have sufficient vacancies to handle the influx of personnel (requiring 335 to 628 housing units), causing an impact on the housing market. Housing affordability would also be negatively affected. Under all three alternatives, local school districts, particularly the Oak Harbor School District, would experience an increase in enrollment. The projected increase in enrollment ranges from 121 students under Alternative 1 to 226 students under Alternative 2. The increased enrollment at the Oak Harbor School District would further exacerbate the existing overcrowding problem and have a significant adverse impact on the district. Minimal to no impact is expected on medical, police, and fire services under all three alternatives. For more information on socioeconomics, see Sections 3.10 and 4.10.

Environmental Justice. Under all alternatives and scenarios, there are minority populations and low-income populations living within the affected environment. The Navy has concluded that there are environmental justice communities within the affected area and there are significant impacts outlined within the EIS to populations living within the affected area (noise impacts to those living within the 65 dB DNL noise contours and overcrowding at Oak Harbor School District schools). However, the Navy has determined that there will be no disproportionate high and adverse human health or environmental effects from noise, Clear Zones/Accident Potential Zones, or school overcrowding on minority populations or low-income populations. The Navy has, however, concluded that impacts on housing

availability and housing affordability could have the potential to have a disproportionately high and adverse impact on low-income communities. The Navy further acknowledges that the increase in the cost of housing and the decrease in available properties may have a negative impact on low-income residents, who typically spend a larger proportion of their income on housing than the general population. For more information on environmental justice, see Sections 3.11 and 4.11.

Transportation. Construction impacts would result in increased traffic on and off the installation, but roadways would be able to handle the increase. An increase in personnel and dependents would result in an increase in traffic on local roads. New trips per weekday would be lowest under Alternative 1 and highest under Alternative 2, regardless of the scenario selected. Under Alternative 1, there would be an estimated 122 to 2,051 new trips per weekday on major roadways off base, and under Alternative 2, there would be an estimated 229 to 3,845 new trips per weekday on major roadways off base. Traffic would be spread throughout roads in Island and Skagit Counties, and, although there would be some degradation of service, it would not be expected to result in level of service falling below established level of service standards. An area of concern at the intersection of State Route 20 and Banta Road would see an increase of between 238 daily trips under Alternative 1 and 445 daily trips under Alternative 2; however, the Washington State Department of Transportation will implement intersection improvements by 2019. An increase in gate traffic of approximately 3 percent to 6 percent over No Action Alternative traffic volumes entering and exiting the installation may result in queuing of vehicles, but this would be limited to peak hours. No significant increase in use of transit, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities would occur because the majority of new traffic would be car based. For more information on transportation, see Sections 3.12 and 4.12.

Infrastructure. Increased consumption or demand would occur for water, wastewater, stormwater, solid waste management, energy, and communications systems from the increase in population that would be spread throughout Island and Skagit Counties. Existing and future capacity is expected to handle the increases in demand; therefore, no significant impacts are expected. Increased consumption or demand is lowest under Alternative 1 (335 additional households in the region) and highest under Alternative 2 (628 additional households in the region) for all types of infrastructure analyzed. New facilities under each alternative would also result in increased demand for infrastructure resources on station. For more information on infrastructure, see Sections 3.13 and 4.13.

Geological Resources. Construction would not include clearing or blasting of earth or rock, and only minor grading activities would occur; therefore, no significant impacts on geologic resources would occur. There would be no impact on resistance to seismic events because all buildings constructed under the Proposed Action would be designed to conform to the seismic provisions of the Washington State Building Code, and a Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure plan would be in place during construction. Impacts to soils during construction could include compaction and rutting from vehicle traffic and an increase in erosion, but impacts would be minimized through the use of BMPs. No significant impacts would occur. BMPs would be implemented to further reduce or eliminate any potential impacts. For more information on geological resources, see Sections 3.14 and 4.14.

Hazardous Waste and Materials. No significant impacts related to hazardous waste and materials would occur due to construction activities or from the addition and operation of additional Growler aircraft. Hazardous materials and wastes would increase in quantity but would be managed under existing law and Navy regulation and management practices. Impacts under Alternatives 2 and 3 would be negligibly higher (36 aircraft) than under Alternative 1 (35 aircraft). The existing practices and strategies would

successfully manage the use and disposal of these materials. No proposed construction activities would occur within or in proximity to any Defense Environmental Restoration Program sites; therefore ongoing remedial programs would not be impacted. For more information on hazardous waste and materials, see Sections 3.15 and 4.15.

Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases. Climate change will continue to occur, resulting in global impacts affecting Whidbey Island and Puget Sound and the Navy's priorities and mission. Federal, state, and local agencies, including the U.S. Department of Defense, will continue to assess impacts and define adaptation and mitigation strategies to address them.

The increase in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the Proposed Action equates to less than 1 percent of all aircraft GHG emissions in Washington. Therefore, the GHG emissions from the Proposed Action should not have a significant impact on Washington's GHG emission goals. Stationary GHG emissions would increase by 4 percent under the alternatives when compared to the No Action Alternative. Mobile GHG emissions would increase by between 25 percent (Scenario C under Alternatives 1 and 3) and 40 percent (Scenario A under all three alternatives) under the alternatives when compared to the No Action Alternative. For more information on climate change and GHGs, see Sections 3.16 and 4.16.

Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

Table 4.17-1 (Summary of Potential Impacts to Resource Areas) provides a tabular summary of the potential impacts to the resources associated with each of the alternatives analyzed. This EIS does not identify any new mitigation measures considering the degree of environmental impacts for the implementation of alternatives but does identify measures that could be taken to develop suggested mitigation techniques, including, but not limited to, stormwater retention practices. During the NEPA process, through comments received during public and regulatory agency review of the EIS, there is the potential to identify and develop new mitigation measures. Appendix H (Noise Mitigation) provides an overview of existing, voluntary noise-mitigation measures that are in place at the NAS Whidbey Island complex. Appendix H also describes potential noise-mitigation measures that are being evaluated for potential future implementation as the Navy takes a proactive approach to noise mitigation and addressing community concerns. Under the Section 106 process, further consultation and development of a Memorandum of Agreement to address adverse effects on historic resources is ongoing. The Navy is consulting with the Washington State Historic Preservation Office, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, tribes, and consulting parties regarding the Memorandum of Agreement. If additional mitigation measures are identified during this process, they would be identified in the Record of Decision. These measures would be funded, and efforts to ensure their successful completion or implementation would be treated as compliance requirements.

Public Involvement

The Navy solicited public, tribal, and state and federal agency comments during two scoping periods and during the Draft EIS review period:

Public Scoping Comment Periods:

1. September 5, 2013, to January 3, 2014, and reopened from January 13 to January 31, 2014
2. October 8, 2014, through January 9, 2015

Public Scoping meetings were held on:

- December 3, 2013, in Coupeville, Washington
- December 4, 2013, in Oak Harbor, Washington
- December 5, 2013, in Anacortes, Washington
- October 28, 2014, in Coupeville, Washington
- October 29, 2014, in Oak Harbor, Washington
- October 30, 2014, in Anacortes, Washington
- December 3, 2014, on Lopez Island, Washington
- December 4, 2014, in Port Townsend, Washington

Draft EIS Review Comment Period:

1. November 10, 2016, to February 24, 2017

Public open house meetings for the Draft EIS were held on:

- December 5, 2016, in Port Townsend, Washington
- December 6, 2016, in Oak Harbor, Washington
- December 7, 2016, on Lopez Island, Washington
- December 8, 2016, in Anacortes, Washington
- December 9, 2016, in Coupeville, Washington

Comments received during the two scoping periods were considered in preparing the Draft EIS.

Comments received during the Draft EIS review period were considered in preparing the Final EIS.

Specifically, the Navy solicited comments from elected officials, agencies, tribes, and the general public to determine the scope and refine the analysis for this EIS.

Noise and Health Reader’s Guide

This guide is intended to assist readers in locating information within the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) related to potential health effects of noise. This list is organized by topic and includes where to find information on the latest science related to noise and health, standards the Navy uses to assess potential impacts, and potential impacts of the Proposed Action.

Page Number

1. Noise Metrics and Modeling

- a. General discussion of the types of noise metrics and modeling used to assess noise impacts can be found in the following EIS sections:
 - i. 3.2.1 Basics of Sound and the A-weighted Sound Level..... 3-15
 - ii. 3.2.2 Noise Metrics and Modeling 3-17
 - iii. 3.2.3 Noise Effects 3-20
 - iv. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Section 2.2 A-21
 - v. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Appendix A1, Discussion of Noise and Its Effect on the Environment, Sections A1.1.1 and A1.1.2..... A1-11, A1-14

2. DNL Noise Contours

- a. Estimation of the population and acreage affected by noise can be found in the following EIS sections:
 - i. 3.2.4.1 DNL Noise Contours (No Action Alternative) 3-28
 - ii. 4.2.2.1 Projected DNL Contours, Alternative 1 4-29
 - iii. 4.2.3.1 Projected DNL Contours, Alternative 2 4-77
 - iv. 4.2.4.1 Projected DNL Contours, Alternative 3 4-122
 - v. 3.5.2.4.1 DNL Noise Contours (Land Use Compatibility Assessment)..... 3-93
 - vi. 4.5.2.1.3 Land Use in the Noise Environment 4-222
 - vii. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Section 5.4, 6.4, 7.4, and 8.4 A-60, A-92, A-140, A-190
 - viii. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Appendix A7, Other Modeling Output for High-tempo Scenarios A7-1
 - ix. Appendix E - Land Use Data, High-tempo FCLP Year..... E-1

3. Single Event Noise

- a. Analysis of single event noise, a composite metric that represents both the intensity of sound and its duration, at several Points of Interest in the vicinity of the Proposed Action, can be found in the following EIS sections:
 - i. 3.2.4.3.1 Single Event Noise and Number of Events Above (No Action Alternative) 3-38
 - ii. 4.2.2.2.1 Single Event Noise, Alternative 1 4-46
 - iii. 4.2.3.2.1 Single Event Noise, Alternative 2 4-95
 - iv. 4.2.4.2.1 Single Event Noise, Alternative 3 4-139
 - v. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Section 5.4.1, 6.4.1, 7.4.1, and 8.4.1 A-62, A-101, A-150, A-200

- vi. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Appendix A1, Discussion of Noise and Its Effect on the Environment, Sections A.1.2 and A.1.3 A1-16, A1-21
- vii. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Appendix A7, Other Modeling Output for High-tempo ScenariosA7-1

4. Speech Interference (Indoor)

- a. General discussion of the science and standards used to assess annoyance and, specifically, speech interference, can be found in the following EIS sections:
 - i. 3.2.3.1 Annoyance 3-20
 - ii. 3.2.3.2 Speech Interference (Indoor) 3-20
 - iii. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Appendix A1, Discussion of Noise and Its Effect on the Environment, Section A1.3.2A1-28
- b. Discussion of the existing environment and potential impacts of the Proposed Action can be found in the following sections:
 - i. 3.2.4.3.2 Speech Interference (Indoor) (No Action Alternative) 3-44
 - ii. 4.2.2.2.2 Speech Interference (Indoor), Alternative 1 4-55
 - iii. 4.2.3.2.2 Speech Interference (Indoor), Alternative 2 4-101
 - iv. 4.2.4.2.2 Speech Interference (Indoor), Alternative 3 4-145
 - v. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Section 5.4.4, 6.4.4, 7.4.4, and 8.4.4 A-67, A-112, A-161, A-211
 - vi. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Appendix A7, Other Modeling Output for High-tempo ScenariosA7-1

5. Classroom/Learning Interference

- a. General discussion of the science and standards used to assess classroom/learning interference can be found in the following EIS sections:
 - i. 3.2.3.3 Classroom/Learning Interference..... 3-20
 - ii. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Appendix A1, Discussion of Noise and Its Effect on the Environment, Section A1.3.7.1A1-50
 - iii. Appendix I - Community Health and Learning..... I-1
- b. Discussion of the existing environment and potential impacts of the Proposed Action can be found in the following sections:
 - i. 3.2.4.3.3 Classroom/Learning Interference (No Action Alternative) 3-46
 - ii. 4.2.2.2.3 Classroom/Learning Interference, Alternative 1 4-59
 - iii. 4.2.3.2.3 Classroom/Learning Interference, Alternative 2 4-105
 - iv. 4.2.4.2.3 Classroom/Learning Interference, Alternative 3 4-149
 - v. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Section 5.4.5, 6.4.5, 7.4.5, and 8.4.5 A-69, A-115, A-164, A-214
 - vi. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Appendix A7, Other Modeling Output for High-tempo ScenariosA7-1
- c. Presentation of local school district test scores and graduation rates can be found in the following appendix:
 - i. Appendix I - Community Health and Learning (Section 3, Local School District Test Scores and Graduation Rates) I-8

6. Sleep Disturbance

- a. General discussion of the science and standards used to assess sleep disturbance can be found in the following EIS sections:

- i. 3.2.3.4 Sleep Disturbance 3-21
 - ii. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Appendix A1, Discussion of Noise and Its Effect on the Environment, Section A1.3.3A1-31
 - b. Discussion of existing environment and potential impacts of the Proposed Action can be found in the following sections:
 - i. 3.2.4.3.4 Sleep Disturbance (No Action Alternative) 3-47
 - ii. 4.2.2.2.4 Sleep Disturbance, Alternative 1 4-63
 - iii. 4.2.3.2.4 Sleep Disturbance, Alternative 2 4-109
 - iv. 4.2.4.2.4 Sleep Disturbance, Alternative 3 4-152
 - v. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Sections 5.4.3, 6.4.3, 7.4.3, and 8.4.3 A-66, A-109, A-158, A-208
 - vi. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Appendix A7, Other Modeling Output for High-tempo ScenariosA7-1

7. Outdoor Speech Interference

- a. General discussion of the science and standards used to assess potential noise effects on outdoor activities can be found in the following EIS sections:
 - i. 3.2.3.5 Outdoor Speech Interference: Potential Noise Effects on Recreation and Outdoor Activities 3-21
 - b. Discussion of the existing environment and potential impacts of the Proposed Action can be found in the following sections:
 - i. 3.2.4.3.5 Outdoor Speech Interference: Potential Noise Effects on Recreation and Outdoor Activities (No Action Alternative) 3-49
 - ii. 4.2.2.2.5 Outdoor Speech Interference: Potential Noise Effects on Recreation and Outdoor Activities, Alternative 1 4-67
 - iii. 4.2.3.2.5 Outdoor Speech Interference: Potential Noise Effects on Recreation and Outdoor Activities, Alternative 2 4-113
 - iv. 4.2.4.2.5 Outdoor Speech Interference: Potential Noise Effects on Recreation and Outdoor Activities, Alternative 3 4-156
 - v. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Sections 5.4.6, 6.4.6, 7.4.6, and 8.4.6 A-71, A-121, A-170, A-220
 - vi. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Appendix A7, Other Modeling Output for High-tempo ScenariosA7-1

