1.0 Purpose and Need

Environmental Impact Statement

Fallon Range Training Complex Modernization

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>1</u> PURPOSE	DF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION1-1
1.1 INTRODUC	TION
1.2 LOCATION	
1.3 BACKGRO	JND1-5
1.4 PURPOSE	DF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION1-9
1.5 TRAINING	NEEDS AND THE CAPABILITIES EVALUATION PROCESS
1.5.1 WEAPO	NS RELEASE TRAINING AND NEED FOR EXPANDED RANGE AREA
1.5.2 AIRSPAC	e Training Need versus Current Range Capability1-17
1.5.3 GROUNI	MOBILITY TRAINING NEED VERSUS CURRENT RANGE CAPABILITY
1.5.4 Non-W	EAPONS TRAINING NEED AND THE CURRENT RANGE CAPABILITY
1.6 SCOPE OF	ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS1-22
1.6.1 Метно	DOLOGY
1.7 KEY DOCU	MENTS
1.7.1 FINAL EI	IVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR WITHDRAWAL OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR RANGE SAFETY AND
TRAININ	G PURPOSES – MAY 19981-27
1.7.2 FINAL LE	gislative Environmental Impact Statement for the Renewal of the Bravo-20 Land
WITHDR	AWAL – DECEMBER 1998
1.7.3 FINAL EI	IVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT, PROPOSED FALLON TRAINING RANGE COMPLEX REQUIREMENTS,
JANUAR	/ 20001-28
1.7.4 ENVIRO	IMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR AIRFIELD OPERATIONS AT NAVAL AIR STATION FALLON, AUGUST 20131-28
1.7.5 ENVIRO	IMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED ADDITION OF TRAINING ACTIVITIES AND RANGE
ENHANC	EMENTS AT NAVAL AIR STATION FALLON ON TRAINING RANGE BRAVO-16, CHURCHILL COUNTY, NEVADA,
Septem	3er 20141-29
1.7.6 NINETY	Days to Combat: Required Training Capabilities for the Fallon Range Training Complex
2015–2	035, JUNE 20151-29
1.7.7 FINAL E	IVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR MILITARY READINESS ACTIVITIES AT FALLON RANGE TRAINING
COMPLE	х, December 20151-30
1.8 RELEVANT	LAWS, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES1-30
1.9 PUBLIC AN	D AGENCY PARTICIPATION AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION1-32
1.9.1 PUBLICS	COPING
1.9.2 DRAFT E	NVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REVIEW PROCESS1-34
1.10 DRAFT EN	VIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: COMMENT THEMES1-34
1.10.1 DESCRIP	TION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION1-34
1.10.1.1 Use c	f Simulators for Training1-34
1.10.1.2 Othe	Alternatives1-35
1.10.1.3 Gove	rnor's Alternative (The Nevada Alternative)1-35
1.10.2 LEVEL O	SIGNIFICANCE
1.10.3 LAND U	5E1-35

1.10.4 MINING AND MINERAL RESOURCES	1-35
1.10.4.1 Minerals and Mining (Locatable)	1-35
1.10.4.2 Mining Claim Loss	1-36
1.10.4.3 Geothermal Development	1-36
1.10.5 Livestock Grazing	1-36
1.10.5.1 Water Rights	1-36
1.10.5.2 Grazing loss/Valuation of Permits	1-36
1.10.5.3 Payment for Losses	1-37
1.10.5.4 Payment for Allotment Improvements	1-37
1.10.5.5 Timing of Permit Cancellation	1-38
1.10.6 TRANSPORTATION	1-38
1.10.6.1 Relocation of State Route 839	1-38
1.10.6.2 Relocation of State Route 361	1-38
1.10.6.3 County Roads (RS2477)	1-39
1.10.7 AIRSPACE	1-39
1.10.7.1 Airspace Buffers—Airports	1-39
1.10.7.2 Flight Tracks and FAA Regulations—sage-grouse seasonal habitat overflight avoidance	1-39
1.10.7.3 Lowering of Restricted Areas/Military Operations Areas	1-39
1.10.8 NOISE	1-40
1.10.8.1 Impacts on Humans	1-40
1.10.8.2 Additional Noise Buffers	1-40
1.10.8.3 Defining Locations for Noise Sensitive Areas	1-40
1.10.8.4 Noise Complaints	1-40
1.10.8.5 Sensitive Receptors	1-40
1.10.8.6 Noise Modeling	1-41
1.10.9 Air Quality	1-41
1.10.10 WATER RIGHTS	1-41
1.10.10.1 Acquisition of Water Rights	1-41
1.10.10.2 Stock Water Rights	1-41
1.10.10.3 Vested Water Rights	1-41
1.10.11 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	1-42
1.10.11.1 Biological Resources General Concern	1-42
1.10.11.2 Greater Sage Grouse/Consistency with State Plans	1-42
1.10.11.3 Noise and Greater Sage Grouse Nesting—Types of Noise Metrics Used	1-42
1.10.11.4 Fencing	1-42
1.10.11.5 Sonic Boom Response	1-43
1.10.12 CULTURAL RESOURCES	1-43
1.10.12.1 Section 106	1-43
1 10 12 2 Potential Impact Areas	1-44
1.10.12.3 Programmatic Agreement	1-44
1.10.12.4 Legacy Issues – Munitions on Walker River Paiute Reservation	1-44
1 10 12 5 Tribal Consultation	1-45
1.10.13 RECREATION	1-45
1.10.13.1 Loss of Recreation	1-45
1.10.13.2 Off-Highway Vehicle Areas	1-46
1.10.13.3 De-Designating Wilderness Study Areas	1-46

1.10.13.4 Loss of Hunting Opportunities1-4	46
1.10.13.5 Aviation – Gabbs Airport1-4	46
1.10.14 SOCIOECONOMICS	46
1.10.14.1 Future Projections—Payment in Lieu of Taxes1-4	46
1.10.14.2 Tourism	47
1.10.15 Public Health and Safety	47
1.10.15.1 Wildland Fire Management1-4	47
1.10.15.2 Hazardous Materials and Wastes1-4	47
1.10.15.3 Munitions Constituent Migration1-4	47
1.10.15.4 Abandoned Mines1-4	47
1.10.16 Environmental Justice1-4	48
1.10.17 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS	48
1.10.17.1 Local Projects considered for cumulative impacts1-4	48
1.10.17.2 Military Actions – Nevada Test and Training Range Military Land Withdrawal at Nellis Air	
Force Base1-4	48
1.10.17.3 Cumulative Noise Impact Analysis1-4	49
1.10.18 MITIGATION	49
1.10.18.1 General Mitigation1-4	49
1.10.18.2 Reducing the Withdrawal and Acquisition1-4	49
1.10.18.3 Mitigation for Loss of Grazing Areas1-5	50
1.10.18.4 Mitigation for Access Loss1-5	50
1.10.18.5 Mitigation for Socioeconomic Loss1-5	50
1.11 FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT AND RECORD OF DECISION	50

List of Figures

FIGURE 1-1: EXISTING FALLON RANGE TRAINING COMPLEX	1-4
FIGURE 1-2: HISTORIC LAND ACTIONS FOR THE FALLON RANGE TRAINING COMPLEX	1-6
FIGURE 1-3: WEAPONS DANGER ZONE FOR A SINGLE FIRING AZIMUTH	. 1-13
FIGURE 1-4: CREATION OF COMPOSITE WEAPONS DANGER ZONE FROM NUMEROUS FIRING AZIMUTHS	. 1-14
FIGURE 1-5: DEVELOPMENT OF TACTICALLY ACCEPTABLE PARAMETERS AND RESULTANT WEAPONS DANGER ZONE AT B-17	. 1-15
FIGURE 1-6: DEVELOPMENT OF TACTICALLY ACCEPTABLE PARAMETERS AND RESULTANT WEAPONS DANGER ZONE AT B-20	. 1-16
FIGURE 1-7: DEVELOPMENT OF TACTICALLY ACCEPTABLE PARAMETERS AND RESULTANT WEAPONS DANGER ZONE AT B-16	. 1-21

List of Tables

TABLE 1-1: MANAGEMENT OF CURRENT FALLON RANGE TRAINING COMPLEX LAND ASSETS	1-3
TABLE 1-2: TACTICS, TECHNIQUES, AND PROCEDURES SUPPORTABLE WEAPONS RELEASE TRAINING VERSUS CAPABILITIES	. 1-17
TABLE 1-3: GROUND MOBILITY TRAINING NEED VERSUS CURRENT RANGE CAPABILITY	. 1-19
TABLE 1-4: FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION CATEGORIES, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ELEMENTS, AND ENVIRONMENTAL	-
IMPACT STATEMENT CATEGORIES	. 1-24
TABLE 1-5: CATEGORIZATION OF PUBLIC SCOPING COMMENTS BY RESOURCE AREA	. 1-33

This page intentionally left blank.

1 Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

1.1 Introduction

The Commander, United States (U.S.) Pacific Fleet, a Command of the U.S. Department of the Navy (Navy), proposes to modernize the land and airspace configurations of the Fallon Range Training Complex (FRTC) in northwest Nevada.

The Navy constantly evaluates its warfighting tactics, techniques, and procedures for their effectiveness against changing threats worldwide. As new weapons systems are developed and introduced to the Fleet and tactics updated to successfully employ these weapons systems, training requirements also change. Changes to training requirements can, in turn, drive the need to expand or modify training ranges. At the FRTC, a number of new weapons systems have been introduced to the Fleet in recent years (e.g., Joint Direct Attack Munitions); and new systems, including new aircraft (e.g., F-35C, EA-18G), will need to be employed in future training activities. However, the FRTC bombing ranges (Bravo [B]-16, B-17, B-19, and B-20) and the Dixie Valley Training Area (DVTA) have not changed substantially in size or configuration since the 1990s. To configure the FRTC bombing ranges to meet modern training requirements, the Navy proposes the following actions:

- Congressional renewal of the 1999 Public Land Withdrawal of 202,864 acres for a term of 25 years, which is scheduled to expire in November 2021;
- withdrawal and reservation by Congress for military use additional federal land for a term of 25 years;
- acquisition of private or state-owned (non-federal) land;
- expansion of associated Special Use Airspace (SUA) and reconfiguration of existing airspace; and
- modification of range infrastructure to support modernization.

The elements of this proposal are based on the results of a comprehensive assessment of air warfare by the Naval Air Warfare Development Center (NAWDC), which is the Naval Aviation Warfighting Center of Excellence for the Navy, to address current, emergent, and future FRTC training capabilities. The assessment is titled *Ninety Days to Combat* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015a) (discussed in full in Section 1.4, Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action), which was not a decision document, and informed the decisions that ultimately became this Proposed Action. With the implementation of the proposed modernization, the FRTC would be capable of supporting the aviation and ground training and readiness requirements for the training missions assigned to the FRTC, into the foreseeable future.

Under the Proposed Action, the type and tempo of aviation and ground training would be similar to what was evaluated in Alternative 2 of the 2015 *Military Readiness Activities at Fallon Range Training Complex, Nevada Final Environmental Impact Statement* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015a). In addition to analyzing the type and tempo of military readiness training activities within the FRTC, that Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) accounted for the introduction of new platforms (aircraft) and weapons systems. This current EIS analyzes physical changes to the FRTC.

At the time the Record of Decision (ROD) for the 2015 *Military Readiness Activities at Fallon Range Training Complex, Nevada Final Environmental Impact Statement* was signed, NAWDC's assessment of the capabilities of the FRTC to meet future training requirements was still under consideration by the Navy. Changes in future range design and tactics at the FRTC were not considered in that EIS. The ROD acknowledged that the Navy would analyze any proposed physical or operational changes to the FRTC in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) when such changes were considered ripe for analysis.

