

Draft
Environmental Impact Statement
Fallon Range Training Complex Modernization

Lead Agency: United States Department of the Navy

Cooperating Agencies:

Bureau of Land Management	Churchill County, Nevada
Federal Aviation Administration	Eureka County, Nevada
Nevada Department of Wildlife	Lander County, Nevada
Nevada Department of Minerals	Mineral County, Nevada
Nevada Department of Agriculture	Nye County, Nevada
Nevada Department of Transportation	Pershing County, Nevada
Nevada Governor's Office of Energy	

Title of the Proposed Action: Fallon Range Training Complex Modernization

Designation: Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Abstract

The Commander, United States (U.S.) Pacific Fleet, a Command of the U.S. Navy (hereinafter referred to as the Navy), proposes to modernize the land and airspace configurations of the Fallon Range Training Complex (FRTC) in northwest Nevada. The Navy prepared this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act. This EIS evaluates the potential environmental impacts of expanding land ranges and modifying associated airspace configurations in the FRTC and Special Use Airspace:

- The No Action Alternative does not include the renewal of the existing withdrawn lands under Public Law 106-65 nor does it propose any withdrawal or acquisition of new land. Current and proposed training at the FRTC would likely need to be accommodated elsewhere, which would likely result in the potential loss of the integrated nature of training at the FRTC, causing fragmentation and total loss of essential training functions.
- Under Alternative 1, all bombing ranges and training areas would be expanded except Bravo (B)-19 and the Shoal Site. The Navy would restrict public activity at each bombing range on withdrawn or acquired lands.
- Under Alternative 2, the Navy would expand the bombing ranges and training areas in the same way as under Alternative 1. Under Alternative 2, the Navy proposes managed access for public activities where compatible with military training on bombing ranges.
- Alternative 3 is similar to Alternatives 1 and 2 in terms of its proposed land withdrawals and acquisitions, except with respect to the orientation, size, and location of B-16, B-17, B-20, and the Dixie Valley Training Area. Alternative 3 is similar to Alternative 2 in terms of managed access, however, land south of U.S. Route 50 would not be withdrawn or acquired as the Dixie Valley Training Area.

The resources evaluated include geological resources, land use, mining and mineral resources, livestock grazing, transportation, airspace, noise, air quality, water resources, biological resources, cultural resources, recreation, socioeconomics, public health and safety and the protection of children, and environmental justice. This EIS also addresses the cumulative impacts of the direct and indirect effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions coupled with the Proposed Action on the human environment.

Prepared by: United States Department of the Navy

Point of Contact: FRTC EIS Project Manager
Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest, Code EV21.SG
1220 Pacific Highway
San Diego, CA 92132