8. Potential Hearing Loss

- a. General discussion of the science and standards used to assess potential hearing loss can be found in the following EIS sections:
 - i. 3.2.3.6 Potential Hearing Loss 3-22
 - ii. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Appendix A1, Discussion of Noise and Its Effect on the Environment, Section A1.3.4A1-34
 - b. Discussion of the existing environment and potential impacts of the Proposed Action can be found in the following sections:
 - i. 3.2.4.3.6 Potential Hearing Loss (No Action Alternative) 3-51
 - ii. 4.2.2.2.6 Potential Hearing Loss, Alternative 1 4-72
 - iii. 4.2.3.2.6 Potential Hearing Loss, Alternative 2 4-118
 - iv. 4.2.4.2.6 Potential Hearing Loss, Alternative 3 4-161
 - v. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Sections 5.4.2, 6.4.2, 7.4.2, and 8.4.2 A-64, A-106, A-155, A-205

vi. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Appendix A7, Other Modeling
Output for High-tempo ScenariosA7-1

9. Nonauditory Health Effects

a. General discussion of the science and standards used to assess nonauditory health effects can be found in the following EIS sections:

- i. 3.2.3.7 Nonauditory Health Effects 3-23
- ii. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Appendix A1, Discussion of Noise and Its Effect on the Environment, Section A1.3.5A1-41

b. Discussion of existing environment and potential impacts of the Proposed Action can be found in the following sections:

- i. 4.2.2.3 Nonauditory Health Effects, Alternative 1 4-76
- ii. 4.2.3.3 Nonauditory Health Effects, Alternative 2 4-121
- iii. 4.2.4.3 Nonauditory Health Effects, Alternative 3 4-164

c. Literature Review

- i. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Appendix A1, Discussion of Noise and Its Effect on the Environment, Section A1.3.5A1-41
- ii. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Appendix A8, Literature Review ProcessA8-1
- iii. Appendix I - Community Health and Learning, Section 4 (Comparison of a Health Impact Assessment and Environmental Impact Statement and Review of Other Health Impact Assessments) I-10
 - 1. Appendix I, Section 4.1, Comparison of the HIA and NEPA Processes with Respect to this EIS..... I-11
 - 2. Appendix I, Section 4.2, Review of Industry Practices in the Preparation of HIAs..... I-13
 - 3. Appendix I, Section 4.4, A discussion of How Public Health Practitioners View Available Literature I-18

d. Other

- i. Appendix I - Community Health and Learning
 - 1. Appendix I, Section 2, Island County Health Factors I-5
 - 2. Appendix I, Section 4.3, Agency Consultation I-17

10. Vibration Effects from Aircraft Operations

a. General discussion of the science and standards used to assess vibration effects from aircraft operations can be found in the following EIS sections:

- i. 3.2.3.8 Vibration Effects from Aircraft Operations 3-24
- ii. Appendix A - Aircraft Noise Study, Appendix A1, Discussion of Noise and Its Effect on the Environment, Section A1.3.9A1-55

b. Discussion of the existing environment and potential impacts of the Proposed Action can be found in the following sections:

- i. 4.2.2.4 Vibration Effects from Aircraft Operations, Alternative 1 4-76
- ii. 4.2.3.4 Vibration Effects from Aircraft Operations, Alternative 2 4-121
- iii. 4.2.4.4 Vibration Effects from Aircraft Operations, Alternative 3 4-164

11. Noise Impacts to Specific Populations

- a. Executive Order 13045, Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks to Children, requires each federal agency to make it a high priority to identify and assess environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children. Environmental health risks and safety risks to children are discussed in the following EIS sections:
 - i. 3.3.1.4 Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks to Children (Regulatory Setting)..... 3-57
 - ii. 3.3.2.4 Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks to Children (No Action Alternative)..... 3-64
 - iii. 4.3.2.4 Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks to Children (Alternatives 1 through 3) 4-178
- b. Environmental Justice
 - i. 3.11.1 Environmental Justice, Regulatory Setting..... 3-220
 - ii. 3.11.2 Environmental Justice, Affected Environment 3-220
 - iii. 4.11.2.3.1 Aircraft Noise (No Action Alternative) 4-400
 - iv. 4.11.3.3.1 Aircraft Noise (Alternatives 1 through 3) 4-433
 - v. Appendix F, Environmental Justice Data, High-tempo FCLP Year F-1

12. Noise Mitigation

- a. General discussion of existing, future, and potential mitigation measures at NAS Whidbey Island
 - i. 3.2.4.2 Existing Noise Mitigation..... 3-34
 - ii. 4.2.6 Noise Mitigation (This section outlines several elements that the Navy either has implemented, is planning to implement, or is considering for future implementation as part of its expansive noise abatement and noise mitigation program.) 4-168
 - iii. Appendix H - Noise Mitigation H-1
 - iv. Appendix H, Section 2.2.1, Air Installations Compatible Use Zone Program H-8
 - v. Appendix H, Section 2.2.3, Encroachment Partnering Efforts (including the Readiness and Environmental Protection Integration [REPI] program) H-11
- b. Alternatives Considered: It should be noted that the Navy considered many alternatives to the Proposed Action; however, most would result in relocating noise and other environmental impacts from one community to another.
 - i. 2.5 Alternatives Considered but Not Carried Forward for Further Analysis..... 2-16
 - ii. 2.5.2 Moving Some or All of the Growler Community Aircraft Elsewhere 2-16
 - iii. 2.5.3 Conducting FCLP Elsewhere 2-21
 - iv. Appendix G, Civilian Airfield Analysis G-1

13. Agency Coordination and Public Participation

- a. The following sections are related to agency coordination and public participation in the EIS:
 - i. 1.8 Agency Participation and Intergovernmental Coordination 1-12
 - ii. 1.9 Public Participation: Scoping 2013 and Scoping 2014..... 1-13

- iii. 1.10 Public Participation: Draft EIS Review 1-20
- iv. 1.11 Public Participation: Comment Themes 1-28
- v. 1.12 Other Reports (reports provided in public comments for the Navy’s consideration in preparation of the Final EIS, including reports on noise, hearing protection, and public health-related concerns) 1-42
- vi. Appendix C, Federal and State Agency Coordination..... C-1
- vii. Appendix M, Draft EIS Public Comment and Response Key.....M-1

14. Other Noise and Health-related Sections Contained in the EIS

- a. NEPA Process
 - i. 1.5 Scope of Environmental Analysis 1-8
 - ii. 1.7 Relevant Laws and Regulations 1-11
 - iii. 1.13 Clarification and Changes to the Environmental Impact Statement 1-60
- b. Health Impact Assessments
 - i. Appendix I, Section 4.1, Comparison of the HIA and NEPA Processes with Respect to this EIS I-11
 - ii. Appendix I, Section 4.2, Review of Industry Practices in the Preparation of HIAs I-13
 - iii. Appendix I, Section 4.4, A discussion of How Public Health Practitioners View Available Literature I-18
- c. Other Community and Health-related Topics
 - i. Appendix H, Section 2.2.3, Encroachment Partnering Efforts (including the Readiness and Environmental Protection Integration [REPI] program) H-11
 - ii. Appendix I, Section 2, Island County Health Factors (general health and well-being of Island County) I-5
 - iii. Appendix I, Section 3, Local School District Test Scores and Graduation Rates (general academic success of Island County) I-8
 - iv. 3.3 Public Health and Safety (Affected Environment) 3-53
 - v. 4.3 Public Health and Safety (Environmental Consequences) 4-173
 - vi. 3.4 Air Quality (Affected Environment) 3-68
 - vii. 4.4 Air Quality (Environmental Consequences) 4-195
 - viii. 3.16 Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases (Affected Environment) 3-252
 - ix. 4.16 Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases (Environmental Consequences) 4-467
 - x. 3.5.2.2 Regional Land Use and Land Use Controls 3-81
 - xi. 3.5.2.4.2 Accident Potential Zones (Affected Environment) 3-95
 - xii. 4.5.2.1.3.2 Accident Potential Zones (Environmental Consequences) 4-259
 - xiii. 3.10.2.1 Population, Affected Environment 3-193
 - xiv. 4.10.2.1 Population Impacts (Alternatives 1 through 3) 4-370
 - xv. 3.10.2.3 Housing, Affected Environment 3-206
 - xvi. 4.10.2.3 Housing Impacts (Alternatives 1 through 3) 4-378
 - xvii. 4.10.2.4 Property Values (Alternatives 1 through 3) 4-380
 - xviii. 3.10.3 Community Services, Affected Environment 3-214

- xix. 4.10.3 Community Services Impacts, Alternatives 1 through 34-382
- xx. 3.10.3.3 Fire and Emergency Services, Affected Environment3-218
- xxi. 4.10.3.3 Fire and Emergency Services (Alternatives 1 through 3)4-384

15. Conclusions Regarding Noise-related Topics

- a. 4.2.5.3 Noise Conclusion, Alternatives 1 through 34-168
- b. 4.17 Summary of Potential Impacts to Resources (Table 4.17-1)4-482
- c. 5. Cumulative Impacts5-1
- d. 5.4.2. Noise Associated with Aircraft Operations (Cumulative Impacts)5-16

This page intentionally left blank.

Overview of the Environmental Impact Statement

This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is for EA-18G “Growler” Airfield Operations at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island complex. It evaluates the potential environmental impacts associated with a No Action Alternative and three action alternatives. The three alternatives consider options for increasing the number of additional Growler aircraft at the NAS Whidbey Island complex. Each alternative contains further analysis of five operational scenarios that involve different distributions of annual field carrier landing practice airfield operations between Ault Field and Outlying Landing Field Coupeville.

Chapter 1 provides background information related to the Proposed Action and describes the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. Chapter 2 describes the Proposed Action, the process for selecting the range of alternatives, and the alternatives carried forward or eliminated from further analysis. Chapter 3 provides a description of the existing environmental resource areas and existing conditions that could be affected from implementing any of the alternatives. Chapter 4 presents an analysis of the potential direct and indirect effects of each alternative on the affected environment. This EIS evaluates the potential environmental impacts associated with 16 resource areas, as well as the cumulative impacts of the Proposed Action and other local projects. Each of the 16 resource areas is discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment) and Chapter 4 (Environmental Consequences). Below is a list of the key sections in this document (for a full Table of Contents, go to page i).

Section Title	Section Number	Page Number
Executive Summary	ES	ES-1
Noise and Health Reader's Guide		ES-15
Table of Contents	TOC	i
Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action	Chapter 1	1-1
Proposed Action and Alternatives	Chapter 2	2-1
Affected Environment (Chapter 3) and Environmental Consequences (Chapter 4)	Chapters 3 and 4	3-1, 4-1
Airspace and Airfield Operations	3.1 and 4.1	3-1, 4-2
Noise Associated with Aircraft Operations	3.2 and 4.2	3-15, 4-26
Public Health and Safety	3.3 and 4.3	3-53, 4-173
Air Quality	3.4 and 4.4	3-68, 4-195
Land Use	3.5 and 4.5	3-77, 4-219
Cultural Resources	3.6 and 4.6	3-109, 4-309
American Indian Traditional Resources	3.7 and 4.7	3-133, 4-329
Biological Resources	3.8 and 4.8	3-139, 4-332
Water Resources	3.9 and 4.9	3-183, 4-366
Socioeconomics	3.10 and 4.10	3-191, 4-370
Environmental Justice	3.11 and 4.11	3-220, 4-387
Transportation	3.12 and 4.12	3-227, 4-442
Infrastructure	3.13 and 4.13	3-238, 4-452
Geological Resources	3.14 and 4.14	3-247, 4-463
Hazardous Materials and Wastes	3.15 and 4.15	3-251, 4-465
Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases	3.16 and 4.16	3-252, 4-467
Summary of Potential Impacts to Resources	4.17	4-482
Cumulative Impacts	Chapter 5	5-1
Aircraft Noise Study	Appendix A	A-1
Air Emissions Calculations	Appendix B	B-1
Federal and State Agency Coordination	Appendix C	C-1
Transportation Trip Generation Data	Appendix D	D-1
Land Use Data, High-tempo FCLP Year	Appendix E	E-1
Environmental Justice Data, High-tempo FCLP Year	Appendix F	F-1
Civilian Airfield Analysis	Appendix G	G-1
Noise Mitigation	Appendix H	H-1
Community Health and Learning Review	Appendix I	I-1
2013 Scoping Information	Appendix J	J-1
2014 Scoping Information	Appendix K	K-1
2016 Draft EIS Public Information Meetings	Appendix L	L-1
Draft EIS Public Comment and Response Key	Appendix M	M-1

Environmental Impact Statement for EA-18G “Growler” Airfield Operations at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island Complex

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ABSTRACT-1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ES-1
NOISE AND HEALTH READER’S GUIDE	ES-15
OVERVIEW OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.....	ES-23
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	xxxix
1 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION	1-1
1.1 Introduction	1-1
1.2 Location.....	1-1
1.3 Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action	1-5
1.4 The Navy’s Electronic Attack Community at Ault Field and OLF Coupeville.....	1-5
1.5 Scope of Environmental Analysis.....	1-8
1.6 Key Documents.....	1-10
1.7 Relevant Laws and Regulations	1-11
1.8 Agency Participation and Intergovernmental Coordination	1-12
1.9 Public Participation: Scoping 2013 and Scoping 2014.....	1-13
1.9.1 Scoping Notifications.....	1-14
1.9.2 Scoping Meetings	1-15
1.9.3 Scoping Comments.....	1-17
1.9.4 Summary of Scoping Comment Topics and Commenters.....	1-18
1.10 Public Participation: Draft EIS Review	1-20
1.10.1 Draft EIS Notifications	1-20
1.10.2 Draft EIS Public Meetings	1-21
1.10.3 Draft EIS Public Comments.....	1-24
1.10.4 Summary of Draft EIS Comment Topics and Commenters	1-25
1.11 Public Participation: Comment Themes	1-28
1.11.1 General Topics.....	1-28
1.11.2 Airspace and Airfield Operations	1-30
1.11.3 Noise Associated with Aircraft Operations	1-31
1.11.4 Public Health and Safety.....	1-38
1.11.5 Air Quality.....	1-40
1.11.6 Socioeconomics.....	1-40
1.12 Other Reports.....	1-42
1.12.1 San Juan County Jet Aircraft Noise Reporting (2014 to present).....	1-43
1.12.2 Sandford Fidell Public Comment on the “Significance” Criterion Used for Noise Impacts (2017).....	1-43
1.12.3 State of Washington Department of Health Public Comment (2017)	1-47
1.12.4 Paul Schomer Public Comment on Aircraft Noise and Hearing Protection (2017)	1-48

1.12.5 Michael Shuman’s Report on the Economic Costs of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex (2017) 1-49

1.12.6 National Park Service Acoustical Monitoring Report for Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve (2016) 1-51

1.12.7 Dahlgren Opinion Paper on the Public Health Impact of Aircraft Noise on Residents in the Vicinity of Whidbey Island (2015) 1-55