The Navy has prepared this current EIS in accordance with NEPA, as implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and Navy Regulations. The Navy is the lead agency for this EIS pursuant to 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) section 1501.5. Cooperating agencies for this EIS, pursuant to 40 CFR section 1501.6 and section 1508.5, include:

- Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Nevada Department of Wildlife
- Nevada Department of Minerals
- Nevada Department of Agriculture
- Nevada Department of Transportation

- Nevada Governor's Office of Energy
- Churchill County, Nevada
- Eureka County, Nevada
- Lander County, Nevada
- Mineral County, Nevada
- Nye County, Nevada
- Pershing County, Nevada

The Navy is also working closely with the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada and the following 13 federally recognized Indian Tribes to prepare this EIS:

- Duckwater Shoshone Tribe
- Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Tribe
- Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe
- Lovelock Paiute Tribe
- Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe
- Reno-Sparks Indian Colony
- Summit Lake Paiute Tribe
- Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada (comprised of the

Battle Mountain Band, Elko Band, South Fork Band, and Wells Band)

- Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California
- Walker River Paiute Tribe
- Winnemucca Paiute Tribe
- Yerington Paiute Tribe
- Yomba Shoshone Tribe
- Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada

In accordance with 36 CFR part 800 (regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act [NHPA] of 1966 [54 United States Code {U.S.C.} 300101 et seq.], as amended); Executive Order 13175, *Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments*; and regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR part 1500 et seq.), consultation with Indian Tribes has been ongoing throughout the development of this EIS. The Navy solicited comments from the listed Indian Tribes by letter, phone, and e-mail, and has received both written and oral responses. The Navy invited the listed Indian Tribes to be present at meetings with cooperating agencies and hosted separate meetings with these Indian Tribes regarding the proposal. The Navy will continue to consult with Indian Tribes on a Government-to-Government basis, including but not limited to consultation under NHPA Section 106.

1.2 Location

The FRTC is located in northern Nevada and encompasses approximately 202,864 acres of training land (Table 1-1) and 8,670 acres of land at the Naval Air Station (NAS) Fallon main base. In addition, the FRTC has approximately 12,256 square nautical miles (NM²) of SUA associated with NAS Fallon. The FRTC airspace overlies large parts of Churchill, Lander, and

Special Use Airspace

Airspace of defined dimensions wherein activities (e.g., military training flights) must be confined because of the nature of their activities or wherein limitations may be imposed upon aircraft operations that are not a part of those activities. Eureka counties, as well as small portions of Pershing County in the north, Nye County in the south, Elko County in the east, Mineral County in the southwest, and Lyon and Washoe Counties in the west. U.S. Highway 50 bisects the FRTC and is a main east-west transportation route through the complex (Figure 1-1).

Area	Land Category			
Area	Withdrawn ¹ (acres)	Navy Fee Owned ² (acres)		
B-16	27,359	0		
B-17 ¹	53,546	25		
B-19	29,012	0		
B-20	21,576	19,429		
DVTA	68,809	28		
Shoal Site	2,561	0		
Totals ⁺	202,864	19,483		

Table 1-1: Management of Current Fallon Range Training Complex Land Assets

¹The existing withdrawn acreage represents the area that is presented in the Navy's withdrawal request segregation package and are lands that the Navy is requesting for renewal. As a result of numerous land surveys by the BLM since 1999, this number does not match the acreage values as described in PL 106-65. ⁺Due to rounding of acreage values at the category level, some total columns may not match calculated totals.

²In addition to the Withdrawn and Navy Fee-Owned lands, there are approximately 1,215 acres of Navy controlled non-federal lands as part of the B-17 range not listed in the table.





1.3 Background

The FRTC hosts training for aviation and ground military units necessary to ensure military readiness for the defense and security of the United States and its interests abroad. Since World War II, the Navy has extensively used the ranges and airspace of the FRTC to conduct military air warfare and ground training, including live-fire training activities. The area in which the FRTC is located provides an ideal training environment due to its climate, potentially usable land areas, terrain, and military airspace.

The FRTC's characteristics include suitable weather for year-round training and designated airspace for overland supersonic training. The region provides large areas suitable for realistic training and space for freedom of tactical maneuver, where naval personnel can build and sustain combat skills and readiness.

The FRTC consists of four live-fire ranges (B-16, B-17, B-19, and B-20) and one non-firing training area (the DVTA, which includes the Shoal Site):

January 2020

History of the FRTC

1942	U.S. Army airfield established in Fallon
1943	First training range established (B-20)
1944	Naval Auxiliary Air Station commissioned with transfer of a property from the Army
1953	Establishment of B-16, B-17, and B-19. Public Land Order 898 indefinitely withdrew 56,011 acres of land for B-16, B-17, and B-19 for military use (Figure 1-2).
1984	Naval Strike Warfare Center based at NAS Fallon
1996	Naval Strike and Air Warfare Center (NSAWC) formed which consolidated the Naval Strike Warfare Center, Navy Fighter Weapons School (TOPGUN), and Carrier Airborne Early Warning Weapons School (TOPDOME)
1986	Public Law 99-606 enacted, withdrew 21,576 acres for use of B-20 for training for a 15-year term.
1999	Public Law 106-65 signed, which withdrew approximately 201,933 acres of land for military use expiring November 5, 2021. Land was withdrawn for B-16 (27,253 acres), B-17 (52,830 acres), B-19 (29,276 acres), B-20 (21,577 acres), the DVTA (68,437 acres), and the Shoal Site (2,560 acres). This number does not match the acreage values as described in the BLM segregation package (and land acreage tables within this EIS) as a result of numerous map revisions and land surveys by the BLM since 1999.

B-16's primary use is unit-level ground and air training. Typical training activities that have
historically occurred include Naval Special Warfare tactical ground mobility training using
wheeled vehicles with crew-served weapons and small arms, fixed-wing inert ordnance (practice
bombs armed only with small spotting charges in order to identify weapon impact location),

helicopter gunnery (machine gun) training, and Close Air Support and Combat Search and Rescue missions. Naval Special Warfare Tactical Ground Mobility Course training, Naval Aviation basic air-to-ground training, and Helicopter Gunnery Training Range training have historically occurred at B-16. The majority of B-16 is closed to the public due to safety reasons, with only small

Combat Search and Rescue

A specific task performed by rescue forces to recover distressed personnel during war or military operations other than war. Also called CSAR.

portions accessible to the public under the terms of the 1999 Military Lands Withdrawal Act (Public Law 106-65). Table 2-9 provides a complete list of training activities conducted at B-16.





- B-17's primary use is advanced training with multiple aircraft. The Navy has heavily developed B-17 and it is the most frequently used bombing range within the FRTC. The range contains a variety of targets and target configurations and provides the most challenging and highcomplexity scenarios for all types of training events. It accommodates live and inert munitions. B-17 is not accessible by the public for safety reasons. Table 2-9 provides a complete list of training activities conducted at B-17.
- B-19 is used for Air-to-Ground munitions delivery and rotary-wing strafing (firing at a ground target from helicopter). The range also has a small arms range managed by the Nevada Army National Guard. Small portions of B-19 are accessible to the public under the terms of the 1999 Military Lands Withdrawal Act. Table 2-9 provides a complete list of training activities conducted at B-19. No changes are proposed for this range.
- B-20's primary use is for advanced weapons training and large force exercises. It contains a variety of targets and target complexes and is capable of accommodating both live and inert ordnance. B-20 is not accessible by the public for safety reasons. Table 2-9 provides a complete list of training activities conducted at B-20.
- The DVTA is typically used for Convoy Training, fixed-wing and helicopter Night Vision Device training, helicopter mountain-flying training, and Combat Search and Rescue activities. The DVTA also supports aviation electronic warfare and some Naval Special Warfare activities. No Air-to-Ground munitions delivery training or live-fire training activities occur within the DVTA. The majority of the DVTA is accessible to the public under the terms of the 1999 Military Lands Withdrawal Act. There are several facilities on the DVTA that are fenced and locked, including radar sites, a maintenance yard, and an electronic support facility (Centroid Complex). Table 2-9 provides a complete list of training activities conducted at the DVTA.
- The Navy typically uses the Shoal Site for Combat Search and Rescue activities. There is no air-to-ground munitions delivery or live-fire training conducted. The Shoal Site is accessible to the public under the terms of the 1999 Military Lands Withdrawal Act. No changes are proposed for this area.

The FRTC's SUA includes 9 restricted areas, 15 Military Operations Areas (MOAs), 14 Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspaces (ATCAA), 2 supersonic operating areas (where aircraft can exceed Mach 1, or the speed of sound), and a Civilian Visual Flight Rules (VFR) corridor. Specifically, the FRTC SUA includes:

- Restricted Airspaces (established by 14 CFR part 73) are areas of airspace that, when activated, are closed to commercial and general aviation aircraft. Restricted areas activate as necessary to support safe range operations, during specific land bombing events and as needed for specific non-ordnance activities, such as lasing. Outside of normal operating hours (during which restricted areas are generally activated), activation of the Restricted Airspace is communicated to the public via FAA-issued Notices to Airmen.
- MOAs are areas of SUA used to separate certain non-hazardous military activities from instrument flight rules flights. Non-hazardous activities can include air combat maneuvers, air intercepts, and low-altitude tactics. MOAs are joint use, in that Civilian VFR traffic has access and priority flight traffic (emergency flights, Medical Evacuations) may transit through the airspace. General aviation pilots using visual flight rules may fly though active MOAs during military training, but many avoid doing so.

- ATCAAs are airspace assigned by FAA Air Traffic Control to segregate air traffic between the specified activities being conducted within the assigned airspace and other Instrumented Flight Rules (IFR) traffic. They may be requested by the military to support SUA, and are evaluated concurrently with SUA to determine the overall aeronautical impact of the SUA proposal. When not activated, the area can be used for commercial or other IFR traffic. IFR are rules and regulations established by the FAA to govern flight under conditions in which flight by VFR is not safe. IFR flight depends upon flying by reference to instruments in the flight deck, and navigation is accomplished by reference to electronic signals.
- Supersonic operating areas are defined airspace within SUAs and ATCAAs where aircraft can perform activities with airspeeds greater than the speed of sound. Two supersonic operating areas have been established at FRTC to conduct military training that requires high-performance flight profiles, including aircraft flying at supersonic speeds (i.e., greater than the speed of sound or Mach 1). Supersonic Operating Area A is comprised of the entire FRTC boundary for all altitudes above Flight Level 300 (standardized pressure altitude of 30,000 feet) (9,144 meters) above mean sea level (MSL). Area B is from 11,000 feet (3,353 meters) above MSL up to Flight Level 300. Area B is above approximately 2,682,705 acres (1,085,652 hectares) of BLM land and 131,424 acres (53,185 hectares) of private land. Land use beneath Area B is mostly ranching, farming, and public land recreation, but recently solar energy development is occurring on both BLM and private land.
- VFR corridors are routes that aircraft (civilian and military) can operate within using visual references without an air traffic control clearance or communication with air traffic control. In general, a pilot operating under VFR must be able to see outside the cockpit to control the aircraft's altitude, navigate, and avoid obstacles and other aircraft. If weather conditions are such that the pilot cannot operate according to VFR, he or she must use IFR and cannot use the VFR corridor unless directed by air traffic control. The current VFR corridor is defined in FAA Order 7400.10A and runs in a west-east direction from Sand Mountain through Austin, Nevada, terminating at the eastern boundary of the Fallon South 5 MOA. Civilian and military aircraft may use it to transit the FRTC airspace. Within the Fallon MOAs, military aircraft avoid the VFR corridor between the altitudes of 2,000 feet above ground level and 8,500 feet MSL, unless abiding by VFR criteria.

In terms of range infrastructure, the FRTC has a sophisticated threat Integrated Air Defense System (comprised of 37 real or simulated radars throughout the DVTA), a Tactical Combat Training System range (the system collects time, space, position, and weapon employment information from participants in training exercises and transfers the information to a ground system that can provide live monitoring of tactical scenarios and debriefing), multiple target types (e.g., bull's-eye, simulated compounds, missile launchers/air defense sites, tanks, simulated petroleum and oil facilities, laser-guided bomb targets, and radar vans), and supporting target facilities.

The FRTC includes an Electronic Warfare Complex, which consists of a variety of systems, both mobile and fixed in place, located beneath the FRTC airspace. These systems are widely dispersed on Navy fee-owned, withdrawn BLM, and BLM rights-of-way lands, with most of the fixed sites in the general vicinity of B-17 and the DVTA. The systems train aircraft crews in defensive maneuvers and tactics by simulating and disabling the electronic jamming capabilities of attacking aircraft. The various fixed and mobile systems offer tailored configurations and levels of complexity to meet many mission scenarios (such as strike/attack, helicopter penetration and reconnaissance, and Combat Search and Rescue). The FRTC is supported by NAS Fallon. NAS Fallon includes an airfield with control tower, runways, personnel housing; and maintenance, support, retail, recreation, administration, and utility support facilities.

The FRTC is the only location available to the Navy that can support, house, and train an entire Carrier Air Wing (upward of 60 aircraft and all aircrew and support crews) for advanced Strike Warfare, Electronic Warfare, and Air Warfare training. In fact, every Navy Carrier Air Wing trains at the FRTC prior to deployment as part of the Optimized Fleet Response Plan (an approximately 36-month cycle of maintenance, basic and integrated training, deployment, and sustainment). The FRTC supports five main weapons and tactics courses: TOPGUN (F-18 Super Hornet), SEAWOLF (MH-60 helicopter),

Advanced Strike Warfare

Operations to destroy or neutralize enemy targets on land.

Electronic Warfare

Operations to enable aircrews to detect and identify the kind of electronic signals they might encounter flying in hostile territory. Electronic Warfare training does not include the use of munitions.

Air Warfare

Operations involving detection, tracking, destruction, or neutralization of enemy air platforms and airborne weapons.

Tactical Ground Mobility

Use of non-standard vehicles (HUMVEE or MRAP) for tactical driving, vehicle operations, and basic maintenance in the field.

HAVOC (EA-18G Growler), Carrier Airborne Early Warning Weapons School (E-2D, Hawkeye), and Viper University (F-16 Viper). The Naval Special Warfare Command also utilizes the FRTC for unit-level training in Tactical Ground Mobility, Special Reconnaissance, Sniper Sustainment, and Land Navigation prior to deployment. The FRTC offers joint (involving multiple Services) integrated training opportunities, which are vital to advanced-level Carrier Air Wing training; support for other mission areas and Tactical Development and Evaluation (including military Unmanned Aircraft Systems [UAS] and other intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance platforms); and support for training activities of other Services and government agencies.

1.4 Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

The overarching purpose of any military force is to be able to successfully conduct combat operations in support of national policy and security objectives. To accomplish this purpose, the military force must train regularly and with sufficient realism. The purpose of the Proposed Action, therefore, is to provide sustainable and modernized airspace, range, maneuver areas, training facilities, and range infrastructure, in order to support acceptably realistic air warfare training activities as well as special operations ground training activities in order to meet emergent and future threats. These activities are prescribed by NAWDC, and other Naval Warfare authorities, such as the Naval Special Warfare Command.

Current range configurations do not support realistic training as identified in *Ninety Days to Combat*. The Proposed Action is needed because the existing FRTC bombing ranges (B-16, B-17, B-19, and B-20) have not changed substantially in size or configuration since the 1990s. As new weapons systems are developed and introduced to the Fleet, and tactics are updated to successfully employ these weapons systems, training requirements also change. Changes to training requirements can, in turn, drive the need to expand or modify training ranges. At the FRTC, new weapons systems have been introduced to the Fleet in recent years (e.g., Joint Direct Attack Munitions) and new systems, including new aircraft (e.g., F-35C, EA-18G), will need to be employed in future training activities. As documented in *Ninety*

Days to Combat (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015b), warfare technology has continued to evolve, most notably with regards to the distance at which munitions can be employed.

In addition to the training activities that occur on the bombing ranges, the Navy also conducts critical non-hazardous training within the DVTA, such as Electronic Warfare training, Dynamic Targeting operations, Combat Search and Rescue, Naval Special Warfare, and other training activities. The DVTA has also not changed substantially in size or configuration since its creation in the 1990s, and in recent years it has been increasingly threatened by encroaching development, especially in low-altitude, dark, and low-light conditions. The DVTA must be retained and expanded to preserve a viable location to train the Navy's air and ground forces in these critical non-ordnance training activities.

With the implementation of the proposed modernization, the FRTC would be fully capable of supporting the aviation and ground training and readiness requirements for the training missions assigned to the FRTC, into the foreseeable future. In this regard, the Proposed Action fulfills the Navy's execution of its congressionally mandated roles and responsibilities under 10 U.S.C. section 5062 and 10 U.S.C. section 167.

1.5 Training Needs and the Capabilities Evaluation Process

To achieve success in combat, the Navy develops a strategy for successfully employing its assets. NAWDC takes this strategy and develops it into combat doctrine. NAWDC is responsible for conducting and providing a continuous and comprehensive assessment of Air Warfare to address current, emergent, and future capabilities to the Fleet and is directly responsive in real time to our deployed Naval forces. NAWDC, through its subject matter experts, is responsible for developing aviation Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures (TTP) that support this combat doctrine and drive advanced naval aviation training. NAWDC's specific duties include

- providing the most threat-realistic training environment available to deploying forces;
- developing and validating aviation TTP. These training requirements define tactical level guidance for the effective employment of weapons systems, platforms (specific aircraft and other vehicles), and forces. In other words, TTPs identify the required combat skills a warfighter needs to repetitively practice prior to deployment to be ready to respond in an actual combat situation when deployed;
- assessing warfighting requirements across all Strike Warfare missions;
- providing independent assessments and recommendations to the Chief of Naval Operations regarding investments in or proposed changes to existing programs that may impact naval aviation; and
- promoting prioritization, rapid development, and delivery of new doctrine, technologies, and training.

Similarly, the Naval Special Warfare subject matter experts develop the TTP for ground mobility training and non-weapons training capabilities using the same principles as outlined for NAWDC.

The current FRTC bombing ranges (B-16, B-17, B-19, and B-20) have not changed substantially in size or configuration since the 1990s. However, warfare technology has continued to evolve. Modern weapons can reach targets at greater distances than ever before, but current range boundaries limit the distance from which pilots can release ordnance. In response to gaps in training capabilities at the FRTC identified as a result of NAWDC's continuous assessment of capabilities for the Fleet, NAWDC completed a comprehensive study in 2015 titled *Ninety Days to Combat* to formalize FRTC requirements (U.S.

Department of the Navy, 2015b). This document included a focused analysis of the capabilities the FRTC should provide to fully sustain Navy training across mission areas, as well as a comparison of the FRTC's current capabilities against required capabilities. This comparison revealed that none of the training requirements supporting the TTP for the delivery of precision-guided munitions and Air Warfare (including Large Force Exercise) events can be fully met at the FRTC as presently configured (see Section 1.5.1, Weapons Release Training and Need for Expanded Range Area).

The Navy evaluated the identified training capability gaps against the real-world constraints (e.g., regional

What is a Large Force Exercise?

Large Force Exercises at the FRTC are based on the principle of "crawl, walk, run." Training exercises begin with simple scenarios and advance to scenarios involving the entire Carrier Air Wing. Training exercises bring together squadrons and teach them to work together under real world scenarios. During the advanced phase of training, Large Force Exercise scenarios include standoff strike, force concentration, self-escort, defense in depth, long-range strike, and other activities.

roadways, commercial airspace, population centers) on meeting all TTP requirements. The process of developing the alternatives considered additional input from the Cooperating Agencies and Tribal Participants. To fully meet the requirements would require a prohibitively large area, approximately double the amount of land as proposed in this EIS (see Section 1.5.2, Airspace Training Need versus Current Range Capability). This evaluation resulted in the development of modified range tactical requirements that would approach full TTP specifications. Even though not all TTP specifications would be met, implementation of the Proposed Action would still allow the Navy to achieve an acceptable level of training capabilities. Concurrently, NAWDC worked with Naval Special Warfare to identify similar gaps and actions that would support ground mobility training requirements that acceptably approach the full TTP (see Section 1.5.3, Ground Mobility Training Need versus Current Range Capability).

In summary, current FRTC training capabilities do not, and will not, meet future and emergent needs of the Fleet and Unified Combatant Commands with the FRTC's current configuration. The current capabilities are so constrained that they limit the overall quality of the training provided. The Navy's Proposed Action to modernize the FRTC would close training capability gaps to tactically acceptable levels but would still not achieve full TTP compliance because that would require land and airspace approximately double what is being requested.

What is Tactically Acceptable?

The weapon release parameters listed in Table 2-1 represent the NAWDC-approved, tactically acceptable release (threshold) parameters for the current cadre of Navy Non-Combat Expenditure Allocations. "Threshold" range requirements were defined as the minimum capabilities to allow training to an acceptable readiness level.

The sections below present the comparisons of training needs against the current capabilities of the FRTC.

1.5.1 Weapons Release Training and Need for Expanded Range Area

In *Ninety Days to Combat* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015b), NAWDC analyzed the land and airspace (see Section 1.5.2, Airspace Training Need versus Current Range Capability, for discussion of airspace requirement) needed to meet combat training requirements for modern aircraft and weapon systems. When comparing older aircraft and mission profiles with modern aircraft and weapons systems, NAWDC noted the following differences:

- Older aircraft flew at lower altitudes, approached targets at closer distances (4–5 miles) before dropping munitions, and because of this close-range release, required a smaller safety area surrounding the target area during training.
- Modern aircraft fly at higher altitudes, release munitions at targets from 10 to 12 miles away, and require a larger safety area surrounding the target area during training.

Though munitions can reach targets at greater distances than ever before, current range boundaries (which do not accommodate modern weapons safety requirements) limit this type of training. Even if actual target areas were to remain the same, if release distances are increased, the safety area that is required during training in case of weapons failure also increases.

To fully meet the TTP for weapons release parameters and to employ longer-range weapons systems, aircrews would need to be able to release weapons from any direction (a 360-degree attack azimuth) and at substantial distances from a target (Table 1-2, Full TTP Compliance column). These release parameters have associated Weapons Danger Zones (WDZ). A WDZ represents the minimum safety requirements designed for aviation weapons training on Department of Defense ranges to protect public safety. A WDZ encompasses the ground and airspace for horizontal and vertical containment of projectiles, fragments, debris, and components resulting from the firing, launching, or detonation of aviation-delivered ordnance. This three-dimensional zone is calculated for each specific weapon type as delivered by a specific aircraft type up to specific air speeds, attack angle, heading, and distance from the target by the aircraft. The WDZ accounts not only for weapon accuracy, but also for potential weapon failures, ricochets, or broaches (a broach occurs when a weapon impacts the ground, burrows underground, and re-surfaces in another area, before finally coming to rest). To ensure public safety, and per Chief of Naval Operations Instruction 3710 and FAA Joint Order 7400.2M, the Navy must both (1) control and restrict public use of any land that is within a WDZ, and (2) ensure that restricted airspace configuration matches WDZs.

Figure 1-3 illustrates the WDZ for a single weapon delivery. The WDZ represents the entire expected weapon hazard pattern from weapon release to impact and detonation, based on a probability of containment accuracy of 99.99 percent. The outermost oval represents the farthest that the weapon may travel based upon release conditions and depicts the area that the weapon will fall within (with 99.99 percent accuracy). The inner oval considers all potential weapon flight paths or failure modes, to include the worst-case "long" (past the target) or worst-case "short" (not reaching the target) weapon impacts, along with weapon ricochets.



Source: Marine Corps Order 3570.1, Range Safety Figure 1-3: Weapons Danger Zone for a Single Firing Azimuth

When using multiple weapons or firing azimuths (release headings), the WDZ analysis tool calculates the hazard pattern for all ordnance trajectories, called a "Composite WDZ." The Composite WDZ depicts the hazard pattern for a combination of weapons released to the same target but with multiple firing azimuths. The WDZ analysis tool performs this by calculating the individual weapon WDZs and then combines them into one larger hazard pattern. In Figure 1-4, Panel A shows a single weapon WDZ for a northern (0 degree) firing azimuth. Panel B displays three firing azimuths for three cardinal headings (0, 90, and 270 degrees). Panel C adds two more firing azimuths. Finally, Panel D overlays all azimuths, and the outer perimeter of all combined WDZs becomes the new Composite WDZ. The Navy then used the composite WDZs described above (and Surface Danger Zones for ground-based ordnance) for each scenario to assist in the design of ranges, as well as to determine how much land is required in order to contain the WDZ.



Figure 1-4: Creation of Composite Weapons Danger Zone from Numerous Firing Azimuths

NAWDC has identified the weapons release parameters for the ideal case (360-degree firing azimuth) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015b). By overlapping the ideal case over existing ranges at the FRTC, the Navy noted the following:

- Existing range boundaries would not be able to contain the WDZs associated with the ideal case (Figure 1-5, Panel B and Figure 1-6, Panel B).
- The Navy would need to request withdrawal or propose acquisition of a very large amount of land to meet the WDZ requirements of the ideal case. Doing so would be both unattainable as a practical matter and undesirable because of the potential level of impacts on the surrounding area and communities.

Noting these real-world constraints, NAWDC has refined parameters to the "tactically acceptable" level (180-degree firing azimuth) and has identified more achievable land and airspace requirements (Figure 1-5 and Figure 1-6, Panel C, which shows the WDZ for the Joint Direct Attack Munitions [the largest of the WDZs] at the B-17 and B-20 ranges as proposed for expansion).