1.12.8 JGL Acoustics, Inc., Report on Whidbey Island Military Jet Noise Measurements (2013) 1-58

1.13 Clarification and Changes to the Environmental Impact Statement..... 1-60

1.13.1 Executive Summary 1-71

1.13.2 Chapter 1: Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action..... 1-71

1.13.3 Chapter 2: Proposed Action and Alternatives 1-72

1.13.4 Chapter 3: Affected Environment and Chapter 4: Environmental Consequences..... 1-72

 1.13.4.1 Airspace and Airfield Operations 1-72

 1.13.4.2 Noise Associated with Aircraft Operations 1-72

 1.13.4.3 Public Health and Safety 1-74

 1.13.4.4 Air Quality..... 1-74

 1.13.4.5 Land Use 1-75

 1.13.4.6 Cultural Resources..... 1-75

 1.13.4.7 American Indian Traditional Resources 1-76

 1.13.4.8 Biological Resources 1-76

 1.13.4.9 Water Resources 1-76

 1.13.4.10 Socioeconomics..... 1-76

 1.13.4.11 Environmental Justice 1-77

 1.13.4.12 Transportation..... 1-77

 1.13.4.13 Infrastructure 1-77

 1.13.4.14 Geological Resources 1-77

 1.13.4.15 Hazardous Materials and Wastes..... 1-77

 1.13.4.16 Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases 1-77

1.13.5 Chapter 5: Cumulative..... 1-78

1.13.6 Chapter 6: Other Considerations Required by NEPA 1-78

1.13.7 Chapter 7: References 1-78

1.13.8 Appendices 1-78

2 PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES2-1

2.1 Proposed Action2-1

2.2 Development of the Range of Action Alternatives.....2-2

2.3 Alternatives Carried forward for Analysis2-4

2.3.1 No Action Alternative 2-4

2.3.2 Action Alternatives 2-4

2.3.3 Description of Alternatives..... 2-11

 2.3.3.1 Aircraft and Personnel Loading 2-11

 2.3.3.2 Aircraft Operations..... 2-12

 2.3.3.3 Facility and Infrastructure Requirements 2-12

2.4 Preferred Alternative2-15

2.5 Alternatives Considered but Not Carried Forward for Further Analysis2-16

2.5.1 Previously Scoped Alternatives2-16

2.5.2 Moving Some or All of the Growler Community Aircraft Elsewhere2-16

2.5.2.1 Single Siting the Growler Community at Ault Field2-17

2.5.2.1.1 Operational Synergy2-17

2.5.2.1.2 Proximity to Training Ranges and Special Use Airspace, and Electromagnetic Frequency Availability2-17

2.5.2.1.3 Efficient Use of Existing Infrastructure2-18

2.5.2.2 Relocating Growlers Elsewhere.....2-19

2.5.2.2.1 NAS Lemoore (Kings County and Fresno County, California)2-19

2.5.2.2.2 Naval Air Facility El Centro (Imperial County, California)2-20

2.5.2.2.3 Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake (Kern, San Bernardino, and Inyo Counties, California).....2-20

2.5.2.2.4 NAS Oceana (Virginia Beach, Virginia)2-20

2.5.2.2.5 Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point (Craven County, North Carolina).....2-21

2.5.3 Conducting FCLP Elsewhere2-21

2.5.3.1 Regional Military Airfields2-21

2.5.3.2 Regional Civilian Airfields2-21

2.5.3.3 Detachment Training Out of the Region2-22

2.5.3.4 Construct a New OLF2-22

2.5.3.5 Anchor an Aircraft Carrier off the Coast.....2-23

2.5.3.6 Exclusive use of Simulators2-24

2.6 Summary of Alternatives Considered.....2-24

3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT3-1

3.1 Airspace and Airfield Operations3-1

3.1.1 Airspace and Airfield Operations, Regulatory Setting3-2

3.1.2 Airspace and Airfield Operations, Affected Environment3-3

3.1.2.1 Airspace Classification and Flight Tracks3-3

3.1.2.1.1 Ault Field3-3

3.1.2.1.2 OLF Coupeville3-5

3.1.2.1.3 Military Operations Areas.....3-5

3.1.2.1.4 Military Training Routes.....3-5

3.1.2.2 Airfield Operations3-7

3.1.2.2.1 Average Annual Airfield Operations3-13

3.2 Noise Associated with Aircraft Operations.....3-15

3.2.1 Basics of Sound and the A-weighted Sound Level3-15

3.2.2 Noise Metrics and Modeling3-17

3.2.2.1 Day-night Average Sound Level.....3-17

3.2.2.2 Equivalent Sound Level3-19

3.2.2.3 Sound Exposure Level.....3-19

3.2.2.4 Maximum Sound Level3-19

3.2.2.5 Number of Events above a Threshold Level.....3-19

3.2.3	Noise Effects	3-20
3.2.3.1	Annoyance.....	3-20
3.2.3.2	Speech Interference (Indoor)	3-20
3.2.3.3	Classroom/learning Interference	3-20
3.2.3.4	Sleep Disturbance.....	3-21
3.2.3.5	Outdoor Speech Interference: Potential Noise Effects on Recreation and Outdoor Activities	3-21
3.2.3.6	Potential Hearing Loss.....	3-22
3.2.3.7	Nonauditory Health Effects	3-23
3.2.3.8	Vibration Effects from Aircraft Operations	3-24
3.2.4	Noise, Affected Environment	3-24
3.2.4.1	DNL Noise Contours	3-28
3.2.4.2	Existing Noise Mitigation.....	3-34
3.2.4.2.1	Noise Abatement Policy.....	3-34
3.2.4.2.2	Noise Complaint Process	3-35
3.2.4.2.3	Air Installations Compatible Use Zones Program	3-36
3.2.4.3	Supplemental Noise Analyses	3-36
3.2.4.3.1	Single Event Noise and Number of Events Above	3-38
3.2.4.3.2	Speech Interference (Indoor)	3-44
3.2.4.3.3	Classroom/learning Interference.....	3-46
3.2.4.3.4	Sleep Disturbance	3-47
3.2.4.3.5	Outdoor Speech Interference: Potential Noise Effects on Recreation and Outdoor Activities.....	3-49
3.2.4.3.6	Potential Hearing Loss	3-51
3.3	Public Health and Safety	3-53
3.3.1	Public Health and Safety, Regulatory Setting.....	3-53
3.3.1.1	Flight Safety	3-53
3.3.1.2	Bird/Animal Aircraft Strike Hazard	3-55
3.3.1.3	Accident Potential Zones.....	3-56
3.3.1.4	Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks to Children	3-57
3.3.2	Public Health and Safety, Affected Environment	3-57
3.3.2.1	Flight Safety	3-57
3.3.2.1.1	Potential for Aircraft Mishaps.....	3-57
3.3.2.1.2	Length of Runway at OLF Coupeville	3-59
3.3.2.1.3	Potential for Natural Disasters	3-59
3.3.2.2	Bird/Animal Aircraft Strike Hazard	3-60
3.3.2.3	Accident Potential Zones.....	3-61
3.3.2.4	Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks to Children	3-64
3.4	Air Quality	3-68
3.4.1	Air Quality, Regulatory Setting.....	3-69
3.4.1.1	Criteria Pollutants and National Ambient Air Quality Standards	3-69
3.4.1.2	General Conformity	3-71
3.4.1.3	Hazardous Air Pollutants	3-71
3.4.1.4	Permitting.....	3-71

3.4.2 Air Quality, Affected Environment 3-72

 3.4.2.1 NAS Whidbey Island Complex Stationary Source Emissions 3-73

 3.4.2.2 NAS Whidbey Island Complex Mobile Source Emissions 3-75

 3.4.2.3 Chaff 3-77

 3.4.2.4 Fuel Dumping 3-77

3.5 Land Use..... 3-77

3.5.1 Land Use, Regulatory Setting 3-78

3.5.2 Land Use, Affected Environment..... 3-79

 3.5.2.1 On-station Land Use and Land Use Controls at the NAS Whidbey Island
Complex..... 3-79

 3.5.2.2 Regional Land Use and Land Use Controls 3-81

 3.5.2.2.1 NAS Whidbey Island AICUZ Update (2005)..... 3-84

 3.5.2.2.2 Washington State Growth Management Act (1990, 2005) 3-84

 3.5.2.2.3 Island County Comprehensive Plan (2011, 2016) and Zoning Ordinance
(2016)..... 3-85

 3.5.2.2.4 City of Oak Harbor Comprehensive Plan (2010, 2016) and Zoning
Ordinance (2016) 3-87

 3.5.2.2.5 Town of Coupeville Comprehensive Plan (2003) and Zoning Ordinance
(2016)..... 3-90

 3.5.2.2.6 Additional Regional Land Use Controls..... 3-90

 3.5.2.2.7 Readiness and Environmental Protection Integration Program,
Conservation Easements, and Navigation Easements..... 3-90

 3.5.2.3 Community Character 3-91

 3.5.2.3.1 Community Character, Island County 3-91

 3.5.2.3.2 Community Character, Skagit County..... 3-92

 3.5.2.3.3 Community Character, City of Oak Harbor 3-92

 3.5.2.3.4 Community Character, Town of Coupeville..... 3-92

 3.5.2.4 Land Use Compatibility Assessment 3-93

 3.5.2.4.1 DNL Noise Contours..... 3-93

 3.5.2.4.2 Accident Potential Zones 3-95

 3.5.2.5 Recreation and Wilderness 3-96

 3.5.2.5.1 Wilderness 3-96

 3.5.2.5.2 Parks and Recreation Areas 3-98

 3.5.2.5.2.1 San Juan Islands National Monument..... 3-101

 3.5.2.5.2.2 San Juan Islands National Wildlife Refuge 3-101

 3.5.2.5.2.3 Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve 3-102

 3.5.2.5.2.4 Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail 3-104

 3.5.2.5.2.5 State Parks and Recreation Areas 3-105

 3.5.2.5.2.6 County and Municipal Parks and Recreation Areas..... 3-106

 3.5.2.5.2.7 Privately Owned and Other Recreation Areas..... 3-107

 3.5.2.5.3 Noise Effects on Recreation..... 3-108

3.6 Cultural Resources 3-109

3.6.1 Cultural Resources, Regulatory Setting 3-109

 3.6.1.1 Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act..... 3-110

3.6.1.2	Area of Potential Effects.....	3-112
3.6.2	Cultural Resources, Affected Environment	3-115
3.6.2.1	Background.....	3-115
3.6.2.1.1	NAS Whidbey Island.....	3-117
3.6.2.1.1.1	Ault Field	3-118
3.6.2.1.1.2	OLF Coupeville.....	3-118
3.6.2.1.1.3	Seaplane Base	3-119
3.6.2.1.2	Island County	3-120
3.6.2.1.3	Central Whidbey Island Historic District and the Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve.....	3-120
3.6.2.2	Archaeological Resources.....	3-122
3.6.2.3	Architectural Resources	3-122
3.6.2.3.1	On-installation Direct Effect Areas	3-123
3.6.2.3.2	On-installation Indirect Effect Areas.....	3-124
3.6.2.3.3	Off-Installation Indirect Effect Areas	3-126
3.6.2.3.3.1	Off-Installation Non-Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve.....	3-126
3.6.2.3.3.2	Central Whidbey Island Historic District and the Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve.....	3-126
3.6.2.4	Cemeteries	3-128
3.6.2.5	Traditional Cultural Properties.....	3-129
3.6.2.6	Section 106 Consultation	3-129
3.7	American Indian Traditional Resources.....	3-133
3.7.1	Policy and Regulatory Setting.....	3-134
3.7.1.1	DoD and Navy Policies Regarding Consultation	3-134
3.7.1.2	Laws, Executive Orders, and Memoranda Mandating Consultation.....	3-134
3.7.1.3	Government-to-Government Consultation.....	3-135
3.7.2	Affected Environment	3-136
3.7.3	Tribal Treaty Rights and Federal Trust Responsibilities; Reservation of Rights by American Indians.....	3-136
3.7.3.1	Treaties of Point No Point and Point Elliot.....	3-137
3.7.3.2	American Indian Access and Use at NAS Whidbey Island	3-138
3.8	Biological Resources.....	3-139
3.8.1	Biological Resources, Regulatory Setting	3-139
3.8.1.1	Federal Regulations.....	3-139
3.8.1.1.1	Endangered Species Act.....	3-139
3.8.1.1.2	Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Executive Order 13186	3-139
3.8.1.1.3	Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act.....	3-140
3.8.1.1.4	Marine Mammal Protection Act	3-141
3.8.1.2	State Regulations.....	3-141
3.8.1.2.1	Species of Concern.....	3-141
3.8.1.3	Local Regulations.....	3-142
3.8.1.3.1	Island County Critical Areas Ordinance	3-142

3.8.1.3.2	Skagit County Critical Areas Ordinance	3-142
3.8.1.3.3	San Juan County Critical Areas Ordinance.....	3-142
3.8.2	Biological Resources, Affected Environment	3-142
3.8.2.1	Terrestrial Wildlife and Vegetation	3-145
3.8.2.1.1	Vegetation.....	3-145
3.8.2.1.2	Reptiles and Amphibians	3-145
3.8.2.1.3	Birds	3-145
3.8.2.1.4	Mammals	3-146
3.8.2.2	Special Status Terrestrial Species.....	3-146
3.8.2.2.1	Federal Threatened and Endangered Terrestrial Species.....	3-146
3.8.2.2.1.1	Golden Paintbrush	3-148
3.8.2.2.1.2	Taylor’s Checkerspot Butterfly.....	3-148
3.8.2.2.1.3	Marbled Murrelet	3-150
3.8.2.2.1.4	Northern Spotted Owl.....	3-153
3.8.2.2.1.5	Streaked Horned Lark	3-153
3.8.2.2.1.6	Yellow-billed Cuckoo.....	3-153
3.8.2.2.1.7	North American Wolverine	3-154
3.8.2.2.2	Migratory Birds	3-154
3.8.2.2.2.1	Birds of Conservation Concern	3-155
3.8.2.2.2.2	Important Bird Areas.....	3-157
3.8.2.2.2.3	eBird Hotspots.....	3-160
3.8.2.2.2.4	National Wildlife Refuges.....	3-160
3.8.2.2.3	Bald and Golden Eagles.....	3-160
3.8.2.2.4	State Threatened and Endangered Species.....	3-161
3.8.2.2.5	Species of Local Importance	3-163
3.8.2.2.5.1	Island County Species of Local Importance	3-163
3.8.2.2.5.2	Skagit County Species of Local Importance	3-163
3.8.2.2.5.3	San Juan County Species of Local Importance	3-163
3.8.2.2.5.4	Jefferson County Species of Local Importance	3-163
3.8.2.2.5.5	Snohomish County Species of Local Importance	3-163
3.8.2.3	Marine Species	3-164
3.8.2.3.1	Marine Fish	3-164
3.8.2.3.2	Marine Mammals.....	3-166
3.8.2.3.2.1	Pinnipeds.....	3-167
3.8.2.3.2.2	Cetaceans.....	3-167
3.8.2.4	Special Status Marine Wildlife.....	3-169
3.8.2.4.1	Federal Threatened and Endangered Marine Species.....	3-169
3.8.2.4.1.1	Green Sturgeon	3-171
3.8.2.4.1.2	Eulachon.....	3-174
3.8.2.4.1.3	Salmonids.....	3-174
3.8.2.4.1.4	Bull Trout.....	3-178
3.8.2.4.1.5	Dolly Varden.....	3-179
3.8.2.4.1.6	Rockfish	3-179
3.8.2.4.1.7	Humpback Whale	3-181

3.8.2.4.1.8 Killer Whale (Southern Resident).....3-181

3.8.2.4.2 State Threatened and Endangered Marine Species3-183

3.9 Water Resources..... 3-183

3.9.1 Water Resources, Regulatory Setting.....3-184

3.9.1.1 Federal Regulations3-184

3.9.1.2 State and Local Regulations3-186

3.9.2 Water Resources, Affected Environment.....3-187

3.9.2.1 Groundwater3-187

3.9.2.1.1 Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances.....3-188

3.9.2.2 Surface Water.....3-189

3.9.2.3 Wetlands3-190

3.9.2.4 Floodplains3-191

3.9.2.5 Marine Waters and Sediments.....3-191

3.10 Socioeconomics 3-191

3.10.1 Socioeconomics, Regulatory Setting3-192

3.10.2 Socioeconomics, Affected Environment3-192

3.10.2.1 Population, Affected Environment.....3-193

3.10.2.1.1 NAS Whidbey Island Complex.....3-193

3.10.2.1.2 Island and Skagit Counties3-194

3.10.2.2 Economy, Employment, and Income, Affected Environment.....3-195

3.10.2.2.1 NAS Whidbey Island Complex.....3-195

3.10.2.2.2 Island and Skagit Counties3-196

3.10.2.2.2.1 Agriculture.....3-198

3.10.2.2.2.2 Tourism3-199

3.10.2.3 Housing, Affected Environment3-206

3.10.2.3.1 NAS Whidbey Island Complex.....3-206

3.10.2.3.2 Island and Skagit Counties3-208

3.10.2.3.3 Housing Affordability3-211

3.10.2.4 Local Government Revenues, Affected Environment3-213

3.10.3 Community Services, Affected Environment3-214

3.10.3.1 Education, Affected Environment3-214

3.10.3.2 Medical Services, Affected Environment3-217

3.10.3.3 Fire and Emergency Services, Affected Environment3-218

3.10.3.4 Police Protection, Affected Environment.....3-219

3.10.3.5 On-Base Community Services Support.....3-219

3.11 Environmental Justice 3-220

3.11.1 Environmental Justice, Regulatory Setting.....3-220

3.11.2 Environmental Justice, Affected Environment.....3-220

3.11.2.1 Environmental Justice Methodology.....3-220

3.11.2.2 Environmental Justice Assessment3-223

3.12 Transportation..... 3-227

3.12.1 Transportation, Regulatory Setting3-227

3.12.1.1	State	3-227
3.12.1.2	Regional.....	3-227
3.12.1.3	Local.....	3-228
3.12.2	Transportation, Affected Environment	3-229
3.12.2.1	Road Network and Access.....	3-232
3.12.2.1.1	Off-station Road Network.....	3-232
3.12.2.1.2	On-station Road Network.....	3-233
3.12.2.2	Traffic Conditions	3-234
3.12.2.3	Transit, Pedestrian, and Bicycle Facilities.....	3-237
3.12.2.3.1	Off-station Facilities.....	3-237
3.12.2.3.2	On-station Facilities.....	3-238
3.13	Infrastructure	3-238
3.13.1	Infrastructure, Regulatory Setting.....	3-238
3.13.1.1	Federal Regulations.....	3-238
3.13.1.2	Local Regulations.....	3-239
3.13.2	Infrastructure, Affected Environment.....	3-239
3.13.2.1	Potable Water	3-239
3.13.2.1.1	Water Supply and Distribution System.....	3-239
3.13.2.1.2	NAS Whidbey Island Water Supply and Distribution System	3-240
3.13.2.1.3	Water Supply Capacity and Usage	3-240
3.13.2.2	Wastewater	3-242
3.13.2.2.1	Wastewater Collection and Treatment System.....	3-242
3.13.2.2.2	NAS Whidbey Island Wastewater Collection and Treatment System	3-242
3.13.2.2.3	Wastewater Supply Capacity and Usage	3-242
3.13.2.3	Stormwater.....	3-243
3.13.2.3.1	Stormwater Supply and Distribution System.....	3-243
3.13.2.3.2	NAS Whidbey Island Stormwater Supply and Distribution System	3-243
3.13.2.3.3	Stormwater Supply Capacity and Usage.....	3-244
3.13.2.4	Solid Waste Management	3-244
3.13.2.4.1	Solid Waste Distribution System.....	3-244
3.13.2.4.2	NAS Whidbey Island Solid Waste Distribution System	3-244
3.13.2.4.3	Solid Waste Capacity and Usage.....	3-244
3.13.2.5	Energy.....	3-244
3.13.2.5.1	Energy Supply	3-244
3.13.2.5.2	NAS Whidbey Island Energy Distribution System	3-245
3.13.2.5.3	Energy Capacity and Usage.....	3-245
3.13.2.6	Communications.....	3-247
3.13.2.6.1	Communications Distribution System	3-247
3.13.2.6.2	NAS Whidbey Island Communication System	3-247
3.13.2.7	Facilities.....	3-247
3.14	Geological Resources	3-247
3.14.1	Geological Resources, Regulatory Setting.....	3-248

3.14.1.1	State Regulations.....	3-248
3.14.2	Geological Resources, Affected Environment.....	3-248
3.14.2.1	Topography.....	3-248
3.14.2.2	Geology.....	3-248
3.14.2.3	Seismic Activity and Geologic Hazards.....	3-248
3.14.2.4	Soils.....	3-249
3.15	Hazardous Materials and Wastes.....	3-251
3.15.1	Hazardous Material and Wastes, Regulatory Setting.....	3-251
3.15.2	Hazardous Materials and Wastes, Affected Environment.....	3-251
3.15.2.1	Hazardous Materials.....	3-251
3.15.2.2	Hazardous Wastes.....	3-252
3.15.2.3	Defense Environmental Restoration Program.....	3-252
3.16	Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases.....	3-252
3.16.1	Policies for the Mitigation of and Adaptation to Climate Change.....	3-253
3.16.1.1	Federal Policies Related to Climate Change.....	3-253
3.16.1.2	Department of Defense Policies Related to Climate Change.....	3-253
3.16.1.3	State Policies Related to Climate Change.....	3-254
3.16.2	Affected Environment.....	3-254
3.16.2.1	Impacts of Climate Change on Department of Defense Mission.....	3-255
3.16.2.2	Impacts of Climate Change in Washington State and Puget Sound.....	3-255
3.16.3	Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	3-255
3.16.3.1	Regional and State Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	3-255
3.16.3.2	NAS Whidbey Island Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	3-256
4	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES.....	4-1
4.1	Airspace and Airfield Operations.....	4-2
4.1.1	Airspace and Airfield Operations, No Action Alternative.....	4-3
4.1.2	Airspace and Airfield Operations, Alternative 1.....	4-5
4.1.2.1	Airspace and Airfield Operations, Potential Impacts under Alternative 1.....	4-5
4.1.2.1.1	Airspace, Alternative 1.....	4-5
4.1.2.1.2	Airfield Operations, Alternative 1.....	4-6
4.1.2.1.3	Alternative 1 Conclusion.....	4-10
4.1.3	Airspace and Airfield Operations, Alternative 2.....	4-13
4.1.3.1	Airspace and Airfield Operations, Potential Impacts under Alternative 2.....	4-13
4.1.3.1.1	Airspace, Alternative 2.....	4-13
4.1.3.1.2	Airfield Operations, Alternative 2.....	4-13
4.1.3.1.3	Alternative 2 Conclusion.....	4-15
4.1.4	Airspace and Airfield Operations, Alternative 3.....	4-18
4.1.4.1	Airspace and Airfield Operations, Potential Impacts under Alternative 3.....	4-18
4.1.4.1.1	Airspace, Alternative 3.....	4-18
4.1.4.1.2	Airfield Operations, Alternative 3.....	4-18
4.1.4.1.3	Alternative 3 Conclusion.....	4-20

4.1.5 Airspace and Airfield Operations Conclusion, Alternatives 1 through 3..... 4-23

 4.1.5.1 Airspace Summary..... 4-23

 4.1.5.2 Airfield Operations Summary..... 4-24

4.2 Noise Associated with Aircraft Operations..... 4-26

4.2.1 Noise, No Action Alternative 4-28

4.2.2 Noise, Alternative 1 4-28

 4.2.2.1 Projected DNL Contours, Alternative 1 4-29

 4.2.2.2 Supplemental Noise Analyses, Alternative 1..... 4-46

 4.2.2.2.1 Single Event Noise, Alternative 1..... 4-46

 4.2.2.2.2 Speech Interference (Indoor), Alternative 1..... 4-55

 4.2.2.2.3 Classroom/learning Interference, Alternative 1 4-59

 4.2.2.2.4 Sleep Disturbance, Alternative 1 4-63

 4.2.2.2.5 Outdoor Speech Interference: Potential Noise Effects on Recreation
and Outdoor Activities, Alternative 1 4-67

 4.2.2.2.6 Potential Hearing Loss, Alternative 1..... 4-72

 4.2.2.3 Nonauditory Health Effects, Alternative 1 4-76

 4.2.2.4 Vibration Effects from Aircraft Operations, Alternative 1 4-76

 4.2.2.5 Noise Conclusion, Alternative 1 4-76

4.2.3 Noise, Alternative 2 4-77

 4.2.3.1 Projected DNL Contours, Alternative 2 4-77

 4.2.3.2 Supplemental Noise Analyses, Alternative 2..... 4-95

 4.2.3.2.1 Single Event Noise, Alternative 2..... 4-95

 4.2.3.2.2 Speech Interference (Indoor), Alternative 2..... 4-101

 4.2.3.2.3 Classroom/learning Interference, Alternative 2 4-105

 4.2.3.2.4 Sleep Disturbance, Alternative 2 4-109

 4.2.3.2.5 Outdoor Speech Interference: Potential Noise Effects on Recreation
and Outdoor Activities, Alternative 2 4-113

 4.2.3.2.6 Potential Hearing Loss, Alternative 2..... 4-118

 4.2.3.3 Nonauditory Health Effects, Alternative 2 4-121

 4.2.3.4 Vibration Effects from Aircraft Operations, Alternative 2 4-121

 4.2.3.5 Noise Conclusion, Alternative 2 4-121

4.2.4 Noise, Alternative 3 4-122

 4.2.4.1 Projected DNL Contours, Alternative 3 4-122

 4.2.4.2 Supplemental Noise Analyses, Alternative 3..... 4-139

 4.2.4.2.1 Single Event Noise, Alternative 3..... 4-139

 4.2.4.2.2 Speech Interference (Indoor), Alternative 3..... 4-145

 4.2.4.2.3 Classroom/learning Interference, Alternative 3 4-149

 4.2.4.2.4 Sleep Disturbance, Alternative 3 4-152

 4.2.4.2.5 Outdoor Speech Interference: Potential Noise Effects on Recreation
and Outdoor Activities, Alternative 3 4-156

 4.2.4.2.6 Potential Hearing Loss, Alternative 3..... 4-161

 4.2.4.3 Nonauditory Health Effects, Alternative 3 4-164

 4.2.4.4 Vibration Effects from Aircraft Operations, Alternative 3 4-164

 4.2.4.5 Noise Conclusion, Alternative 3 4-165

4.2.5 Noise Impact Comparison, Alternatives 1 through 3 4-165

 4.2.5.1 Noise Impact Comparison, Alternatives 1 through 3, Acreage and
 Population 4-165

 4.2.5.2 Noise Impact Comparison, Alternatives 1 through 3, Supplemental Metrics..... 4-168

 4.2.5.3 Noise Conclusion, Alternatives 1 through 3 4-168

4.2.6 Noise Mitigation 4-168

 4.2.6.1 Fifteen Action Alternatives..... 4-169

 4.2.6.2 Noise-reduction Measures 4-169

 4.2.6.3 Noise Abatement Policy 4-170

 4.2.6.4 Noise Complaint Process..... 4-172

 4.2.6.5 Air Installations Compatible Use Zones Program..... 4-172

4.3 Public Health and Safety 4-173

 4.3.1 Public Health and Safety, No Action Alternative..... 4-173

 4.3.2 Public Health and Safety Potential Impacts, Alternatives 1 through 3 4-173

 4.3.2.1 Flight Safety 4-173

 4.3.2.2 Bird/Animal Aircraft Strike Hazard 4-174

 4.3.2.3 Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones 4-174

 4.3.2.4 Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks to Children 4-178

 4.3.3 Public Health and Safety Conclusion, Alternatives 1 through 3..... 4-194

4.4 Air Quality 4-195

 4.4.1 Air Quality, No Action Alternative 4-195

 4.4.2 Air Quality, Alternative 1 4-195

 4.4.2.1 Air Quality Potential Impacts, Alternative 1 4-195

 4.4.2.1.1 Construction-related Emissions, Alternative 1 4-196

 4.4.2.1.2 Stationary Operation-related Emissions, Alternative 1 4-197

 4.4.2.1.3 Mobile Operation-related Emissions, Alternative 1 4-198

 4.4.3 Air Quality, Alternative 2 4-203

 4.4.3.1 Air Quality Potential Impacts, Alternative 2 4-204

 4.4.3.1.1 Construction-related Emissions, Alternative 2 4-204

 4.4.3.1.2 Stationary Operation-related Emissions, Alternative 2 4-204

 4.4.3.1.3 Mobile Operation-related Emissions, Alternative 2 4-204

 4.4.4 Air Quality, Alternative 3 4-209

 4.4.4.1 Air Quality Potential Impacts, Alternative 3 4-210

 4.4.4.1.1 Construction-related Emissions, Alternative 3 4-210

 4.4.4.1.2 Stationary Operation-related Emissions, Alternative 3 4-210

 4.4.4.1.3 Mobile Operation-related Emissions, Alternative 3 4-210

 4.4.5 Air Quality Conclusions, Alternatives 1 through 3 4-215

 4.4.5.1 Air Quality Conclusions, Average Operations 4-215

 4.4.5.2 Air Quality Conclusions, High-Tempo Operations 4-217

4.5 Land Use..... 4-219

 4.5.1 Land Use, No Action Alternative 4-219

 4.5.2 Land Use, Alternatives 1 through 3 4-219

4.5.2.1 Potential Impacts, Land Use Compatibility4-220

 4.5.2.1.1 On-station Land Use4-220

 4.5.2.1.1.1 On-station Land Use Controls4-220

 4.5.2.1.2 Regional Land Use.....4-220

 4.5.2.1.2.1 Regional (Off-station) Land Use Controls.....4-221

 4.5.2.1.3 Land Use in the Noise Environment4-222

 4.5.2.1.3.1 DNL Noise Contours4-222

 4.5.2.1.3.2 Accident Potential Zones4-259

4.5.2.2 Potential Impacts, Recreation and Wilderness4-260

 4.5.2.2.1 Wilderness4-262

 4.5.2.2.2 Parks and Recreation Areas Potential Noise Impacts.....4-263

 4.5.2.2.2.1 San Juan Islands National Monument.....4-263

 4.5.2.2.2.2 San Juan Islands National Wildlife Refuge4-267

 4.5.2.2.2.3 Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve4-267

 4.5.2.2.2.4 Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail4-277

 4.5.2.2.2.5 State Parks and Recreation Areas4-279

 4.5.2.2.2.6 County and Municipal Parks and Recreation Areas4-285

 4.5.2.2.2.7 Privately Owned and Other Recreation Areas4-294

4.5.3 Land Use Conclusion, Alternatives 1 through 34-297

4.6 Cultural Resources 4-309

4.6.1 Documentation of the correspondence with the tribes is provided in Appendix C.
Cultural Resources, No Action Alternative4-315