Figure 1-5: Development of Tactically Acceptable Parameters and Resultant Weapons Danger Zone at B-17



Figure 1-6: Development of Tactically Acceptable Parameters and Resultant Weapons Danger Zone at B-20

The parameter changes are tactically acceptable because they would allow the Navy to acceptably approach full TTP compliance. If modernization of the ranges does not occur, the current capabilities of the FRTC do not allow the Navy to approach full TTP compliance to a tactically acceptable level. Panel D (Figure 1-5 and Figure 1-6) displays the area of land under the WDZ needed at B-17 and B-20 for the Navy to both (1) control and restrict public use of any lands that are within a WDZ, and (2) ensure that restricted airspace configuration matches WDZs.

Table 1-2 shows the full TTP compliance and tactically acceptable release parameters compared against the FRTC's current capabilities. All of the WDZs for munitions listed in Table 1-2 (Laser-Guided Weapons, HELLFIRE, and Dual-Mode Laser-Guided Bomb) are smaller than, and fit within, the WDZ for the Joint Direct Attack Munition. The tactically acceptable parameters for Dual-Mode Laser-Guided Bomb are smaller than that of the Joint Direct Attack Munition. While in an optimal situation the Dual-Mode Laser-Guided Bomb WDZ is larger than the Joint Direct Attack Munition WDZ, in the tactically acceptable scenario, the WDZ for Dual-Mode Laser-Guided Bomb is contained within the Joint Direct Attack Munition WDZ.

Weapons Class ¹	Parameter	Full TTP Compliance	Current Capability	Tactically Acceptable Parameters
Lesen Cuided	Release Range (NM [miles])	6.8 (7.8)	5 (5.8)	5 (5.8)
Weapons	Release Altitude (ft. MSL)	35,000	30,000	30,000
	Attack Azimuth (degrees)	360	360	360
	Release Range (NM [miles])	13 (14.9)	4 (4.6)	10 (11.5)
Joint Direct Attack Munitions	Release Altitude (ft. MSL)	35,000	30,000	30,000
	Attack Azimuth (degrees)	360	180	180
	Release Range (NM [miles])	5 (5.8)	3 (3.5)	4.3 (4.9)
HELLFIRE	Release Altitude (ft. MSL)	2,000	700	2,000
	Attack Azimuth (degrees)	360	35	180
	Release Range (NM [miles])	14 (16.1)	7 (8.1)	14 (16.1)
Dual-Mode Laser- Guided Bomb	Release Altitude (ft. MSL)	35,000	30,000	30,000
	Attack Azimuth (degrees)	360	40	<180

Table 1-2: Tactics,	s, Techniques, and Procedures Supportable Weapons Release	Training Versus Capabilities
---------------------	---	-------------------------------------

¹ WDZs for Laser-Guided Weapons and HELLFIRE are smaller than, and fit within, the WDZ for the Joint Direct Attack Munition. Release parameters for Dual-Mode Laser-Guided Bomb are estimated. The Dual-Mode Laser-Guided Bomb has not yet been deployed to the Fleet, and minimally acceptable TTPs have not yet been developed.

Notes: ft. = feet; MSL = mean sea level; NM = nautical mile(s); TTP = Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures.

1.5.2 Airspace Training Need versus Current Range Capability

To fully meet training to advanced combat TTP and support Air Warfare (including Large Force Exercise) events, *Ninety Days to Combat* states that SUA would require at least the following characteristics:

• Size – 100 x 200 nautical miles of SUA (20,000 NM²). The current FRTC SUA is 8,958 NM².

- Vertical Range From 500 feet above ground level to 50,000 feet mean sea level. The current FRTC SUA varies in vertical limits, and only small portions approach required specifications.
- Supersonic Capability SUA must be fully supersonic capable. Currently, the FRTC meets this requirement only within portions of the existing MOA boundaries.

Achieving this size of SUA at the FRTC is unlikely due to heavily used commercial routes that surround the FRTC airspace and general civilian aviation using the National Airspace System in the western United States. Regional airspace surrounding the FRTC, and including the FRTC when the SUA is not active, is administered and controlled by Air Route Traffic Control Centers in Oakland, CA for the western FRTC airspace and Salt Lake City, UT for the eastern airspace. Accordingly, NAWDC, in developing the FRTC airspace component of the Proposed Action during meetings with FAA in 2016, 2017, and 2018, configured airspace training scenarios to conform to the National Airspace System limitations, reduced weapons release parameters by modifying Navy requirements for restricted airspace associated with the bombing ranges, and modified the supersonic capability requirement. While not a perfect solution, the Navy deemed this configuration tactically acceptable because the Navy would still be able to train to scenarios of advanced combat TTP. Further, by modifying vertical airspace, the Navy would be able to meet training and tempo requirements by being able to schedule activities at distinct elevations, or "stacking" activities on top of each other. Additionally, the airspace must be available for blocks of time, year-round to accommodate pre-deployment training tempo. The airspace must also be available during darkness to meet nighttime training, to include non-weapons training such as combat search and rescue.

1.5.3 Ground Mobility Training Need versus Current Range Capability

To fully support training to TTP for ground mobility training, land areas would need to be controlled by the Navy and fully contain the Surface Danger Zones for both the firing range (distance) and firing direction (azimuth) for the largest fire-and-maneuver activities, which include basic and advanced Immediate Action Drills and Integrated Close Air Support. The largest land area required would be that associated with Integrated Close Air Support, which would require a firing distance of 9.2 NM (10.6 miles) and azimuth of 360° (Table 1-3, Full TTP Compliance column). The existing B-16 range can only accommodate a 60° radius area over a distance

Immediate Action Operations

Activities to train proper responses to enemy visual or physical contact.

Close Air Support

Close Air Support is air action by fixed-wing and rotary-wing aircraft against hostile targets that are in close proximity to friendly forces and requires detailed integration of each air mission with the fire and movement of those forces.

of 2.5 miles for individual and crew-served weapons firing across open ground, which severely limits the training and realism available for individual and crew-served weapons employed in live-fire scenarios.

NAWDC worked with Naval Special Warfare to identify similar gaps and actions that would support ground mobility training requirements that acceptably approach the full TTP, as TTPs for Naval Special Warfare activities also cannot fully be met at FRTC in its current configuration. The Navy identified the weapons release or firing parameters for the ideal case (360-degree firing azimuth). By overlapping the ideal case for all proposed weapon use (a composite SDZ/WDZ, both air-to-ground and ground based) over existing ranges at B-16, the Navy noted that:

• Existing range boundaries (Panel A, Figure 1-7) would not be able to contain the WDZs/SDZs associated with the ideal case (Panel B, Figure 1-7).

- The Navy would need to locate the proposed Immediate Action Drill WDZ/SDZ to the west of the existing targets on B-16 to allow concurrent use to meet tempo requirements (Panel C, Figure 1-7).
- The Navy would need to request withdrawal or propose acquisition of land to the west of the existing B-16 to meet the WDZ/SDZ requirements of the ideal case (Panel D, Figure 1-7).

Training Event	Weapon Caliber	Parameter	Full TTP Compliance ¹	Current Capability	Tactically Acceptable Parameters
Static Live Fire	5.56, 7.62, 300WM, .50 Cal, 40mm, 84mm	Azimuth (degrees)	40	20	40
Static Live File		Range (miles [km])	4.7 (7.5)	6.8	4.7 (7.5)
Basic Live Fire IADs (Open	5.56, 7.62, 40mm, 84mm	Azimuth (degrees)	360	20	360
Terrain)		Range (miles [km])	2.5 (4.1)	2.5 (4.1)	2.5 (4.1)
Advanced Live Fire IADs	5.56, 7.62, 40mm, 84mm	Azimuth (degrees)	360	60	360
(Open Terrain)		Range (miles [km])	2.5 (4.1)	2.5 (4.1)	2.5 (4.1)
Advanced Live Fire IADs	.50 Cal	Azimuth (degrees)	180	None	180
(.50 Cal open terrain)		Range (miles [km])	4.2 (6.8)	None	4.2 (6.8)
Advanced Live Fire IADs	5.56, 7.62,	Azimuth (degrees)	360	None	360
(Urban Village)	40mm, 84mm	Range (miles [km])	2.5 (4.1)	None	2.5 (4.1)
Integrated Close Air	МК-76, 20mm ТР	Azimuth (degrees)	360	None	360
Support		Range (miles [NM])	10.6 (9.2)	None	5.8 (5.0)

Table 1-3: Ground Mobility Training Need versus Current Range Capability

Notes: cal = caliber, IADs = Immediate Action Drills, km = kilometer, mm = millimeter, NM = nautical mile(s), TTP = Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures. Distances calculated for munitions ranges are initially provided in kilometers from requirements calculations.

¹ While almost all training events can achieve full TTP compliance under the proposed modernization, Integrated Close Air support cannot support the full TTP of up to 10.6 miles (9.2 NM). The value presented here is the Tactically Acceptable Parameter for Integrated Close Air Support. Integrated Close Air Support is presented in nautical miles because these munitions are delivered from an aerial platform.

The current Naval Special Warfare Tactical Ground Mobility course training area does not have sufficient space to accommodate the firing directions and distances needed for advanced live-fire and integrated Close Air Support activities. Table 1-3 shows what would hypothetically be required for full compliance with TTP as well as the tactically acceptable parameters identified by the Navy for ground mobility training compared against FRTC's current capabilities. The tactically acceptable parameters are very close to the full TTP (the exception is Close Air Support) as defined by Naval Special Warfare.

1.5.4 Non-Weapons Training Need and the Current Range Capability

To approach meeting the advanced combat TTP, non-weapons capabilities (Electronic Warfare, Combat Search and Rescue, Land Navigation, and Convoy Escort) must include the required airspace, varied topography land areas, range tracking, instrumentation, and communications infrastructure. The

placement of electronic signal transmitters requires various terrain elevations in order to replicate opposition forces and threats. In addition, any area chosen must be free of electromagnetic interference to preserve a "clean" spectrum for Electronic Warfare training.

The existing DVTA is a non-live-fire training area on Navy-managed land that is generally open to public use (e.g., recreation, and limited off-highway vehicle use). Infrastructure, mining, and geothermal development existing near the DVTA has degraded training realism and potentially compromises aircrew safety, particularly in low-altitude, dark, and low-light conditions. If allowed to continue unabated, aircrew and Special Forces personnel would be unable to safely train or train to tactically acceptable parameters within the DVTA. Currently, given the extent of existing development, the Navy can utilize only undesirably predictable and repetitive scenarios due to the limited availability of multiple signal locations and elevations, and due to having only a minimal set of combat search and rescue recovery sites for helicopters.

Section 2.2.1 (Realistic Training Environment) of the Final EIS describes the capabilities needed to meet non-weapons training requirements. Additionally, Section 2.2.2 (Safety) describes the safety parameters that need to be met in the DVTA to ensure the safe operation of aircraft. Potential hazards include cables, wires, and towers; as well as cultural lighting (from cities, streets, and infrastructure), which is incompatible with the use of Night Vision Devices. The proposed new boundaries for the DVTA were determined utilizing terrain features to readily contain spectrum and limit environmental lighting. Bounding the DVTA east-west to ridgelines of the neighboring mountains facilitates line of sight. The northern boundary was drawn to provide the minimum area necessary to facilitate free maneuver and allow the Navy to spread out the threat emitters that are included as part of the proposed training activities. The southern boundary was limited by U.S. Route 50.



Figure 1-7: Development of Tactically Acceptable Parameters and Resultant Weapons Danger Zone at B-16

1.6 Scope of Environmental Analysis

CEQ implementing regulations for NEPA (40 CFR part 1500) provide guidance about considering alternatives to a federally proposed action. This guidance requires rigorous exploration and objective evaluation of reasonable alternatives. Only those alternatives determined by the Navy to be reasonable and that meet the purpose and need of the proposal require detailed analysis (see 40 CFR section 1502.14.). Reasonable alternatives are those that meet the purpose and need, meet screening factors, and are practical or feasible from a technical and economic standpoint. The range of alternatives initially considered includes reasonable alternatives as well as alternatives that the Navy ultimately did not carry forward for detailed study after having determined that they either would not meet the purpose and need or would otherwise not be reasonable.

The Navy developed the alternatives considered in this EIS after careful input and assessment by subject matter experts, including military units and commands that use the ranges, military range management professionals, cooperating agencies, tribal participants, and Navy environmental managers and scientists. Additionally, the public submitted comments on the scope of the analysis, including environmental issues and potential viable alternatives, during the scoping period for this EIS (August 26, 2016 through December 12, 2016). The Navy incorporated all substantive comments submitted during the scoping process into its identification and development of potential alternatives as well as alternatives to the Proposed Action.

The Navy has considered what it believes are all potentially relevant environmental resource areas for analysis in this EIS. To comply with NEPA, as well as CEQ, Department of the Navy, BLM, and FAA regulations, the discussion of the affected environment (i.e., existing conditions) focuses on those resource areas that would potentially be subject to more-than-negligible impacts as a result of the Navy implementing a given alternative. The level of detail describing a resource is commensurate with the anticipated level of potential impact.