4.6.2 Cultural Resources, Alternatives 1 through 3.....4-315

 4.6.2.1 Cultural Resources, Potential Impacts4-315

 4.6.2.1.1 Direct Effects.....4-315

 4.6.2.1.1.1 Archaeological Resources4-316

 4.6.2.1.1.2 Architectural Resources4-316

 4.6.2.1.1.3 Cemeteries4-317

 4.6.2.1.1.4 Traditional Cultural Properties.....4-318

 4.6.2.1.2 Indirect Effects4-318

 4.6.2.1.2.1 Archaeological Resources4-318

 4.6.2.1.2.2 Architectural Resources4-318

 4.6.2.1.2.2.1 Visual Effects4-319

 4.6.2.1.2.2.1.1 On-Installation Indirect Effect Areas4-319

 4.6.2.1.2.2.1.2 Off-Installation Indirect Effect Areas, Central Whidbey
Island Historic District, and the Ebey’s Landing
National Historical Reserve4-320

 4.6.2.1.2.2.2 Atmospheric Effects4-321

 4.6.2.1.2.2.3 Noise and Vibration.....4-321

 4.6.2.1.2.2.3.1 On-Installation Indirect Effect Areas4-324

4.6.2.1.2.2.3.2 Off-Installation Indirect Effect Areas and the Central Whidbey Island Historic District and Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve 4-324

4.6.2.1.2.3 Cemeteries4-326

4.6.2.1.2.4 Traditional Cultural Properties.....4-326

4.6.3 Cultural Resources Conclusion, Alternatives 1 through 3 4-326

4.7 American Indian Traditional Resources..... 4-329

4.7.1 Approach to Analyses..... 4-329

4.7.2 No Action Alternative 4-329

4.7.3 Alternatives 1, 2, and 3..... 4-330

4.7.4 American Indian Traditional Resources Conclusion, Alternatives 1 through 3..... 4-331

4.8 Biological Resources..... 4-332

4.8.1 Biological Resources, No Action Alternative 4-332

4.8.2 Biological Resources Potential Impacts, Alternatives 1 through 3..... 4-332

4.8.2.1 Effects on Terrestrial Wildlife..... 4-333

4.8.2.1.1 Habitat Loss..... 4-333

4.8.2.1.1.1 Endangered Species Act..... 4-334

4.8.2.1.1.2 Migratory Bird Treaty Act 4-334

4.8.2.1.1.3 Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act 4-334

4.8.2.1.2 Sensory Disturbances..... 4-334

4.8.2.1.2.1 Construction..... 4-336

4.8.2.1.2.1.1 Endangered Species Act 4-336

4.8.2.1.2.1.2 Migratory Bird Treaty Act..... 4-336

4.8.2.1.2.1.3 Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act 4-337

4.8.2.1.2.2 Aircraft Operations 4-337

4.8.2.1.2.2.1 Birds..... 4-337

4.8.2.1.2.2.1.1 Endangered Species Act 4-342

4.8.2.1.2.2.1.2 Migratory Bird Treaty Act..... 4-344

4.8.2.1.2.2.1.3 Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act 4-344

4.8.2.1.2.2.2 Mammals..... 4-345

4.8.2.1.2.2.3 Reptiles and Amphibians..... 4-347

4.8.2.1.3 Bird/Animal Aircraft Strike Hazard 4-348

4.8.2.1.3.1 Construction..... 4-348

4.8.2.1.3.1.1 Endangered Species Act 4-349

4.8.2.1.3.1.2 Migratory Bird Treaty Act..... 4-349

4.8.2.1.3.1.3 Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act 4-349

4.8.2.1.3.2 Aircraft Operations 4-349

4.8.2.1.3.2.1 Birds..... 4-350

4.8.2.1.3.2.1.1 Endangered Species Act 4-353

4.8.2.1.3.2.1.2 Migratory Bird Treaty Act..... 4-354

4.8.2.1.3.2.1.3 Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act 4-354

4.8.2.1.3.2.2 Mammals..... 4-355

4.8.2.1.3.2.3	Reptiles and Amphibians.....	4-356
4.8.2.2	Effects on Marine Species	4-356
4.8.2.2.1	Construction	4-356
4.8.2.2.1.1	Endangered Species Act.....	4-356
4.8.2.2.1.2	Marine Mammal Protection Act	4-357
4.8.2.2.2	Aircraft Operations	4-357
4.8.2.2.2.1	Fish.....	4-358
4.8.2.2.2.1.1	Endangered Species Act.....	4-358
4.8.2.2.2.2	Marine Mammals.....	4-359
4.8.2.2.2.2.1	Pinnipeds.....	4-360
4.8.2.2.2.2.2	Cetaceans	4-361
4.8.2.2.2.2.2.1	Endangered Species Act	4-362
4.8.2.2.2.2.2.2	Marine Mammal Protection Act.....	4-363
4.8.3	Biological Resources Conclusion	4-363
4.9	Water Resources.....	4-366
4.9.1	Water Resources, No Action Alternative.....	4-366
4.9.2	Water Resources, Alternatives 1 through 3	4-366
4.9.2.1	Water Resources Potential Impacts	4-366
4.9.2.1.1	Groundwater.....	4-366
4.9.2.1.1.1	Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances.....	4-367
4.9.2.1.2	Surface Water	4-367
4.9.2.1.3	Wetlands.....	4-368
4.9.2.1.4	Floodplains.....	4-368
4.9.2.1.5	Marine Waters and Sediments	4-369
4.9.3	Water Resources Conclusion, Alternatives 1 through 3.....	4-369
4.10	Socioeconomics	4-370
4.10.1	Socioeconomics, No Action Alternative	4-370
4.10.2	Socioeconomic Impacts, Alternatives 1 through 3.....	4-370
4.10.2.1	Population Impacts.....	4-370
4.10.2.2	Economy, Employment, and Income Impacts.....	4-373
4.10.2.2.1	Short-term Construction-related Impacts	4-374
4.10.2.2.2	Long-term Employee Earnings and Spending Impacts	4-374
4.10.2.2.3	Impacts to Other Industries.....	4-375
4.10.2.2.3.1	Agriculture.....	4-375
4.10.2.2.3.2	Tourism	4-375
4.10.2.2.3.3	Other Noise-Sensitive Industries	4-378
4.10.2.2.4	Economy, Employment, and Income Summary.....	4-378
4.10.2.3	Housing Impacts	4-378
4.10.2.4	Property Values.....	4-380
4.10.2.5	Local Government Revenues.....	4-381
4.10.3	Community Services Impacts, Alternatives 1 through 3	4-382

4.10.3.1 Education.....4-382

4.10.3.2 Medical Services.....4-384

4.10.3.3 Fire and Emergency Services.....4-384

4.10.3.4 Police Protection4-385

4.10.4 Socioeconomics Conclusion, Alternatives 1 through 34-385

4.11 Environmental Justice4-387

4.11.1 Methodology4-387

4.11.1.1 Methodology for Identifying Environmental Justice Communities4-387

4.11.2 Environmental Justice, No Action Alternative.....4-395

4.11.2.1 Identifying Environmental Justice Communities Analysis under the No
Action Alternative.....4-397

4.11.2.2 Identifying Disproportionately High and Adverse Impacts under the No
Action Alternative.....4-397

4.11.2.3 Analysis for Identifying Disproportionately High and Adverse Impacts
under the No Action Alternative4-399

4.11.2.3.1 Aircraft Noise4-400

4.11.2.3.2 Potential Increased Risk of Aircraft Mishaps in Clear Zones/Accident
Potential Zones4-400

4.11.2.3.3 Potential Impacts from Overcrowding at Oak Harbor School District.....4-403

4.11.2.3.4 Potential Impacts on Housing Affordability.....4-403

4.11.3 Environmental Justice, Alternatives 1 through 34-403

4.11.3.1 Identifying Environmental Justice Communities Analysis under Alternatives
1 through 34-403

4.11.3.2 Methodology for Identifying Disproportionately High and Adverse Impacts
under Alternatives 1 through 34-433

4.11.3.3 Analysis for Identifying Disproportionately High and Adverse Impacts
under Alternatives 1 through 34-433

4.11.3.3.1 Aircraft Noise4-433

4.11.3.3.2 Potential Increased Risk of Aircraft Mishaps in Clear Zones/Accident
Potential Zones4-437

4.11.3.3.3 Potential Impacts from Overcrowding at Oak Harbor School District.....4-440

4.11.3.3.4 Potential Impacts to Housing Affordability.....4-440

4.11.4 Environmental Justice Conclusion, Alternatives 1 through 3.....4-441

4.12 Transportation.....4-442

4.12.1 Transportation, No Action Alternative4-443

4.12.2 Transportation, Alternatives 1 through 3.....4-443

4.12.2.1 Renovation of Existing Facilities at NAS Whidbey Island4-443

4.12.2.2 Off-base Operations, Trip Generation.....4-443

4.12.2.3 Off-base Operations, Level of Service4-449

4.12.2.4 On-base Operations4-450

4.12.2.5 Transit, Pedestrian, and Bicycle Facilities.....4-451

4.12.3 Transportation Conclusion, Alternatives 1 through 34-451

4.13 Infrastructure 4-452

4.13.1 Infrastructure, No Action Alternative..... 4-452

4.13.2 Infrastructure, Alternatives 1 through 3 4-453

 4.13.2.1 Potable Water Impacts..... 4-453

 4.13.2.2 Wastewater Impacts 4-455

 4.13.2.3 Stormwater Impacts..... 4-458

 4.13.2.4 Solid Waste Management Impacts 4-458

 4.13.2.5 Energy Impacts 4-459

 4.13.2.6 Communications Impacts..... 4-461

 4.13.2.7 Facilities Impacts 4-461

4.13.3 Infrastructure Conclusion, Alternatives 1 through 3..... 4-462

4.14 Geological Resources 4-463

4.14.1 Geological Resources, No Action Alternative..... 4-463

4.14.2 Geological Resources, Alternatives 1 through 3 4-463

 4.14.2.1 Geological Resources Potential Impacts 4-463

 4.14.2.1.1 Topography Impacts 4-463

 4.14.2.1.2 Geology Impacts 4-463

 4.14.2.1.3 Seismic Activity and Geologic Hazard Impacts 4-463

 4.14.2.1.4 Soils Impacts 4-464

4.14.3 Geological Resources Conclusion..... 4-464

4.15 Hazardous Materials and Wastes..... 4-465

4.15.1 Hazardous Materials and Wastes, No Action Alternative 4-465

4.15.2 Hazardous Materials and Wastes, Alternatives 1 through 3..... 4-465

 4.15.2.1 Hazardous Materials and Wastes Potential Impacts 4-465

4.15.3 Hazardous Materials and Wastes Conclusion, Alternatives 1 through 3 4-466

4.16 Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases 4-467

4.16.1 Global Climate Change Projections 4-468

 4.16.1.1 Projections for Impacts of Climate Change to Washington and Puget Sound..... 4-468

 4.16.1.2 Projections for Impacts of Climate Change on Department of Defense..... 4-469

 4.16.1.3 Projections for Impacts of Climate Change at NAS Whidbey Island 4-469

4.16.2 Changes in Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Proposed Action 4-469

 4.16.2.1 Changes in Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Proposed Action, No
Action Alternative..... 4-470

 4.16.2.2 Changes in Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Proposed Action,
Alternative 1 4-470

 4.16.2.3 Changes in Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Proposed Action,
Alternative 2 4-472

 4.16.2.4 Changes in Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Proposed Action,
Alternative 3 4-474

 4.16.2.5 Greenhouse Gas Summary Conclusions, Alternatives 1 through 3..... 4-476

4.16.3 Adaptation and Mitigation 4-478

 4.16.3.1 Washington State 4-478

 4.16.3.2 Department of Defense..... 4-479

4.17 Summary of Potential Impacts to Resources 4-482

5 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS5-1

5.1 Definition of Cumulative Impacts.....5-1

5.2 Scope of Cumulative Impacts Analysis5-2

5.3 Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions5-3

5.3.1 Past Actions 5-11

5.3.1.1 Federal Actions.....5-11

5.3.1.2 Non-federal Actions5-11

5.3.2 Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions..... 5-11

5.3.2.1 Federal Actions.....5-11

5.3.2.2 Non-federal Actions5-13

5.4 Cumulative Impact Analysis.....5-14

5.4.1 Airfield and Airspace 5-15

5.4.1.1 Description of Geographic Study Area5-15

5.4.1.2 Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions5-15

5.4.1.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis5-16

5.4.2 Noise Associated with Aircraft Operations 5-16

5.4.2.1 Description of Geographic Study Area5-16

5.4.2.2 Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions5-16

5.4.2.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis5-17

5.4.3 Public Health and Safety..... 5-18

5.4.3.1 Description of Geographic Study Area5-18

5.4.3.2 Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions5-18

5.4.3.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis5-18

5.4.3.4 Combined Impacts from Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future
Actions..... 5-19

5.4.4 Air Quality..... 5-19

5.4.4.1 Description of Geographic Study Area5-19

5.4.4.2 Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions5-19

5.4.4.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis5-21

5.4.5 Land Use 5-22

5.4.5.1 Description of Geographic Study Area5-22

5.4.5.2 Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions5-22

5.4.5.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis5-22

5.4.6 Cultural Resources..... 5-23

5.4.6.1 Description of Geographic Study Area5-23

5.4.6.2 Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions5-23

5.4.6.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis5-23

5.4.7 American Indian Traditional Resources..... 5-24

5.4.7.1 Description of Geographic Study Area5-24

5.4.7.2 Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions5-24

5.4.7.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis5-25

5.4.8	Biological Resources	5-26
5.4.8.1	Description of Geographic Study Area	5-26
5.4.8.2	Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions	5-26
5.4.8.3	Cumulative Impact Analysis	5-29
5.4.9	Water Resources	5-31
5.4.9.1	Description of Geographic Study Area	5-31
5.4.9.2	Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions	5-31
5.4.9.3	Cumulative Impact Analysis	5-32
5.4.10	Socioeconomics	5-33
5.4.10.1	Description of Geographic Study Area	5-33
5.4.10.2	Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions	5-33
5.4.10.3	Cumulative Impact Analysis	5-33
5.4.11	Environmental Justice	5-35
5.4.11.1	Description of Geographic Study Area	5-35
5.4.11.2	Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions	5-35
5.4.11.3	Cumulative Impact Analysis	5-35
5.4.12	Transportation.....	5-36
5.4.12.1	Description of Geographic Study Area	5-36
5.4.12.2	Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions	5-36
5.4.12.3	Cumulative Impact Analysis	5-37
5.4.13	Infrastructure	5-37
5.4.13.1	Description of Geographic Study Area	5-37
5.4.13.2	Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions	5-38
5.4.13.3	Cumulative Impact Analysis	5-38
5.4.14	Geological Resources.....	5-39
5.4.14.1	Description of Geographic Study Area	5-39
5.4.14.2	Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions	5-39
5.4.14.3	Cumulative Impact Analysis	5-40
5.4.15	Hazardous Materials and Wastes.....	5-41
5.4.15.1	Description of Geographic Study Area	5-41
5.4.15.2	Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions	5-41
5.4.15.3	Cumulative Impact Analysis	5-41
5.4.16	Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases	5-41
6	OTHER CONSIDERATIONS REQUIRED BY THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT.....	6-1
6.1	Consistency with Other Federal, State, and Local Laws, Plans, Policies, and Regulations.....	6-1
6.2	Irreversible or Irrecoverable Commitments of Resources.....	6-11
6.3	Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	6-11
6.3.1	Noise Associated with Aircraft Operations	6-12
6.3.2	Education.....	6-12
6.3.3	Mitigation	6-13