Describing the environment and analyzing impacts requires a comprehensive and systematic review of relevant literature and data to ensure that the Navy uses the best available information for analysis. Section 1.6.1 (Methodology) describes the data used and the characteristics of the best available data, and provides a general approach to analysis. Each resource section lists the regulations applicable to that resource, discusses the affected environment and the environmental consequences of implementing the No Action and action alternatives, and summarizes potential impacts.

Chapter 3 (Sections 3.1 through 3.15) assesses the potential impacts on 15 resource categories.

- 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 Protection of Children
- Environmental Justice

Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) applies current resource protection measures (e.g., standard operating procedures, management practices, and conservation measures that

are integral to the activities covered by the Proposed Action and alternatives) as part of the process of determining environmental consequences. If the analysis identifies potential adverse impacts on the resource from implementing the No Action or action alternatives, the Navy will identify methods and coordinate with cooperating agencies to minimize or mitigate those impacts, where appropriate and practicable. Mitigation measures are discussed at the end of each resource section and summarized in Chapter 5 (Management Practices, Monitoring, and Mitigation).

Through the environmental impact analysis process, the Navy has identified potentially impacted resources, defined the expected geographic scope (called the region of influence) for each resource, and analyzed potential impacts on those resources. The region of influence is the geographic area where impacts may potentially occur. For most resources, the region of influence coincides with the air and land training areas of the proposed modernized FRTC. However, there will be variations in the breadth of the region of influence for some resource areas, with some regions of influence being relatively smaller and some being relatively larger. For example, the region of influence for geological resources includes only the footprint encompassing the requested withdrawals and proposed acquisitions, but the region of influence for noise includes land areas underlying SUA that experience aircraft noise.

Because some topics may affect multiple resources, several sections may address the same resources. For example, infrastructure (defined in this EIS as physical and organizational structures and facilities, such as buildings, roads, and power supplies), as it relates to removing or relocating utilities, is discussed in the transportation, air quality, socioeconomics, and environmental justice sections.

As described in Section 1.1 (Introduction), several federal and state agencies are cooperating agencies for this EIS. As the FAA and BLM have specific policies, procedures, and organizational structures for NEPA analyses, the Navy has compared the resource categories defined by each federal agency with the Navy's resource categories and organizations. The Navy has worked to develop an overall approach to the NEPA analysis for this EIS that integrates FAA and BLM practices and policies, as these two agencies must prepare rule-making documents that may either utilize or adopt the information described in this EIS.

The FAA is a cooperating agency for this EIS, as the Proposed Action would require FAA rulemaking for SUA pursuant to FAA Joint Order 7400.2M. Establishment of new MOA and restricted area airspace would require rulemaking or non-rulemaking actions, as applicable, in each case per requirements in FAA Orders 1050.1 and 7400.2. The airspace modifications proposed in this EIS require the FAA to complete an aeronautical study that examines the potential impacts of each SUA proposal on the safe and efficient use of airspace and Air Traffic Control procedures. A draft concept of the airspace proposals is typically presented to the FAA during the initial planning processes and, as feasible, the FAA study of the finalized proposals is normally performed concurrently with the Draft EIS review processes. Such study includes an overview of the existing airspace structure and use, and an analysis of the proposed actions on the existing air traffic environment, to include (1) IFR and VFR en route operations, (2) public airports and charted private airfields, (3) Air Traffic Control services, and (4) other airspace proposals and cumulative impacts in the region. This analysis also considers measures to mitigate or avoid, minimize, or reduce any impacts of these actions. FAA Order 1050.1F, which identifies "environmental impact categories," includes procedures for ensuring NEPA compliance. Table 1-4 presents each FAA Environmental Impact Category and the section(s) within this EIS that address those resources.

The BLM is also a cooperating agency for this EIS, as the Proposed Action includes the withdrawal of BLM public lands. The BLM complies with policies and procedures outlined in BLM NEPA Handbook H-1790-1 (Bureau of Land Management, 2008) to ensure NEPA compliance for its major actions. These policies and procedures support BLM rulemaking under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. section 1701 et seq.). In the same way as the Navy and other federal agencies, the BLM identifies issues based on scoping comments (40 CFR part 1502.6) and focuses on issues significant to a proposed action (40 CFR part 1500.1). Table 1-4 presents issues commonly considered as "elements" by BLM and the section(s) within this EIS that address each element.

FAA Category	BLM Element	EIS Resource Section Where Addressed		
Air Quality	Air Quality	Air Quality		
		Land Use		
	Areas of Critical	Cultural Resources		
-	Environmental Concern	Water Resources ¹		
		Public Health and Safety and Protection of Children		
	Fish Habitat			
	Invasive and Nonnative			
	Species and Noxious			
Dielegical recourses (including	Weeds			
fish wildlife and plants)	Migratory Birds	Biological Resources		
fish, wildlife, and plants)	Special Status Species			
	Vegetation			
	Wildlife			
	Wild Horses and Burros			
	Cave and Karst	Castagiast Descurres		
-	Resources	Geological Resources		
Climate	Climate Change	Air Quality		
Coastal Resources	_	n/a²		
Department of Transportation		n/a^3		
Act, Section 4(f)	-	li/a		
Farmlands	Farmlands (prime or	Land Use		
Farmanus	unique)	Geological Resources		
Hazardous materials, solid		Public Health and Safety and Protection of Children		
waste, and pollution	Hazardous Wastes	Water Resources		
prevention		Geological Resources		
Historical, architectural,	Cultural Resources	Cultural Resources		
archeological, and cultural	Historic Trails	Pagraption		
resources	Indian Tribe Concerns	Recleation		
		Land Use		
Land Use	-	Noise		
Natural resources and energy		n/2 ⁴		
supply	_	11/a		
Noise and compatible land	Noise	Land Use		
use		Noise		

Table 1-4: Federal Aviation Administration Categories, Bureau of Land Management Elements, and Environmental Impact Statement Categories

Table 1-4: Federal Aviation Administration Categories, Bureau of Land Management Elements, and
Environmental Impact Statement Categories (continued)

FAA Category	BLM Element	EIS Resource Section Where Addressed	
Socioeconomics, environmental justice, and children's environmental health and safety risks	Socioeconomic Values Human Health and Safety Environmental Justice	Socioeconomics Public Health and Safety and Protection of Children Environmental Justice	
-	Forests and Rangelands	Land Use	
-	Forest Products	Land Use	
_	Floodplains	Water Resources	
-	Geology and Minerals	Geological Resources Mining and Mineral Resources ⁵	
-	Land Use, Realty, and	Land Use	
	Transportation	Transportation	
_	Lands with Wilderness Characteristics Outside Existing Wilderness Study Areas	Land Use	
Visual effects (including light emissions)	Visual Resources	Cultural	
_	Livestock Grazing	Grazing	
_	Renewable Energy	Mineral and Mining Resources	
_	Soils	Geological Resources	
_	Paleontological Resources	Geological Resources	
Water resources (including	Water Resources		
wetlands, floodplains, surface	Wetlands and Riparian	Land Use	
waters, groundwater, and	Zones	Water Resources	
wild	Wild and Scenic Rivers	Biological Resources	
and scenic rivers)			
_	Wildland Fire Ecology	Public Health and Safety and Protection of Children	
	and Management	Biological Resources	
Cumulative Impacts	-	Cumulative Impacts	

¹Water rights are included in this EIS resource section.

²Not addressed in this EIS; the region of influence is geographically separate from coastal areas.

³Designation of airspace for military flight operations is exempt from section 4(f). The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) provided that "[n]o military flight operations (including a military training flight), or designation of airspace for such an operation, may be treated as a transportation program or project for purposes of section 303(c) of title 49, United States Code."

⁴This category evaluates potential impacts on supplies of energy and natural resources needed to build and maintain airports, which is not part of the Proposed Action or Alternatives.

⁵Geothermal exploration and development are addressed in this EIS resource section.

1.6.1 Methodology

In accordance with NEPA and the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. sections 551–559), the analyses used the best available data accepted by the appropriate regulatory and scientific

communities. The Navy reviewed primary literature, including journals, books, periodicals, bulletins, Department of Defense operations reports, County Master Plans, theses, dissertations, species management plans, and other technical reports published by government agencies, private businesses, or consulting firms to assist in analysis of potential environmental consequences. The Navy conducted internet searches and evaluated websites for the credibility of the source, the quality of the information, and the relevance of the content to ensure the use of high-quality information.

The Navy considered both direct and indirect effects resulting from the action alternatives. Direct effects occur in the same location and at the same time as the agency action (40 CFR part 1508.8). Indirect effects are reasonably foreseeable and caused by the action, but occur later in time or at a distance (40 CFR part 1508.8).

The term "significantly" or "significance," as used in NEPA, requires considerations of both context and intensity. Context means analyzing the significance of an action in several perspectives, such as society as a whole (e.g., human, national), the affected region, the affected interests, and the locality. Significance varies with the setting of a proposed action. For instance, in the case of a site-specific action, significance would usually depend on the effects in the locale rather than in the world as a whole. Both short- and long-term effects are relevant. Intensity refers to the severity or extent of the potential environmental impact. Another understanding of intensity is in terms of the potential extent of the likely change. In general, the more sensitive the context, the less intense a potential impact would need to be to be considered significant. Likewise, the less sensitive the context, the more intense a potential impact would need to be to be considered significant.

While specific methods used to analyze the effects of the Proposed Action vary by resource, all resource analyses follow this general approach:

- Describe existing resource conditions (affected environment) based on geographic areas within the FRTC or as otherwise appropriate based on the resource area-specific region of influence. Because the FRTC is a large area, each resource section splits the affected environment discussion into the five main areas (B-16, B-17, B-20, the DVTA, and Special Use Airspace [Impacts pertaining to B-19 are not analyzed since the Navy is not proposing or requesting any changes with respect to the current configuration of B-19.]).
- 2. Review existing federal, state, and local regulations and standards relevant to resource-specific management or protection.
- 3. Identify resource conditions or areas that require specific analytical attention, such as designated critical habitat for federally listed species.
- 4. Analyze the specific actions entailed within a given alternative to determine what components of the alternative may affect the particular resource.
 - a. Review and analyze data sources for information on the resource, including modeling efforts and scientific research.
 - b. Determine specific impacts on the resource that could result from Navy activities.
 - c. Adjust initial impact determinations as appropriate to account for the use of standard operating procedures, management practices, and other impact avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures.
 - d. Determine overall impacts on the resource associated with the Proposed Action and Alternatives, given the applicable regulatory framework.

5. Summarize impact findings concerning resource effects.

The Navy reviewed and evaluated additional information, such as unique resource characteristics; public and agency scoping comments; previous environmental analyses; agency and tribal consultations; resource-specific information; and applicable laws, regulations, and Executive Orders. This process helped focus the information presented in the affected environment and the analysis presented in the environmental consequences sections.

1.7 Key Documents

Key documents are sources of information incorporated into this EIS. Documents are considered to be key because of similar actions, analyses, or impacts that may apply to this Proposed Action. CEQ guidance encourages incorporating documents by reference. Documents incorporated by reference in part or in whole include the following:

- Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for Withdrawal of Public Lands for Range Safety and Training Purposes, May 1998 (U.S. Department of the Navy, 1998)
- Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for the Renewal of the B-20 Land Withdrawal, December 1998 (U.S. Department of the Navy, 1998)
- Final Environmental Impact Statement, Proposed Fallon Training Range Complex Requirements, January 2000. A ROD was also prepared by the FAA for airspace changes proposed in this EIS. (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2000)
- Environmental Assessment for Airfield Operations at Naval Air Station Fallon, August 2013 (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2013)
- Environmental Assessment for Proposed Addition of Training Activities and Range Enhancements at Naval Air Station Fallon on Training Range Bravo-16, Churchill County, Nevada, September 2014 (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2014)
- Ninety Days to Combat: Required Training Capabilities for the Fallon Range Training Complex 2015-2035, June 2015 (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015b)
- Military Readiness Activities at Fallon Range Training Complex, Nevada Final Environmental Impact Statement, December 2015 (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015a)

The Navy has made the above-referenced documents available on the project website (https://www.frtcmodernization.com). Other documents incorporated by reference in this EIS will be made available—or information provided as to how to access such documents—upon request.

1.7.1 Final Environmental Impact Statement for Withdrawal of Public Lands for Range Safety and Training Purposes – May 1998

In this EIS, the Navy proposed to withdraw federally administered land within the FRTC to facilitate and improve the realistic operational and strategic combat training conducted on existing FRTC lands (see History of the FRTC in Section 1.3, Background) and to provide public safety buffers. All lands requested for withdrawal at the time were being administered by the BLM, Bureau of Reclamation, or the Department of Energy. The focus was on the FRTC ranges B-16, B-17, B-19, the Shoal Site, and Dixie Valley Training Area. A separate Legislative EIS (see below) evaluated the land withdrawal renewal for B-20. Besides the No Action Alternative, the Navy evaluated three action alternatives. Identified impacts of the withdrawal included the closure of public access and potential effects on mining, visual resources, and recreation from development of small sites and from integrated air and ground training activities. The withdrawal of the requested 202,864 acres of public lands was approved by Congress in the Military

Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-65) in October 1999, with an expiration in November 2021.

1.7.2 Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for the Renewal of the Bravo-20 Land Withdrawal – December 1998

This Legislative EIS supported the Congressional reauthorization of the withdrawal of public lands comprising B-20. In November 1986 under the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-606), the Navy applied for the renewal of 21,576 acres of withdrawn land and the continued use of B-20 for training operations as specified in Section 1(a)(2)(A) and (B) of Public Law 99-606. Under the Proposed Action, there were no increases in aircraft operations. As presented in the analysis of the EIS, the Proposed Action would not result in any significant impacts. The Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-65) reauthorized the withdrawal of these public lands in October 1999, with an expiration in November 2021.

1.7.3 Final Environmental Impact Statement, Proposed Fallon Training Range Complex Requirements, January 2000

In 1998, the Naval Strike and Air Warfare Center (now NAWDC) conducted an evaluation (resulting in a Training Requirements Document) of the training assets at NAS Fallon and compared these capabilities against Navy tactical aviation training objectives. The Training Requirements Document assessed and reported current and future training needs and operational requirements for NAS Fallon and outlined changes necessary to both update and consolidate Navy training on public and Navy-managed lands and update airspace parameters overlying these lands.

Under the Proposed Action, the Navy proposed to develop Electronic Warfare sites on public and Navy-managed lands, four tracking instrumentation subsystem remote sites on public lands, fiber optic cable routes from the air station to the B-16 and B-19 training ranges, and helicopter gunnery ranges on B-17 and B-19. The Navy also proposed to use Navy-managed lands in Dixie Valley for Close Air Support training, revise the operating hours of the Reno MOA, and raise the ceiling of restricted area airspace to allow for high-altitude weapons delivery training at B-17 and B-20. Because actions were going to occur on lands managed by both the Navy and the BLM Carson City and Battle Mountain Field Offices and required rights-of-way from BLM, the Navy and the BLM prepared the EIS as joint lead agencies.

The Navy did not identify any significant impacts from any of the alternatives analyzed. The ROD, released on April 14, 2000, announced the decision to implement the Preferred Alternative, Alternative 2, for the Proposed FRTC Requirements. Changes to the FRTC under Alternative 2 included developing new fixed and mobile Electronic Warfare sites; developing new Tracking Instrumentation Subsystem sites; developing additional targets at B-17 and B-19; laying fiber optic cable to B-16 and B-19; utilizing Navy-managed lands in Dixie Valley for Close Air Support training; performing Hellfire missile and high-altitude weapons delivery training at B-17 and B-20; and proposing changes to special use airspace.

1.7.4 Environmental Assessment for Airfield Operations at Naval Air Station Fallon, August 2013

The Navy evaluated the potential for environmental impacts if it maintained then-currently conducted airfield operations, conducted operations with introduction of new types of aircraft, and increased airfield operations to meet future training requirements. The Navy was scheduled to progressively transition from aging aircraft to newer aircraft beginning in 2015, with the transition complete by 2028. As aircraft transitions occur, Carrier Air Wings and other aviation units would arrive at NAS Fallon to

participate in training events with newer aircraft, such as the F-35C Lightning II, EA-18G Growler, and RQ-21A Blackjack. Under the Proposed Action, F-35C training courses were expected to begin in 2017. Proposed facility development required to support aircraft missions at NAS Fallon would include space for aircraft maintenance, crew and equipment, administration, training, and a UAS runway and staging area. This Environmental Assessment was focused on airfield operations only and did not include analysis of training activities in the FRTC. As described in the Finding of No Significant Impact dated August 19, 2013, it was determined that the Proposed Action would not significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

1.7.5 Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Addition of Training Activities and Range Enhancements at Naval Air Station Fallon on Training Range Bravo-16, Churchill County, Nevada, September 2014

The Navy proposed to conduct additional training activities and provide training enhancements for the existing Tactical Ground Mobility platform and air/ground inter-operability training that had been conducted at B-16 since 2008. The Proposed Action was to improve the B-16 training range to meet Navy and joint training requirements by (1) closing to public entry two portions of B-16 that were then open to the public and installing a new fence around these areas; (2) installing rail-mounted moving target systems for live-fire training; (3) developing and operating a semi-prepared expedient landing zone for C-130 aircraft; (4) developing and operating a launch and recovery area for unarmed, UAS training; (5) re-routing the primary access road to the Drop Zone to accommodate the new C-130 aircraft and UAS operations; (6) installing a new range tower within the Drop Zone; (7) installing visual cueing items, including relocatable habitat units; and (8) establishing two free maneuver areas in the southwestern and northwestern portions of B-16.

The Navy evaluated the environmental consequences of the two action alternatives and a No Action Alternative. Both action alternatives would have provided additional training activities and training enhancements and improved the B-16 training range to meet Navy and joint training requirements. As described in the Finding of No Significant Impact dated September 29, 2014, it was determined that the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts on the human or natural environment.

1.7.6 Ninety Days to Combat: Required Training Capabilities for the Fallon Range Training Complex 2015–2035, June 2015

This document identifies the required warfighting capabilities for naval aviation and Naval Special Warfare, describes the current capability of NAWDC and the FRTC to support those requirements, and is the foundation of the Proposed Action described in full in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives). It compares the current range capabilities against what would be needed to be able to fully train to Navy Doctrine TTP. These TTP are informed by current policies, available resources, current strategy and campaign concepts, threats, lessons learned, fielded or emerging technologies, and threat tactics and procedures. Finally, it identifies FRTC land and airspace capability gaps that inhibit the ability to train aircrew and Special Forces to a tactically acceptable level of combat capability prior to deployment.

1.7.7 Final Environmental Impact Statement for Military Readiness Activities at Fallon Range Training Complex, December 2015

The Navy evaluated the potential for environmental impacts from conducting military readiness activities at the FRTC in its current configuration. The Proposed Action was to continue and enhance training activities within the existing FRTC by:

- increasing existing aviation and ground training activities,
- conducting training activities with new platforms and systems as they transition into the fleet to replace older platforms and systems, and
- conducting new ground training activities (e.g., Dismounted Fire and Maneuver Training and Ground LASER Training).

The Proposed Action included adjusting activities from then-current (baseline) levels to levels needed to accommodate evolving mission requirements. The Proposed Action was a step toward ensuring the continued vitality and viability of the FRTC as an essential training resource. The Proposed Action resulted in increases in training activities to achieve and maintain a state of military readiness commensurate with the Navy national defense mission. Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) of this current Modernization EIS (Section 2.4, Environmental Baseline [Current Training Activities]) discussed the types and tempos of training performed under Alternative 2 (the Alternative selected in the ROD). As described in the ROD dated February 26, 2016, Alternative 2, as described above would have no significant impacts for any of the resource areas analyzed, and no mitigation measures were identified.

1.8 Relevant Laws, Regulations, and Policies

The Navy has prepared this EIS based upon federal, state, and local statutes, regulations, and policies that are pertinent to the implementation of the Proposed Action. Relevant laws, regulations, and policies include the following:

- NEPA (42 U.S.C. sections 4321 et seq.)
- CEQ Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500–1508)
- Navy procedures for implementing NEPA (32 CFR part 775)
- Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. sections 7401 et seq.)
- Federal Water Pollution Control Act "Clean Water Act" (33 U.S.C. sections 1251 et seq.)
- Federal Land Policy Management Act (43 U.S.C section 1701 et seq.)
- FAA Order 1050.1F, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures
- FAA Joint Order 7400.2L, Procedures for Handling Airspace Matters
- NHPA (54 U.S.C. section 300101 et seq.)
- National Materials and Minerals Policy, Research and Development Act of 1980 (30 U.S.C. sections 1601-1605)
- National Wildlife Refuge System Administrative Act and the National Wildlife Refuge Systems Improvement Act (16 U.S.C. sections 668dd–668ee and Public Law 105-57)
- National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. section 1241 et seq.)
- Nevada Revised Statutes Chapter 405, Control and preservation of public highways
- Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. section 1531 et seq.)
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. sections 703–712)
- Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. sections 668–668d)

- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. section 9601 et seq.)
- Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (42 U.S.C. section 11001 et seq.)
- Federal Noxious Weed Act (7 U.S.C. section 2801 et seq.)
- Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. section 136 et seq.)
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. section 6901 et seq.)
- Taylor Grazing Act (43 U.S.C. sections 315–3160)
- Nevada Revised Statutes Chapter 568, Grazing and ranching
- Farmland Protection Policy Act (7 U.S.C. sections 4201 et seq.)
- General Mining Law of 1872 (30 U.S.C. sections 22 et seq.)
- Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. sections 181 et seq.)
- Materials Act of 1947 (30 U.S.C. sections 601–604)
- Geothermal Steam Act (30 U.S.C. section 1001 et seq.)
- The Military Construction Authorization Act (10 U.S.C. section 2671)
- Federal Cave Resources Protection Act (16 U.S.C. sections 4301 et seq.)
- Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act (42 U.S.C. sections 7701 et seq.)
- Defense Withdrawal ("Engel Act") (43 U.S.C. sections 155-158)
- Paleontological Resources Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. sections 470aaa et seq.)
- The Sikes Act of 1960 (16 U.S.C. sections 670a–670o, as amended by the Sikes Act Improvement Act of 1997, Pub. L. No. 105-85)
- Archeological Resources Protection Act (16 U.S.C. sections 470aa–mm)
- Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. sections 3001–3013)
- American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 U.S.C. section 1996)
- Wild and Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act (16 U.S.C. sections 1331–1340)
- Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. sections 1131 et seq.)
- Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (54 U.S.C. 200301 et seq.)
- Nevada Revised Statutes Chapter 533, Adjudication of vested water rights
- Nevada Revised Statutes Chapter 534, Underground water and wells
- Nevada Revised Statutes Chapter 569, Estrays and Livestock
- Executive Order (EO) 11988, Floodplain Management
- EO 11990, Protection of Wetlands
- EO 12088, Federal Compliance with Pollution Control Standards
- EO 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights
- EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations
- EO 13007, Indian Sacred Sites
- EO 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks
- EO 13112, Invasive Species
- EO 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments
- EO 13406, Protecting the Property Rights of the American People
- EO 13693, Planning for Federal Sustainability in the Next Decade (revoked by EO 13834, Efficient Federal Operations)
- EO 13751, Safeguarding the Nation from the Impacts of Invasive Species

• EO 13817, A Federal Strategy To Ensure Secure and Reliable Supplies of Critical Minerals

1.9 Public and Agency Participation and Intergovernmental Coordination

A Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS was published in the Federal Register (FR) on August 26, 2016 (78 FR 31909; Appendix A, Federal Register Notices). The Notice of Intent announced the public scoping period and the dates, times, and locations of public scoping meetings. Notices announcing the intent to prepare an EIS and of scoping meetings were placed in local newspapers (*Battle Mountain Bugle, Eureka Sentinel, Lahontan Valley News, Lovelock Review-Miner, Mineral County Independent News, Nevada Appeal, Reno Gazette-Journal,* and *Tonopah Times-Bonanza*) and on the project's website (https://frtcmodernization.com). The Notice of Intent also announced that the Navy would operate an informational phone line (775-426-4081) for public, Indian tribe, and agency inquiries. The Navy solicited public and agency comments during a scoping period from August 26, 2016, through November 25, 2016. To allow time for additional public input, the Navy extended the public scoping comment period from November 10, 2016 (81 FR 78999) and in the aforementioned newspapers. Public scoping meetings were held in Fallon, Lovelock, Reno, Austin, Eureka, Hawthorne, and Gabbs, Nevada from October 3 through 7, 2016.