6.4 Relationship between Short-Term Use of the Environment and Long-Term Productivity6-13

7 REFERENCES7-1

8 LIST OF PREPARERS8-1

9 DISTRIBUTION LIST.....9-1

List of Figures

Figure 1.2-1	General Location Map – NAS Whidbey Island Complex	1-2
Figure 1.2-2	General Location Map, Aerial - Ault Field	1-3
Figure 1.2-3	General Location Map, Aerial – OLF Coupeville	1-4
Figure 2.3-1	Ault Field Planned Facility Activities under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3	2-14
Figure 3.1-1	Cross Section of Controlled and Uncontrolled Airspace Classes	3-3
Figure 3.1-2	Aeronautical Chart NAS Whidbey Island Complex	3-4
Figure 3.1-3	Current Aircraft Arrival and Departure Flight Tracks at NAS Whidbey Island Complex	3-8
Figure 3.1-4	Current Interfacility and FCLP Flight Tracks	3-9
Figure 3.1-5	Current Pattern Operations Flight Tracks	3-10
Figure 3.1-6	Standard FCLP Pattern Altitudes (AGL)	3-12
Figure 3.2-1	A-weighted Sound Levels from Typical Sources	3-16
Figure 3.2-2	Engine Run-Up Locations at Ault Field.....	3-26
Figure 3.2-3	No Action Environment for NAS Whidbey Island Overview	3-29
Figure 3.2-4	No Action Environment for Ault Field, NAS Whidbey Island Complex	3-30
Figure 3.2-5	No Action Environment for OLF Coupeville, NAS Whidbey Island Complex	3-31
Figure 3.2-6	Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of NAS Whidbey Island Complex	3-37
Figure 3.3-1	Example of APZ-I and APZ-II for an FCLP Flight Track (with APZ-II extended)	3-57
Figure 3.3-2	2005 AICUZ APZs for Ault Field, NAS Whidbey Island	3-62
Figure 3.3-3	2005 AICUZ Clear Zones for OLF Coupeville	3-63
Figure 3.5-1	Island County Adopted APZs.....	3-86
Figure 3.5-2	65 dB DNL Average Year No Action Alternative Land Use for Ault Field	3-88
Figure 3.5-3	65 dB DNL Average Year No Action Alternative Land Use for OLF Coupeville	3-89
Figure 3.5-4	Parks and Recreation Areas in the NAS Whidbey Island Complex Affected Environment DNL Noise Contours	3-100
Figure 3.6-1	Area of Potential Effect.....	3-113
Figure 3.6-2	On Installation Direct Effect Areas.....	3-114
Figure 3.6-3	Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve, Landscape Character Areas	3-127
Figure 3.8-1	Biological Resource Study Area	3-144
Figure 3.8-2	Taylor’s Checkerspot Butterfly Designated Critical Habitat within the Study Area	3-149
Figure 3.8-3	Important Bird Areas and National Wildlife Refuges in the Study Area.....	3-158
Figure 3.8-4	Green Sturgeon and Rockfish Designated Critical Habitat within the Study Area	3-173
Figure 3.8-5	Salmonid Designated Critical Habitat within the Study Area	3-176
Figure 3.8-6	Southern Resident Killer Whale Designated Critical Habitat within the Study Area...	3-182
Figure 3.11-1	Census Tracts and Census Block Groups in the Environmental Justice Study Area	3-222

Figure 3.11-2 Environmental Justice Populations Affected by the No Action Alternative3-225

Figure 3.12-1 Local and Regional Traffic Circulation – Ault Field.....3-230

Figure 3.12-2 Local and Regional Traffic Circulation – Seaplane Base.....3-231

Figure 4.1-1 No Action Alternative FCLP Flight Tracks at NAS Whidbey Island Complex4-4

Figure 4.1-2 Alternatives 1-3 FCLP Flight Tracks at NAS Whidbey Island Complex4-8

Figure 4.2-1 Alternative 1 Overview of 65 dB DNL Noise Contours for the NAS Whidbey Island Complex4-35

Figure 4.2-2 Alternative 1A DNL Noise Contours for Ault Field4-36

Figure 4.2-3 Alternative 1B DNL Noise Contours for Ault Field4-37

Figure 4.2-4 Alternative 1C DNL Noise Contours for Ault Field4-38

Figure 4.2-5 Alternative 1D DNL Noise Contours for Ault Field4-39

Figure 4.2-6 Alternative 1E DNL Noise Contours for Ault Field4-40

Figure 4.2-7 Alternative 1A DNL Noise Contours for OLF Coupeville4-41

Figure 4.2-8 Alternative 1B DNL Noise Contours for OLF Coupeville4-42

Figure 4.2-9 Alternative 1C DNL Noise Contours for OLF Coupeville.....4-43

Figure 4.2-10 Alternative 1D DNL Noise Contours for OLF Coupeville4-44

Figure 4.2-11 Alternative 1E DNL Noise Contours for OLF Coupeville.....4-45

Figure 4.2-12 Alternative 2 Overview of 65 dB DNL Noise Contours for the NAS Whidbey Island Complex4-84

Figure 4.2-13 Alternative 2A DNL Noise Contours for Ault Field4-85

Figure 4.2-14 Alternative 2B DNL Noise Contours for Ault Field4-86

Figure 4.2-15 Alternative 2C DNL Noise Contours for Ault Field4-87

Figure 4.2-16 Alternative 2D DNL Noise Contours for Ault Field4-88

Figure 4.2-17 Alternative 2E DNL Noise Contours for Ault Field4-89

Figure 4.2-18 Alternative 2A DNL Noise Contours for OLF Coupeville4-90

Figure 4.2-19 Alternative 2B DNL Noise Contours for OLF Coupeville4-91

Figure 4.2-20 Alternative 2C DNL Noise Contours for OLF Coupeville.....4-92

Figure 4.2-21 Alternative 2D DNL Noise Contours for OLF Coupeville4-93

Figure 4.2-22 Alternative 2E DNL Noise Contours for OLF Coupeville.....4-94

Figure 4.2-23 Alternative 3 Overview of 65 dB DNL Noise Contours for the NAS Whidbey Island Complex4-128

Figure 4.2-24 Alternative 3A DNL Noise Contours for Ault Field4-129

Figure 4.2-25 Alternative 3B DNL Noise Contours for Ault Field4-130

Figure 4.2-26 Alternative 3C DNL Noise Contours for Ault Field4-131

Figure 4.2-27 Alternative 3D DNL Noise Contours for Ault Field4-132

Figure 4.2-28 Alternative 3E DNL Noise Contours for Ault Field4-133

Figure 4.2-29 Alternative 3A DNL Noise Contours for OLF Coupeville4-134

Figure 4.2-30 Alternative 3B DNL Noise Contours for OLF Coupeville4-135

Figure 4.2-31 Alternative 3C DNL Noise Contours for OLF Coupeville.....4-136

Figure 4.2-32 Alternative 3D DNL Noise Contours for OLF Coupeville4-137

Figure 4.2-33 Alternative 3E DNL Noise Contours for OLF Coupeville.....4-138

Figure 4.3-1 Existing 2005 AICUZ Clear Zones and Conceptual APZs for OLF Coupeville4-177

Figure 4.5-1 Alternative 1 Overview of the 65 dB DNL Noise Contours and Land Use for Ault Field.....4-253

Figure 4.5-2 Alternative 1 Overview of the 65 dB DNL Noise Contours and Land Use for OLF Coupeville4-254

Figure 4.5-3 Alternative 2 Overview of the 65 dB DNL Noise Contours and Land Use for Ault Field.....4-255

Figure 4.5-4 Alternative 2 Overview of the 65 dB DNL Noise Contours and Land Use for OLF Coupeville4-256

Figure 4.5-5 Alternative 3 Overview of the 65 dB DNL Noise Contours and Land Use for Ault Field.....4-257

Figure 4.5-6 Alternative 3 Overview of the 65 dB DNL Noise Contours and Land Use for OLF Coupeville4-258

Figure 4.5-7 Greater than 65 dB DNL Noise Contours in the Vicinity of the San Juan Islands National Monument4-266

Figure 4.10-1 Tourism and Revenue and Employment in Island, Skagit, and San Juan Counties, 1997-2014.....4-377

Figure 4.11-1 Environmental Justice Populations Affected by Alternative 14-390

Figure 4.11-2 Environmental Justice Populations Affected by Alternative 24-391

Figure 4.11-3 Environmental Justice Populations Affected by Alternative 34-392

Figure 5-1 Cumulative Impact Project Locations5-10

This page intentionally left blank.

List of Tables

Table 1.9-1	Summary of Public Scoping Notifications for the Environmental Impact Statement for EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island Complex	1-15
Table 1.9-2	Public Scoping Meeting Dates and Locations for the Environmental Impact Statement for EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island Complex	1-16
Table 1.9-3	Libraries and Locations Provided Paper Copies of Scoping Information Materials (2014-2015 Scoping Efforts) for the Environmental Impact Statement for EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island Complex	1-17
Table 1.9-4	Summary of Comment Methods during Public Scoping for the Environmental Impact Statement for EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island Complex	1-18
Table 1.9-5	Comparison of Comment Topics and Quantities of Public Scoping Comments for the Environmental Impact Statement for EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island Complex	1-19
Table 1.10-1	Summary of Notifications for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island Complex	1-21
Table 1.10-2	Public Meeting Dates and Locations for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island Complex	1-22
Table 1.10-3	Libraries and Locations Provided Paper Copies of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island Complex	1-23
Table 1.10-4	Summary of Comments by Submittal Method during the Public Comment Period for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island Complex	1-25
Table 1.10-5	Comment Topics and Quantities of Public Comment Segments for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island Complex	1-26
Table 1.13-1	Comparison of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2, Scenario A) from Draft EIS to Final EIS	1-62
Table 1.13-2	Comparison of Certain Resource Areas from Draft EIS to Final EIS	1-63
Table 2.3-1	Total Airfield Operations by Alternative for the Environmental Impact Statement for EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island Complex	2-8
Table 2.3-2	Comparison of FCLPs by Alternative at the NAS Whidbey Island Complex	2-10

Table 2.3-3	Aircraft, Personnel, and Dependents by Alternative for the Environmental Impact Statement for EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island Complex.....	2-11
Table 2.6-1	Summary of Alternatives Considered in the Environmental Impact Statement for EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island Complex	2-25
Table 3.1-1	Annual Military Training Route Operations in the Affected Environment	3-6
Table 3.1-2	Representative Sound Levels for Growler Aircraft in Level Flight	3-6
Table 3.1-3	Annual Modeled Affected Environment Operations at Ault Field and OLF Coupeville (Average).....	3-14
Table 3.2-1	Subjective Responses to Changes in A-weighted Decibels.....	3-16
Table 3.2-2	Estimated Acreage and Population within the DNL Contour Ranges for the Average Year at the NAS Whidbey Island Complex (CY 21).....	3-33
Table 3.2-3	Percent Difference in the Estimated Acreage and Population within the Average and High-Tempo FCLP Year DNL Contour Ranges for the NAS Whidbey Island Complex (CY 21).....	3-33
Table 3.2-4	Maximum Sound Exposure Level (dB) and Maximum Sound Level (dB) for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex (CY 21).....	3-39
Table 3.2-5	Number of Events above a Maximum Sound Level of 80 dB, 90 dB, and 100 dB for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, No Action Alternative (CY 21)	3-42
Table 3.2-6	Average Number of Events per Hour of Indoor Speech Interference for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex (CY 21).....	3-45
Table 3.2-7	Average Number of Events per Hour of Indoor Classroom/learning Interference for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex (CY 21).....	3-47
Table 3.2-8	Average Indoor Nightly Probability of Awakening for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex (CY 21)	3-48
Table 3.2-9	Average Number of Events per Hour of Outdoor Speech Interference for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex (CY 21).....	3-49
Table 3.2-10	Average and 10th Percentile Noise Induced Permanent Threshold Shifts as a Function of Equivalent Sound Level at NAS Whidbey Island Complex (CY 21).....	3-52
Table 3.3-1	EA-18G Growler Mishap Data from FY 2009 through FY 2017 for Land-based Operations	3-58
Table 3.3-2	Percentage of Children Living in Census Block Groups Affected by the NAS Whidbey Island Complex under the No Action Alternative.....	3-67

Table 3.3-3	Number and Percent of Children and Schools Affected by the NAS Whidbey Island Complex under the No Action Alternative	3-68
Table 3.3-4	Number and Percent of Children Affected by the Clear Zones and APZs at Ault Field and Coupeville OLF under the No Action Alternative	3-68
Table 3.4-1	National and State Ambient Air Quality Standards	3-70
Table 3.4-2	Northwest Clean Air Agency Jurisdiction Air Emissions Inventory, 2014	3-73
Table 3.4-3	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Criteria Pollutant Air Emissions Inventory	3-74
Table 3.4-4	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Reported Annual GHG Air Emissions Inventory, Required Stationary Sources Only	3-75
Table 3.4-5	NAS Whidbey Island Existing Criteria Pollutant Mobile Air Emissions, Growler Operations Only	3-76
Table 3.5-1	AICUZ Land Use Recommendations.....	3-83
Table 3.5-2	Existing Land Uses within Affected Environment DNL Noise Contours Surrounding Ault Field and OLF Coupeville	3-94
Table 3.5-3	Parks and Recreation Areas in the NAS Whidbey Island Complex Affected Environment DNL Noise Contours	3-99
Table 3.5-4	Estimated Total Visitors to State Parks in the Study Area, 1987-2011 (Every Third Year) and 2011-2016.....	3-106
Table 3.6-1	Architectural Resources within the APE	3-123
Table 3.6-2	NRHP-Eligible Buildings at Ault Field	3-125
Table 3.8-1	Reptiles and Amphibians Potentially Occurring within the Study Area	3-145
Table 3.8-2	Federally Listed Terrestrial Species and Critical Habitats Potentially Occurring within the Study Area	3-146
Table 3.8-3	Birds of Conservation Concern Occurring Annually within the Study Area.....	3-156
Table 3.8-4	Categories of Birds in Important Bird Areas	3-160
Table 3.8-5	State-listed Terrestrial Wildlife Species, Their Preferred Habitats, and Their Likelihood of Occurrence within the Study Area	3-162
Table 3.8-6	Marine Fishes by Taxonomic Group that Have the Potential to Occur in the Study Area.....	3-164
Table 3.8-7	MMPA-protected Marine Mammals Potentially Occurring within the Study Area	3-166
Table 3.8-8	NMFS/USFWS-managed Federally Endangered and Threatened Species and Critical Habitats Identified by IPaC as Potentially Occurring within the Study Area ...	3-169
Table 3.10-1	Military and Civilian Personnel Expected to be Assigned to the NAS Whidbey Island Complex in 2021	3-193
Table 3.10-2	Personnel Stationed and Employed at the NAS Whidbey Island Complex by Place of Residence.....	3-194
Table 3.10-3	Total Population Counts, Estimates, and Projections for Communities in the Study Area Surrounding the NAS Whidbey Island Complex.....	3-195