1.9.1 Public Scoping

The Navy considered comments from the public, government agencies and officials, Indian Tribes, and nongovernmental organizations, in the preparation of this EIS. Comments received are categorized in Table 1-5. A total of 328 comment letters were received with over 1,500 distinct comments. Comment letters were submitted via the project website's electronic comment form (181), postal mail and e-mail (111), in writing at the scoping meetings (21), and orally (15) at the scoping meetings. The comment summary below provides a brief overview of the general issues or concerns expressed by the public. The majority of comments expressed general opposition to the proposal. The following list is intended as a general summary and presents issues and concerns in no particular order:

- General concerns about land withdrawal and expansion (too much land proposed to be removed from public use)
- Requests to change the boundaries of proposed land withdrawal
- Impacts on the local customs, culture, and economy
- Impacts on land use, public access (including access to historical sites), and road closures
- Impacts on wilderness areas and wildlife refuges, wildlife, grazing, mining claims, geothermal leases, general recreation (particularly hunters and off-highway vehicles), and landowners
- Impacts on the economy, specifically socioeconomic impacts on ranch and cattle owners, loss of tax revenue from land withdrawal, and impacts on property value
- Concerns about current investments made to improve water supplies for wildlife (small and big game guzzlers) and habitat
- Unexploded ordnance concerns and impacts on wildlife
- Requests for fair compensation for economic losses
- Request for scoping comment period extension by 60 or 90 days (with most comments referring to the original November 25, 2016, comment period deadline)
- Various requests to be a cooperating agency

Becourse Area	Number of	Percentage of
Resource Area	Comments ¹	Comments
Land Use (total)	285	18%
Minerals and Mining (specific)	105	7%
Grazing (specific)	101	6%
Land Use (not grazing, minerals, or mining)	79	5%
Proposed Action	219	14%
Recreation (total)	206	13%
Recreation (not Off-Highway Vehicle or hunting)	82	5%
Hunting (specific)	73	5%
Off-Highway Vehicle (specific)	51	3%
Socioeconomics	162	10%
Biological Resources	88	6%
Water Resources and Quality	68	4%
National Environmental Policy Act Process/Public Participation	63	4%
Other	62	4%
Alternatives Development	56	4%
Utilities/Infrastructure	50	3%
Transportation	48	3%
Cultural Resources, including Indian Tribe Traditional Resources	43	3%
Airspace and Aviation	37	2%
Airborne Noise	33	2%
Mitigation	30	2%
Public Health and Safety	30	2%
Comment Extension Request	20	1%
Hazardous Materials/Wastes	19	1%
Cumulative Impacts	15	1%
Air Quality/Climate	13	1%
Soils	11	1%
Environmental Justice and the Protection of Children	9	1%
Total	1567	100%

¹ Comment totals by resource issue exceed the actual number of total comments received, as some contained multiple comments on more than one resource area.

Following the public scoping period, the Navy reviewed comments and conducted over 170 additional meetings with various stakeholders and Indian Tribes to discuss potential action alternatives as well as alternatives to the Proposed Action. Many comments indicated the desire to have an alternative that would generally avoid restrictions on land uses (or that would involve fewer restrictions than originally envisioned by the Navy), or requested reconfigurations of the Bravo ranges to alleviate potential impacts on hunting, grazing, recreation, transportation, and other concerns. While not all of these suggestions met the purpose and need or the screening factors, the Navy has incorporated some of the suggestions into Alternatives 2 and 3 of this EIS.

1.9.2 Draft Environmental Impact Review Process

The Draft EIS was released for public review on November 16, 2018, for a 60-day public comment period. A Notice of Public Meetings was published in the FR on November 15, 2018, and a Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS was published in the FR on November 16, 2018. Public meetings were held in Fallon, Lovelock, Reno, Austin, Eureka, Hawthorne, and Gabbs, Nevada from December 10 through 13, 2018. The purpose of the public meetings was to describe the environmental impacts of the Proposed Action and alternatives and to receive comments on the Draft EIS impacts analyses. The Navy also set up a general phone information line at 775-426-4081, which described the NEPA process and was monitored during the public review period in the event that a member of the public had a question or required assistance. Display advertisements were published in local newspapers to advertise the notice of availability of the Draft EIS, the public meetings, and the public review and comment period. The first series of advertisements was published to coincide with publication of the FR notice. A second series was published 5–10 days before the public meetings, and a third series was published for each public meeting for three consecutive days in the appropriate newspapers for each meeting location. Adjustments were made according to the newspaper's publication frequency (e.g., daily, semi-weekly, or weekly).

The Navy extended the public comment period 30 days to February 14, 2019, and a notice announcing the extension of the public review and comment period was published in the FR on December 27, 2018. All FR notices are found in Appendix A (Federal Register Notices). Additional newspaper ads were published to notify the public of the extension of the public review and comment period. Advertisements ran a total of 44 times in eight local and regional newspapers between November 17, 2018, and January 5, 2019.

The purpose of public involvement and outreach during the public review and comment period of the Draft EIS was (1) to notify and inform stakeholders and the public about the Proposed Action and the release of the Draft EIS, and (2) to provide the opportunity for the public and stakeholders to comment on the Draft EIS.

1.10 Draft Environmental Impact Statement Public Participation: Comment Themes

The following sections summarize the Navy's responses to comments based on topics raised during the Draft EIS public comment period by multiple entities. Themes are recurring topics raised by commenters across the three public comment periods. Theme topics are detailed below, including information on how these themes are considered within the EIS analysis. Themes are organized under their respective resource area, in the order they are presented in the EIS. When applicable, theme descriptions include references to analysis in the EIS where expanded or additional information is located.

1.10.1 Description of the Proposed Action

1.10.1.1 Use of Simulators for Training

Although virtual training and simulators are an important aspect of naval training, there are numerous ways in which they do not sufficiently re-create fully integrated, real-life situations that may be encountered in a combat environment. For example, as discussed in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) of the Final EIS, virtual training and simulators cannot re-create the physical stresses, such as increased heart rates and adrenalin levels, that a live-fire exercise provides.

The FRTC is the only location where an entire carrier air wing, consisting of more than 60 aircraft and associated support crews, can train as a single unit conducting the full arc of the mission, including pre-

flight planning, ordnance handling, in-air activities, weapons deployment, and post-flight briefing. This cannot be accomplished via simulations.

1.10.1.2 Other Alternatives

Section 2.5.3, Alternate Training Locations) of the Final EIS discusses various alternatives the Navy considered, including those suggested by the public. The Final EIS provides screening criteria in Section 2.2 (Screening Factors) and rationale for not carrying specific alternatives forward for further analysis.

While it would hypothetically be possible to develop training systems at Nellis Air Force Base, the U.S. Air Force and U.S. Air Force-sponsored training currently uses nearly all of the complex's available training capacity (time and space). Shared use of Nellis Air Force Base, as currently configured or as proposed, would not be able to support the intensity of both Navy and Air Force training, and therefore was not carried forward for further analysis.

1.10.1.3 Governor's Alternative (The Nevada Alternative)

Most of the components of the Governor's Alternative were considered in the development of Alternative 3. However, some components could not be accommodated due to incompatibility with the Navy's need to provide sufficient land for military training and range safety requirements (see Section 1.4, Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action). A detailed discussion is provided in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives), specifically Section 2.5.7 (Governor's Alternative ["Nevada Alternative"]).

1.10.2 Level of Significance

The approach to analysis, including significance criteria for potential impacts, are presented in the Final EIS for each resource section. The approach to analysis and significance criteria varies but was developed based on applicable laws, regulations, and policies for each resource area. In addition, context, intensity, and relevant thresholds were considered when determining significance.

1.10.3 Land Use

The Navy analyzed potential social impacts, including impacts on customs and culture, in Section 3.13 (Socioeconomics). In addition, the Navy addresses impacts on resource areas that contribute to customs and culture in separate sections in the Final EIS, such as land use (Section 3.2), mining and mineral resources (Section 3.3), livestock grazing (Section 3.4), cultural resources (Section 3.11), recreation (Section 3.12), and cumulative impacts (Chapter 4).

1.10.4 Mining and Mineral Resources

1.10.4.1 Minerals and Mining (Locatable)

In the Final EIS, when a mineral resource potential is classified as either moderate or high, a lost exploration opportunity would represent a significant impact on that mineral resource. The resource potential classification considers occurrence, geologic relationship, and historic production for each mineral resource.

As discussed in Section 3.3 (Mining and Mineral Resources), the land proposed for withdrawal would no longer be open to new mining claims, and the lands would be barred from future mineral exploration and development. Implementation of any of the action alternatives would result in potential significant impacts on the exploration and development of locatable, leasable, and salable mineral resources.

1.10.4.2 Mining Claim Loss

The Final EIS has been updated to include the process by which the Navy would make payments to holders of mining claims. Valid and existing mining rights, existing patented mining claims, and unpatented mining claims are discussed in Section 3.3 (Mining and Mineral Resources).

For there to be a valid existing mining right, the claim holder must demonstrate that the claim contains a discovery of a valuable mineral deposit. Having a valid existing claim would exclude any such claim from any moratorium imposed by the requested withdrawal legislation for development of the claim. Therefore, under the Proposed Action, the Navy would acquire any valid existing claims within the proposed withdrawal at fair market value.

For existing patented mining claims, the federal government has passed the title of these lands to the claimant, making these lands private lands. The Navy would therefore need to acquire any such lands within the proposed FRTC land boundary.

Holders of unpatented mining claims on public lands may conduct a validity exam, which is a formal process that determines whether the claim holder has a valid existing right. The Secretary of the Interior determines the validity of a claim based on this validity examination. However, holders of unpatented mining claims are not required to conduct a validity exam. In instances where a claim holder has not conducted a validity exam, any value associated with the claim is assumed to be nominal. Accordingly, the Navy would offer to claim holders without a validity exam demonstrating a valuable mineral deposit a nominal amount to extinguish the claim.

1.10.4.3 Geothermal Development

The Final EIS identifies the process by which interested parties could pursue compatible geothermal development in a portion of the Dixie Valley Training Area. The proposed required design features (RDFs) are necessary for the Navy to meet training requirements. Development of the RDFs affords an opportunity for geothermal development that would otherwise be lost. The Navy acknowledges that complying with RDFs could add cost to a potential geothermal development; however, the Navy is committed to working with the developer on a case-by-case basis. This is addressed in Section 3.3 (Mining and Mineral Resources).

1.10.5 Livestock Grazing

1.10.5.1 Water Rights

The Navy acknowledges that the loss of water rights could be a factor in the proposed process for determining payments for losses due to cancelled or modified federal grazing permits and allotment improvements. Section 3.4 (Livestock Grazing), specifically Section 3.4.3.2 (Alternative 1: Modernization of the Fallon Range Training Complex) addresses the proposed process for determining payments for losses due to cancelled or modified federal grazing permits. This valuation process would also apply to Alternatives 2 and 3.

1.10.5.2 Grazing loss/Valuation of Permits

The Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 (43 U.S.C. sections 315q) provides the Navy with the authority to make payments for certain grazing-related losses. The Navy would work with grazing permittees on a case-by-case basis to try to minimize losses resulting from the cancellation of a grazing permit. The Final EIS further describes the valuation proposed process for determining payments for losses due to cancelled or modified federal grazing permits. This process allows for the valuation of the cost of providing

replacement forage and/or losses resulting from an inability to provide replacement forage. The process also determines the value of improvements made by permit holders (e.g., value of wells, corrals, fencing, and other real property). The Navy would use this process to determine payments to individuals who may experience losses resulting from the cancellation or modification of grazing permits or other disruption of their livestock grazing operations as a result of implementation of any of the action alternatives.

The following information has been included in Section 3.4 (Livestock Grazing), specifically Section 3.4.3.2 (Alternative 1: Modernization of the Fallon Range Training Complex), and also applies to Alternatives 2 and 3 in the Final EIS.

1.10.5.3 Payment for Losses

The Navy would first consider costs associated with obtaining replacement forage and otherwise restoring/maintaining a permittee's existing operational capacity. Working with BLM and the permittee, the Navy would determine the costs necessary to replace the area/capacity removed from a grazing permit. These costs could include, but would not be limited to, preparing new allotment applications; complying with BLM environmental requirements and water rights studies; procuring private market replacement forage; shipping or transporting forage, cattle, and/or ranch personnel and their horses and equipment; one-time relocation expenses associated with any full or partial transferring of operations to any new location(s); any reasonably anticipated lost profits arising as a result of operational downtime while restoring and/or relocating operations; and any other costs identified, which would be properly payable under 43 U.S.C. section 315q.