Table 3.10-4	Civilian Employment by Industrial Sector for Communities within the Study Area Surrounding the NAS Whidbey Island Complex in 2016.....	3-197
Table 3.10-5	Selected Economic Characteristics for the Communities in the Study Area Surrounding the NAS Whidbey Island Complex.....	3-198
Table 3.10-6	Annual Travel Expenditures, Earnings, and Employment in Island, San Juan, and Skagit Counties (1991-2014).....	3-200
Table 3.10-7	Industry Earnings Directly Generated by Travel Spending by Subsector in Island, San Juan, and Skagit Counties: 2014 (\$ millions).....	3-201
Table 3.10-8	Government Revenue Directly Generated by Travel Spending by Sector in Island, San Juan, and Skagit Counties: 2014 (\$ millions).....	3-201
Table 3.10-9	Overnight Visitor Volume in Island and San Juan Counties: 2012-2014.....	3-202
Table 3.10-10	Estimated Visitors to Deception Pass State Park, 1987-2008 (every third year) and 2011-2016	3-203
Table 3.10-11	2016 Estimated Visitors to State Parks within Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve	3-204
Table 3.10-12	Estimated Total Visitors to State Parks within Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve for Selected Years 1987-2016	3-204
Table 3.10-13	2016 Estimated Visitors to State Parks in San Juan Islands near the NAS Whidbey Island Complex.....	3-205
Table 3.10-14	Estimated Total Visitors to State Parks in San Juan Islands near the NAS Whidbey Island Complex for Selected Years 1987-2016	3-206
Table 3.10-15	Total Unaccompanied Personnel Housing Needs and Military Family Housing Needs and Available Assets at the NAS Whidbey Island Complex in 2017 and 2022	3-207
Table 3.10-16	Selected Housing Characteristics for the Communities in the Study Area Surrounding the NAS Whidbey Island Complex in 2016.....	3-208
Table 3.10-17	Suitable Rental Housing Located in the NAS Whidbey Island Housing Market Area: 2017.....	3-210
Table 3.10-18	Vacant Suitable Rental Housing Located in the NAS Whidbey Island Housing Market Area: 2017	3-210
Table 3.10-19	HUD Fair Market Rent by Unit Type, Island County, 2017	3-212
Table 3.10-20	Available Affordable Housing Units in Island County by Income Level	3-212
Table 3.10-21	Total County Government Revenues by Source for Calendar Year 2014 in the Area Surrounding the NAS Whidbey Island Complex	3-213
Table 3.10-22	Total County Government Expenditures by Category for Calendar Year 2014 in the Area Surrounding the NAS Whidbey Island Complex.....	3-214
Table 3.11-1	Comparison of Environmental Justice Populations in Census Block Groups Affected by the NAS Whidbey Island Complex under the No Action Alternative to County Totals.....	3-224

Table 3.11-2	Environmental Justice Populations Affected by the NAS Whidbey Island Complex under the No Action Alternative.....	3-226
Table 3.12-1	NAS Whidbey Island Gate Traffic Counts.....	3-233
Table 3.12-2	Existing Average Daily Traffic and Level of Service within the NAS Whidbey Island Complex Study Area	3-235
Table 3.13-1	Water Consumption Data at NAS Whidbey Island, 2010 through 2015.....	3-242
Table 3.13-2	Energy Use Data at NAS Whidbey Island, 2009 through 2015	3-246
Table 3.16-1	Washington State Annual Greenhouse Gas Air Emissions Inventory	3-256
Table 3.16-2	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Annual Reported GHG Air Emissions Inventory (Required Stationary Sources Only).....	3-257
Table 4.1-1	Annual Military Training Route Operations in the Affected Environment	4-6
Table 4.1-2	Comparison of Modeled No Action Alternative and Alternative 1, under All Scenarios (Average Year), Aircraft Operations at the NAS Whidbey Island Complex	4-10
Table 4.1-3	Comparison of Modeled No Action Alternative and Alternative 2, under All Scenarios (Average Year), Aircraft Operations at the NAS Whidbey Island Complex	4-16
Table 4.1-4	Comparison of Modeled No Action Alternative and Alternative 3, under All Scenarios (Average Year), Aircraft Operations at the NAS Whidbey Island Complex	4-21
Table 4.1-5	Comparison of Alternatives, under All Scenarios (Average Year), and No Action Alternative for Total Aircraft Operations at the NAS Whidbey Island Complex.....	4-23
Table 4.2-1	Estimated Acreage and Population within the DNL Contour Ranges for the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 1 (Average Year).....	4-31
Table 4.2-2	Percent Difference in the Estimated Acreage and Population within the Average and High-Tempo FCLP Year DNL Contour Ranges for the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 1	4-34
Table 4.2-3	Maximum Sound Exposure Level (dB) and Maximum Sound Level (dB) for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 1 (Average Year).....	4-47
Table 4.2-4	Number of Events Above a Maximum Sound Level of 80 dB, 90 dB, and 100 dB for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 1 (Average Year).....	4-51
Table 4.2-5	Average Number of Events per Hour of Indoor Speech Interference for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 1 (Average Year).....	4-56
Table 4.2-6	Average Number of Events per Hour of Indoor Classroom/Learning Interference for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 1 (Average Year).....	4-61

Table 4.2-7 Average Indoor Nightly Probability of Awakening for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 1 (Average Year).....4-64

Table 4.2-8 Average Number of Events per Hour of Outdoor Speech Interference for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 1 (Average Year).....4-68

Table 4.2-9 Average and 10th Percentile Noise Induced Permanent Threshold Shifts as a Function of Equivalent Sound Level under Alternative 1 at NAS Whidbey Island Complex (Average Year).....4-74

Table 4.2-10 Estimated Acreage and Population within the DNL Contour Ranges for the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 2 (Average Year).....4-80

Table 4.2-11 Percent Difference in the Estimated Acreage and Population within the Average and High-Tempo FCLP Year DNL Contour Ranges for the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 24-83

Table 4.2-12 Maximum Sound Exposure Level (dB) and Maximum Sound Level of 80 dB, 90 dB, and 100 dB for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 2 (Average Year).....4-97

Table 4.2-13 Average Number of Events per Hour of Indoor Speech Interference for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 2 (Average Year).....4-102

Table 4.2-14 Average Number of Events per Hour of Indoor Classroom/Learning Interference for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 2 (Average Year).....4-107

Table 4.2-15 Average Indoor Nightly Probability of Awakening for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 2 (Average Year).....4-110

Table 4.2-16 Average Number of Events per Hour of Outdoor Speech Interference for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 2 (Average Year).....4-114

Table 4.2-17 Average and 10th Percentile Noise Induced Permanent Threshold Shifts as a Function of Equivalent Sound Level under Alternative 2 at NAS Whidbey Island Complex (Average Year).....4-119

Table 4.2-18 Estimated Acreage and Population within the DNL Contour Ranges for the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 3 (Average Year).....4-124

Table 4.2-19 Percent Difference in the Estimated Acreage and Population within the Average and High-Tempo FCLP Year DNL Contour Ranges for the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 34-127

Table 4.2-20 Maximum Sound Exposure Level (dB) and Maximum Sound Level of 80 dB, 90 dB, and 100 dB for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 3 (Average Year).....4-141

Table 4.2-21 Average Number of Events per Hour of Indoor Speech Interference for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 3 (Average Year).....4-146

Table 4.2-22 Average Number of Events per Hour of Indoor Classroom/Learning Interference for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 3 (Average Year).....4-150

Table 4.2-23 Average Indoor Nightly Probability of Awakening for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 3 (Average Year).....4-153

Table 4.2-24 Average Number of Events per Hour of Outdoor Speech Interference for Representative Points of Interest in the Vicinity of the NAS Whidbey Island Complex, Alternative 3 (Average Year).....4-157

Table 4.2-25 Average and 10th Percentile Noise Induced Permanent Threshold Shifts as a Function of Equivalent Sound Level under Alternative 3 at NAS Whidbey Island Complex (Average Year).....4-162

Table 4.2-26 DNL Noise Contour Comparison - Overall Increase in the Number of People within the 65 dB DNL Noise Contour4-167

Table 4.3-1 Existing Clear Zones and Conceptual APZ Development based on Projected Operations at OLF Coupeville4-176

Table 4.3-2 Total Populations Aged 19 Years or Younger at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under the No Action Alternative and Alternative 1, All Scenarios, Average Year4-180

Table 4.3-3 Total Populations Aged 19 Years or Younger at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under the No Action Alternative and Alternative 2, All Scenarios, Average Year4-182

Table 4.3-4 Total Populations Aged 19 Years or Younger at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under the No Action Alternative and Alternative 3, All Scenarios, Average Year4-184

Table 4.3-5 Total Populations Aged 19 Years or Younger at the NAS Whidbey Island Complex under Alternative 1, All Scenarios, High-Tempo FCLP4-186

Table 4.3-6 Total Populations Aged 19 Years or Younger at the NAS Whidbey Island Complex under Alternative 2, All Scenarios, High-Tempo FCLP4-188

Table 4.3-7 Total Populations Aged 19 Years or Younger at the NAS Whidbey Island Complex under Alternative 3, All Scenarios, High-Tempo FCLP4-190

Table 4.3-8 Number of Children Residing within APZs for Ault Field and OLF Coupeville under Each Alternative/Scenario4-192

Table 4.3-9 Schools and Licensed Daycare Centers within 65+ DNL under all Alternatives, All Scenarios, Average and High-Tempo FCLP4-193

Table 4.4-1 NAS Whidbey Island Complex Emissions from Construction, All Alternatives4-196

Table 4.4-2 Stationary Direct and Indirect Criteria Pollutant Emissions, All Alternatives4-198

Table 4.4-3 NAS Whidbey Island Complex Criteria Pollutant Mobile Air Emissions Comparison with No Action, Alternative 1, Scenario A4-199

Table 4.4-4	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Criteria Pollutant Mobile Air Emissions Comparison with No Action, Alternative 1, Scenario B	4-200
Table 4.4-5	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Criteria Pollutant Mobile Air Emissions Comparison with No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, Scenario C	4-201
Table 4.4-6	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Criteria Pollutant Mobile Air Emissions Comparison with No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, Scenario D	4-202
Table 4.4-7	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Criteria Pollutant Mobile Air Emissions Comparison with No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, Scenario E.....	4-203
Table 4.4-8	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Criteria Pollutant Mobile Air Emissions Comparison with No Action Alternative, Alternative 2, Scenario A	4-205
Table 4.4-9	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Criteria Pollutant Mobile Air Emissions Comparison with No Action Alternative, Alternative 2, Scenario B	4-206
Table 4.4-10	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Criteria Pollutant Mobile Air Emissions Comparison with No Action Alternative, Alternative 2, Scenario C	4-207
Table 4.4-11	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Criteria Pollutant Mobile Air Emissions Comparison with No Action Alternative, Alternative 2, Scenario D	4-208
Table 4.4-12	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Criteria Pollutant Mobile Air Emissions Comparison with No Action Alternative, Alternative 2, Scenario E.....	4-209
Table 4.4-13	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Criteria Pollutant Mobile Air Emissions Comparison with No Action Alternative, Alternative 3, Scenario A	4-211
Table 4.4-14	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Criteria Pollutant Mobile Air Emissions Comparison with No Action Alternative, Alternative 3, Scenario B	4-212
Table 4.4-15	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Criteria Pollutant Mobile Air Emissions Comparison with No Action Alternative, Alternative 3, Scenario C	4-213
Table 4.4-16	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Criteria Pollutant Mobile Air Emissions Comparison with No Action Alternative, Alternative 3, Scenario D	4-214
Table 4.4-17	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Criteria Pollutant Mobile Air Emissions Comparison with No Action Alternative, Alternative 3, Scenario E.....	4-215
Table 4.4-18	Total Change in Criteria Pollutant and GHG Emissions, All Alternatives	4-216
Table 4.4-19	Total Change in Criteria Pollutant and GHG Emissions, High-Tempo, All Alternatives.....	4-218
Table 4.5-1	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Land Use Acreage (+/-) within the DNL Contours ² for Alternative 1, Scenario A, during an Average Year	4-223
Table 4.5-2	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Land Use Acreage (+/-) within the DNL Contours ² for Alternative 1, Scenario B, during an Average Year	4-225
Table 4.5-3	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Land Use Acreage (+/-) within the DNL Contours ² for Alternative 1, Scenario C, during an Average Year	4-227
Table 4.5-4	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Land Use Acreage (+/-) within the DNL Contours ² for Alternative 1, Scenario D, during an Average Year	4-229

Table 4.5-5	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Land Use Acreage (+/-) within the DNL Contours ² for Alternative 1, Scenario E, during an Average Year.....	4-231
Table 4.5-6	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Land Use Acreage (+/-) within the DNL Contours ² for Alternative 2, Scenario A, during an Average Year	4-233
Table 4.5-7	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Land Use Acreage (+/-) within the DNL Contours ² for Alternative 2, Scenario B, during an Average Year	4-235
Table 4.5-8	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Land Use Acreage (+/-) within the DNL Contours ² for Alternative 2, Scenario C, during an Average Year	4-237
Table 4.5-9	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Land Use Acreage (+/-) within the DNL Contours ² for Alternative 2, Scenario D, during an Average Year	4-239
Table 4.5-10	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Land Use Acreage (+/-) within the DNL Contours ² for Alternative 2, Scenario E, during an Average Year.....	4-241
Table 4.5-11	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Land Use Acreage (+/-) within the DNL Contours ² for Alternative 3, Scenario A, during an Average Year	4-243
Table 4.5-12	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Land Use Acreage (+/-) within the DNL Contours ² for Alternative 3, Scenario B, during an Average Year	4-245
Table 4.5-13	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Land Use Acreage (+/-) within the DNL Contours ² for Alternative 3, Scenario C, during an Average Year	4-247
Table 4.5-14	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Land Use Acreage (+/-) within the DNL Contours ² for Alternative 3, Scenario D, during an Average Year	4-249
Table 4.5-15	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Land Use Acreage (+/-) within the DNL Contours ² for Alternative 3, Scenario E, during an Average Year.....	4-251
Table 4.5-16	Land Use Acreage within Conceptual APZs for Runway 32 at OLF Coupeville	4-260
Table 4.5-17	Estimated San Juan National Conservation Area Waters (Acres) within the Noise Contours under Each Alternative and Scenario (Average Year)	4-264
Table 4.5-18	Area of Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve Encompassed by the Greater than 65 dB DNL Noise Contours under the Proposed Action (Acres).....	4-269
Table 4.5-19	Number of Events per Hour of Outdoor Speech Interference for Representative Points of Interest at Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve (Average Year Daytime).....	4-270
Table 4.5-20	Number of Annual Aircraft Noise Events with Maximum Sound Level of 100 dB at Points of Interest in Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve, Alternative 1 (Average Year).....	4-273
Table 4.5-21	Number of Annual Aircraft Noise Events with the Maximum Sound Exposure Level or Maximum Sound Level at Points of Interest in Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve, Alternative 2 (Average Year).....	4-274
Table 4.5-22	Number of Annual Aircraft Noise Events with the Maximum Sound Exposure Level or Maximum Sound Level at Points of Interest in Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve, Alternative 3 (Average Year).....	4-275

Table 4.5-23	Length of the Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail Encompassed by the Greater than 65 dB DNL Noise Contours under the Proposed Action (Miles [Percentage Change])	4-278
Table 4.5-24	Number of Events per Hour of Outdoor Speech Interference for Representative Points of Interest at State Parks (Average Year).....	4-279
Table 4.5-25	Number of Events of Outdoor Speech Interference per Nighttime Hour at Deception Pass State Park and Fort Casey State Park	4-281
Table 4.5-26	Number of Annual Aircraft Noise Events with Maximum Sound Level above 100 dB at Seleted Park Points of Interest in the Study Area, Alternative 1 (Average Year).....	4-282
Table 4.5-27	Number of Annual Aircraft Noise Events with Maximum Sound Level above 100 dB at Seleted Park Points of Interest in the Study Area, Alternative 2 (Average Year).....	4-283
Table 4.5-28	Number of Annual Aircraft Noise Events with Maximum Sound Level above 100 dB at Seleted Park Points of Interest in the Study Area, Alternative 3 (Average Year).....	4-284
Table 4.5-29	dB DNL Contour Range at County Parks and Recreation Areas under Each Alternative and Scenario.....	4-287
Table 4.5-30	dB DNL Contour Range at Municipal Parks and Recreation Areas under Each Alternative and Scenario.....	4-291
Table 4.5-31	Potential Changes to Recreational Levels of Service in Skagit County as a Result of the Proposed Action	4-294
Table 4.5-32	dB DNL Contour Range at Community Gathering Places under Each Alternative and Scenario	4-295
Table 4.5-33	Total Acreage within the Greater than 65 dB DNL Noise Contours (Average Year [Percentage Change])	4-297
Table 4.5-34	Summary of Impacts on Land Use and Recreation, All Action Alternatives	4-298
Table 4.6-1	Definitions of Effects on Historic Properties.....	4-310
Table 4.8-1	Annual Time of Exposure to Growler Events Greater than or Equal to 92 dBA in the Study Area	4-341
Table 4.8-2	Annual Time EA-18G Growler Aircraft Altitude is less than 500 feet in the Study Area.....	4-351
Table 4.10-1	EA-18G Growler Personnel Loading at the NAS Whidbey Island Complex under Each Alternative in 2021	4-372
Table 4.10-2	Regional Population Impacts Resulting from the Changes in EA-18G Growler Personnel Loading at the NAS Whidbey Island Complex Compared to the Affected Environment Levels.....	4-373
Table 4.10-3	Total Direct and Indirect Impacts Resulting from Construction Expenditures under Each Alternative at the NAS Whidbey Island Complex	4-374

Table 4.10-4 NAS Whidbey Island Complex Direct Employment and Employee Earnings Impacts Associated with Each Alternative Compared to the Affected Environment4-375

Table 4.10-5 Estimated Increase in Tax Revenues Resulting from the Changes in EA-18G Growler Personnel Loading at the NAS Whidbey Island Complex Compared to the Affected Environment Levels.....4-382

Table 4.10-6 Projected Number of School-aged Children Relocating to the Region as a Result of Changes in EA-18G Growler Personnel Loading at NAS Whidbey Island Compared to the No Action Alternative Levels4-383

Table 4.10-7 Projected Number of School-aged Children Enrolling in the Oak Harbor School District as Result of Changes in EA-18G Growler Personnel Loading at NAS Whidbey Island Compared to the No Action Alternatives Levels.....4-384

Table 4.11-1 Minority and Low-Income Populations in Census Block Groups Underlying Ault Field and OLF Coupeville dB DNL Contours,* either Wholly or Partially Impacted by the Greater than 65 dB DNL Noise Contour by Any Alternatives or Scenarios, Average Year4-393

Table 4.11-2 Environmental Justice Populations at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under the No Action Alternative, Average Year4-396

Table 4.11-3 Environmental Justice Populations at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under Clear Zones/APZs for Ault Field and OLF Coupeville.....4-402

Table 4.11-4 Environmental Justice Populations at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under Alternative 1, Scenario A, Average Year4-403

Table 4.11-5 Environmental Justice Populations at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under Alternative 1, Scenario B, Average Year4-405

Table 4.11-6 Environmental Justice Populations at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under Alternative 1, Scenario C, Average Year4-407

Table 4.11-7 Environmental Justice Populations at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under Alternative 1, Scenario D, Average Year4-409

Table 4.11-8 Environmental Justice Populations at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under Alternative 1, Scenario E, Average Year.....4-411

Table 4.11-9 Environmental Justice Populations at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under the Alternative 2, Scenario A, Average Year4-413

Table 4.11-10 Environmental Justice Populations at NAS Whidbey Island under the Alternative 2, Scenario B, Average Year4-415

Table 4.11-11 Environmental Justice Populations at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under Alternative 2, Scenario C, Average Year4-417

Table 4.11-12 Environmental Justice Populations at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under Alternative 2, Scenario D, Average Year4-419

Table 4.11-13 Environmental Justice Populations at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under Alternative 2, Scenario E, Average Year.....4-421

Table 4.11-14	Environmental Justice Populations at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under the Alternative 3, Scenario A, Average Year	4-423
Table 4.11-15	Environmental Justice Populations at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under Alternative 3, Scenario B, Average Year	4-425
Table 4.11-16	Environmental Justice Populations at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under Alternative 3, Scenario C, Average Year	4-427
Table 4.11-17	Environmental Justice Populations at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under Alternative 3, Scenario D, Average Year	4-429
Table 4.11-18	Environmental Justice Populations at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under Alternative 3, Scenario E, Average Year.....	4-431
Table 4.11-19	Demographic and Economic Characteristics of the Population Change from the No Action Alternative for Each Alternative and Scenario under the Average Year and High-Tempo FCLP Year.....	4-435
Table 4.11-20	Environmental Justice Populations at NAS Whidbey Island Complex under Clear Zones/APZs for Ault Field and OLF Coupeville.....	4-439
Table 4.12-1	NAS Whidbey Island Trip Distribution	4-444
Table 4.12-2	NAS Whidbey Island Projected Average Daily Traffic and Level of Service	4-445
Table 4.13-1	NAS Whidbey Island Water Supply Capacity by District	4-453
Table 4.13-2	NAS Whidbey Island Area Projected Water Consumption per Alternative.....	4-454
Table 4.13-3	Projected Annual Water Consumption for New Facilities at Ault Field (gpd)	4-455
Table 4.13-4	NAS Whidbey Island Area Wastewater Treatment Capacity.....	4-456
Table 4.13-5	NAS Whidbey Island Area Projected Wastewater Production	4-457
Table 4.13-6	Projected Annual Wastewater Production for New Facilities at Ault Field (gpd)	4-457
Table 4.13-7	NAS Whidbey Island Projected Solid Waste Production (pounds per day)	4-459
Table 4.13-8	NAS Whidbey Island Projected Annual Energy Consumption	4-459
Table 4.13-9	Projected Annual Electricity Consumption for New Facilities at Ault Field (kWh)	4-460
Table 4.13-10	Projected Annual Natural Gas Consumption for New Facilities at Ault Field (MMBTU)	4-460
Table 4.16-1	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Annual GHG Emissions, Alternative 1	4-471
Table 4.16-2	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Annual GHG Emissions, Alternative 2	4-473
Table 4.16-3	NAS Whidbey Island Complex Annual GHG Emissions, Alternative 3	4-475
Table 4.16-4	Total Change in GHG Emissions, All Alternatives.....	4-477
Table 4.16-5	DoD Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan Objectives	4-480
Table 4.17-1	Summary of Potential Impacts to Resource Areas	4-483
Table 5-1	Other Actions Considered for Potential Cumulative Impacts Associated with the Proposed Action for the NAS Whidbey Island Complex	5-4
Table 5-2	Total Changes in Criteria Pollutant and GHG Emissions due to Proposed Actions, NWCAA Jurisdiction	5-20

Table 6-1 Principal Federal and State Laws Applicable to the Proposed Action6-1
Table 9-1 Distribution List.....9-1

Appendices

Volume 2:

- Appendix A Aircraft Noise Study
- Appendix B Air Emissions Calculations

Volume 3:

- Appendix C Federal and State Agency Coordination

Volume 4:

- Appendix D Transportation Trip Generation Data
- Appendix E Land Use Data, High-tempo FCLP Year
- Appendix F Environmental Justice Data, High-tempo FCLP Year
- Appendix G Civilian Airfield Analysis
- Appendix H Noise Mitigation
- Appendix I Community Health and Learning Review
- Appendix J 2013 Scoping Information
- Appendix K 2014 Scoping Information
- Appendix L 2016 Draft EIS Public Information Meetings
- Appendix M Draft EIS Public Comment and Response Key

Abbreviations and Acronyms

Acronym	Definition
AAM	Advanced Acoustic Model
AAD	Average Annual Day
AB	Afterburner
ABD	Average Busy Day
ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
ACRP	Aircraft Cooperative Research Program
ADT	Average Daily Traffic
AEMR	Annual Energy Management Report
AESO	Aircraft Environmental Support Office
AFFF	aqueous film-forming foam
AGL	above ground level
AICUZ	Air Installations Compatible Use Zones
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
AOP	air operating permit
APE	Area of Potential Effects
APZ	Accident Potential Zone
AQCR	Air Quality Control Region
ATC	air traffic control
ATCAA	Air Traffic Controlled Assigned Airspace
ATFP	Anti-Terrorist Force Protection
BASH	Bird/Animal Aircraft Strike Hazard
BCC	Bird of Conservation Concern
BCR	Bird Conservation Region

Acronym	Definition
BGEPA	Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BMP	best management practice
BO	Biological Opinion
CAA	Clean Air Act
CCA	Carrier Controlled Approach
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CH ₄	methane
CI	confidence interval
CNG	Cascade Natural Gas Corporation
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CNO	Chief of Naval Operations
CO	carbon monoxide
COER	Citizens of Ebey's Reserve
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	carbon dioxide equivalent
CWA	Clean Water Act
CY	Calendar Year
CZMA	Coastal Zone Management Act
dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted sound level
dB(C)	C-weighted sound level
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Acronym	Definition
DERP	Defense Environmental Restoration Program
DNL	day-night average sound level (also known as L_{dn})
DNWG	U.S. Department of Defense Noise Working Group
DoD	U.S. Department of Defense
DoDI	United States Department of Defense Instruction
DPS	Distinct Population Segment
EA	Environmental Assessment
e.g.	for example
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EMS	emergency medical service
EO	Executive Order
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESU	Evolutionarily Significant Unit
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FCLP	field carrier landing practice
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FICON	Federal Interagency Committee on Noise
FICUN	Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise
FMR	Fair Market Rent
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FRS	Fleet Replacement Squadron
FWHCAs	Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas

Acronym	Definition
FY	Fiscal Year
GCA	Ground Controlled Approach
GHG	greenhouse gas
HAP	hazardous air pollutant
Hz	hertz
IBA	Important Bird Area
ICRMP	Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan
IFLOLS	Improved Fresnel Lens Optical Landing System
IFR	Instrument Flight Rule
in/sec	inches per second
INRMP	Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan
IPaC	Information for Planning and Conservation
IR	Instrument Flight Rules Military Training Route
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
JLUS	joint land use study
lbf	pound-force
L_{dn}	day-night average sound level (also known as DNL)
L_{eq}	Equivalent Sound Level
$L_{eq(8)}$	8-hour Equivalent Sound Level
$L_{eq(24)}$	24-hour Equivalent Sound Level
L_{max}	maximum A-weighted sound level
LID	low-impact development
LOS	level of service

Acronym	Definition
LSO	Landing Signal Officer
LTO	landing and takeoff operation
MAGIC CARPET	Maritime Augmented Guidance with Integrated Controls for Carrier Approach and Recovery Precision Enabling Technologies (now known as Precision Landing Mode [PLM])
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MCAS	Marine Corps Air Station
μPa	Micropascal
mgd	million gallons per day
MLS	Multiple Listings Service
MMPA	Marine Mammal Protection Act
MOVES	Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator
mph	miles per hour
MoA	Memorandum of Agreement
MOA	Military Operations Area
MSAT	Mobile Source Air Toxics
MSL	mean sea level
MT	metric ton
MTCO _{2e}	metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent
MTR	military training route
NA	number of events above (a specific sound level)
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAF	Naval Air Facility
NAS	Naval Air Station

Acronym	Definition
Navy	U.S. Department of the Navy
NAWS	Naval Air Weapons Station
NDI	Noise Depreciation Index
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NIPTS	Noise Induced Permanent Threshold Shift
nm	nautical miles
nm ²	square nautical miles
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NO ₂	nitrogen dioxide
NO _x	nitrogen oxides
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPS	National Park Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NRNW F&ES	Navy Region Northwest Fire and Emergency Services
N ₂ O	nitrous oxide
NWCAA	Northwest Clean Air Agency
NWR	National Wildlife Refuge
NWSTF	Naval Weapons Systems Training Facility
NWTRC	Northwest Training Range Complex
NWTT	Northwest Training and Testing
OEIS	Overseas Environmental Impact Statement

Acronym	Definition
OLF	outlying landing field
OPNAVINST	Office of the Chief of Naval Operations Instruction
OU	Operable Unit
PFAS	per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances
PFC	perfluorinated compound
PFOA	perfluorooctanic acid
PFOS	perfluorooctane sulfanate
PHL	Potential Hearing Loss
PLM	Precision Landing Mode (aka MAGIC CARPET)
PM _{2.5}	particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter
PM ₁₀	particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter
POI	point of interest
POV	Personally Owned Vehicles
PSD	Prevention of Significant Deterioration
PSE	Puget Sound Energy
PUD	Public Utility District
RCW	Revised Code of Washington
RDT&E	Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation
REPI	Readiness and Environmental Protection Integration
ROD	Record of Decision
RTIP	Regional Transportation Improvement Program

Acronym	Definition
RTPO	Regional Transportation Planning Organization
SAR	search and rescue
SCOG	Skagit Council of Governments
SDZ	Surface Danger Zone
SEL	sound exposure level
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office(r)
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SO ₂	sulfur dioxide
SPBHD	Seaplane Base Historic District
SPCC	Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures
SPL	Sound Pressure Level
SR	State Route
STIP	Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
SUA	Special Use Airspace
TCP	traditional cultural property
T&G	touch-and-go
TACAN	Tactical Air Navigation
U&A	usual and accustomed
UFC	Unified Facility Criteria
UIC	Underground Injection Control
U.S.C.	United States Code
U.S.	United States
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency

Acronym	Definition
USFS	United States Forest Service
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
VFR	Visual Flight Rules
VOC	volatile organic compound
VQ	Fleet Air Reconnaissance
VR	Visual Flight Rules Military Training Route

Acronym	Definition
WAC	Washington Administrative Code
WDFW	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
WGMA	Washington State Growth Management Act
WHO	World Health Organization
WSDOT	Washington State Department of Transportation

This page intentionally left blank.