Should a permit holder decide not to seek replacement forage in conjunction with restoring operational capacity, or when restoring such capacity is not practicable, the Navy would make a good faith estimate of the financial impact the loss of that individual's permit would be expected to have on his or her ranching operation. The Navy would ask each permit holder to provide recent business operating expenses associated with the permit, their total operating expenses, an estimate of that portion of income believed to be directly related to utilization of the permit, and total income and taxes. This information would be used to determine a payment amount to compensate for losses resulting from permit cancellation, including reasonably anticipated lost profits for what would otherwise have been the duration of the permit. If a permit holder does not wish to share their financial information, or if the information shared is incomplete, the Navy would make an estimate of the value of the losses based on existing information from other sources.

It is possible that a payment amount would be based both on replacement forage along with other operational restoration-related costs, and on the financial impact the loss of a permit would be expected to have on a ranching operation (i.e., part of the payment would be based on obtaining replacement forage to the extent practicable and the rest based on payment for losses to the extent obtaining replacement forage is not practicable). In those instances, the costs to restore operational capacity would first be determined, and the remaining payment amount would then be determined in accordance with the paragraph above discussing permits holders who may elect not to seek replacement forage capacity.

1.10.5.4 Payment for Allotment Improvements

Improvements such as corrals, fencing, wells, and other appurtenances that cannot be relocated are considered real property, similar to a building. The Navy would appraise the value of all real property owned by a permit holder and would offer fair market value for the purchase of any such real property.

Equipment, such as relocatable water tanks, is not considered real property, and the permit holder would be afforded an opportunity to remove their equipment prior to cancellation of a permit.

1.10.5.5 Timing of Permit Cancellation

The Navy anticipates issuing its Record of Decision with respect to FRTC modernization in January 2020. However, any Congressional withdrawal of the area currently supporting grazing permits would not be expected until September 30, 2020, or later. Similarly, any Congressional appropriation for implementing the FRTC Modernization action, which would include funds for making payments to grazing permit holders, would not be expected until September 30, 2020, or later. Accordingly, the earliest the Navy would request that the BLM modify any permit would be October 1, 2020.

If the Congressional withdrawal is enacted, and if Congress appropriates funds to implement the FRTC Modernization effort, the Navy would ask BLM to contact each affected permit holder. BLM would coordinate with the Navy on any action to initiate modification of a permit. Under 43 CFR Part 4100 Subpart 4110.4-2 (Decrease in Land Acreages), BLM would be required to provide two years advance notice of any permit modification. Once a given notification is made, the Navy, with assistance from BLM, would begin discussions with affected permit holders to determine payment amounts in accordance with the processes described herein.

1.10.6 Transportation

1.10.6.1 Relocation of State Route 839

As discussed in Section 3.5 (Transportation), under Alternatives 1 and 2, the WDZ would extend over a portion of State Route 839. That segment would be closed and rerouted outside of the WDZ due to mission and public safety requirements. However, under Alternative 3 (Preferred Alternative), the WDZ in its entirety would shift to avoid rerouting of State Route 839.

Relocation of State Route 839 would not cut off access to Rawhide Mine. Notional relocation corridors for the potential rerouting of State Route 839 are presented in Section 3.5.3 (Environmental Consequences).

Any proposed rerouting is still conceptual in nature and would be evaluated prior to closure of the route. Follow-on NEPA analysis would be conducted for the potential relocation of State Route 839 if Alternative 1 or 2 were to be selected. Refer to Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives), specifically Section 2.3.4.4.4 (Road and Infrastructure Improvements to Support Alternative 1) for further details. If Alternative 1 or 2 were to be selected, the Navy would transfer any funds appropriated for relocating the road to the Federal Highway Administration, which in turn would make these funds available to Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) for planning, designing, and constructing the replacement road to meet state standards.

1.10.6.2 Relocation of State Route 361

Under Alternative 3, the proposed WDZ for B-17 would extend over a portion of SR 361. That segment would be closed and rerouted outside of the WDZ due to mission and public safety requirements.

The potential closure and rerouting of SR 361 associated with the expansion of B-17 would only occur if Congress were to select Alternative 3. However, the affected segment of State Route 361 would not be closed unless and until a suitable replacement route is established. Relocation of State Route 361 would not cut off access to Gabbs or Berlin Ichthyosaur State Park. The notional relocation corridor for the potential re-routing of State Route 361 can be found in Section 3.5.3 (Environmental Consequences). Any proposed rerouting is still conceptual in nature and would be evaluated prior to closure of the route. Follow-on NEPA analysis would be conducted for the potential relocation of State Route 361 if Alternative 3 were to be selected. Refer to Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives), specifically Section 2.3.6.2.4 (Road and Infrastructure Improvements to Support Alternative 3) for further details. If Alternative 3 were to be selected, the Navy would transfer any funds appropriated for relocating the road to the Federal Highway Administration, which in turn would make these funds available to NDOT for planning, designing, and constructing the replacement road to meet state standards.

1.10.6.3 County Roads (RS2477)

The Navy does not take a position on the validity or non-validity of any claimed RS2477 road or right-of way. In working with the BLM, no adjudicated RS2477 roads have been identified in the lands requested for withdrawal and proposed for acquisition. The Navy recognizes there would be loss of access to certain withdrawn or acquired areas and potentially to non-traditional roads. However, other means of accessing available areas would still remain; therefore, roads would not need to be relocated.

1.10.7 Airspace

1.10.7.1 Airspace Buffers—Airports

When developing the proposed alternatives, the Navy designed special use airspace to maximize the Navy's use of the airspace while allowing as much public and commercial use as possible. To minimize aviation impacts under each of the alternatives, the Navy is requesting the FAA create "airspace exclusion zones" (3-nautical-mile radius, surface to 1,500 feet Above Ground Level [AGL]) around the Gabbs, Crescent Valley, and Eureka airports. These exclusion zones would ensure those airports could continue to operate under all of the alternatives. The Navy would avoid the exclusion areas unless the airport is specifically being used for takeoffs and landings associated with military training activities. Airspace exclusion zones are discussed further in Section 3.6.2.2.4 (Local and Regional Airports).

1.10.7.2 Flight Tracks and FAA Regulations—sage-grouse seasonal habitat overflight avoidance

The Navy is required to train year-round and is unable to restrict flying during certain seasons. Based on available literature and the analysis presented in Section 3.10 (Biological Resources), specifically, Section 3.10.3.1 (Potential Stressors) of the Final EIS, impacts on sage grouse are expected to be minimal. However, the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) expressed concern regarding increased low-level overflights and requested the Navy undertake a long-term study to further assess potential impacts. Because there is no specific literature available regarding overflights and impacts on sage grouse or their leks, the Navy is proposing to fund and partner with NDOW on a future study that would directly address aircraft overflight and its potential impacts, both locally and to the overall population data. The Navy looks forward to assisting in this study with NDOW. The Navy anticipates using the results from the study to help inform potential future actions and adaptive management strategies, if necessary.

1.10.7.3 Lowering of Restricted Areas/Military Operations Areas

General aviation aircraft would continue to be allowed to transit through the FRTC outside of active restricted airspace or through the VFR corridor, as currently done. This same approach would also apply to any proposed restricted airspace. Typically, restricted airspace is inactive on weekends and holidays, and when ground ranges are closed for maintenance. Therefore, there would continue to be regular opportunities for general aviation aircraft to transit through inactive restricted airspace. Proposed changes to airspace would not significantly impact recreational/general aviation aircraft. Impacts on

general aviation for each alternative are discussed in Section 3.6 (Airspace), specifically in Section 3.6.3 (Environmental Consequences).

1.10.8 Noise

1.10.8.1 Impacts on Humans

The Navy does not anticipate any risk of hearing loss because noise would not rise to a level at which hearing loss would occur. Areas that could experience noise levels of 65 A-weighted decibels (dBA) or greater due to underlying Day-Night Level (DNL) contours above 65 dB are located in Churchill, Lander, Lyon, Mineral, Nye, and Pershing counties. However, intermittent aircraft operations, coupled with the time most people spend indoors, means it is very unlikely that individuals would experience noise exposure that would result in hearing loss.

The EIS includes figures (Figure 3.7-32 and Figure 3.7-41) that depict where changes to noise levels would occur, using existing and proposed noise contour data.

1.10.8.2 Additional Noise Buffers

In the past, the Navy has established Noise Sensitive Areas around wildlife refuges, incorporated areas, and certain tribal areas. As part of the Proposed Action and alternatives, the Navy is proposing new Noise Sensitive Areas around the incorporated areas of Crescent Valley and Eureka. The establishment of these Noise Sensitive Areas is considered compatible with military training activities and will include a 5-nautical-mile radius and an elevation of 3,000 feet AGL.

1.10.8.3 Defining Locations for Noise Sensitive Areas

The Navy acknowledges that people may live on the edges of town and in adjacent areas. However, the Navy cannot define Noise Sensitive Areas using a town's perimeter because doing so would significantly constrain proposed training activities. Tracking irregular areas underneath aerial training areas would require pilots to pay more attention to where they are flying rather than concentrating on the mission that they are training for.

1.10.8.4 Noise Complaints

As stated in Section 3.7.3.5 (Proposed Management Practices, Monitoring, and Mitigation), the Air Operations Office logs noise complaints at Naval Air Station Fallon. The office records information about the time, location, and nature of the complaint; and initiates investigation of what, if any, Navy airspace operations were being conducted by the Navy at the FRTC. If the caller requests, range personnel will follow up with a return phone call to explain the resolution of the complaint. The Navy may be contacted for noise complaints and operational suggestions at 775-426-2419.

1.10.8.5 Sensitive Receptors

Sensitive receptors are those areas where noise interferes with normal activities associated with its use (such as residential, educational, health, and religious structures and sites; parks; recreational areas [including areas with wilderness characteristics]; tribal reservations; wildlife refuges; and cultural and historical sites). The Navy modeled the existing and proposed noise levels associated with military training activities, described in Section 3.7 (Noise). As discussed in Section 3.2 (Land Use), specifically Section 3.2.3.2.5 (Fallon Range Training Complex Special Use Airspace), aerial maps of the areas where the DNL is above 65 dBA were visually inspected to determine the presence or absence of sensitive receptors, such as residences, lodging, and medical facilities. The EIS provides supplemental noise data for representative sensitive receptors.

Potential noise impacts on Indian Tribes were analyzed as they relate to environmental justice. Implementation of any of the action alternatives would not cause disproportionately high or adverse human health or environmental effects, including noise impacts, on minority and low-income populations, including Indian Tribes. This analysis is discussed in Section 3.15 (Environmental Justice).

1.10.8.6 Noise Modeling

Noise modeling presented in Section 3.7 (Noise) included 24 representative locations throughout the FRTC that could be considered sensitive receptors, including Austin, Kingston, the Yomba Tribal area, Reese River Valley, Antelope Valley, and Lander County. Noise-sensitive areas that include a 5-nautical-mile radius and ground surface to 3,000 feet AGL avoidance buffer currently include Austin, Kingston, and the Yomba Tribal Settlement.

1.10.9 Air Quality

The Navy is not proposing to increase the types or levels of training activities under any alternative. Therefore, there would be no increase in greenhouse gas emissions. See Section 3.8 (Air Quality), specifically Sections 3.8.3.2.9 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions), 3.8.3.3.9 (Greenhouse Gases), and 3.8.3.4.9 (Greenhouse Gases) of the Final EIS for more information.

1.10.10 Water Rights

1.10.10.1 Acquisition of Water Rights

The Navy recognizes the potential impact of the loss of water rights on the community. The Navy would purchase private water rights as real property. Additionally, acquisition of water rights would be factored into the processes for valuing grazing and mining-related just compensation or other authorized payments as appropriate. As discussed in Section 3.9 (Water Resources), the Navy does not have the authority to assist water rights holders with other water rights actions (e.g., change applications).

1.10.10.2 Stock Water Rights

The Navy does not plan to use water rights purchased for stock water but would instead request to modify the beneficial use, as appropriate, relative to mission requirements. In the Dixie Valley Training Area (DVTA), the Navy would not seek to acquire existing water rights. Section 3.9 (Water Resources), specifically Section 3.9.3 (Environmental Consequences), of the Final EIS has been updated with a discussion of the evaluation of water rights.

1.10.10.3 Vested Water Rights

The Navy completed a water resources study after the publication of the Draft EIS. This study, which is available at https://frtcmodernization.com, includes a discussion of vested water rights. The findings of the study were incorporated into the Final EIS in Section 3.9 (Water Resources), specifically Section 3.9.3 (Environmental Consequences).

The Navy does not have the authority to validate vested water rights. Only the State Engineer can validate water rights. However, valid water rights would be treated as real property in the valuation process.

1.10.11 Biological Resources

1.10.11.1 Biological Resources General Concern

The Final EIS includes a thorough impact analysis conducted by qualified wildlife biologists. Potential impacts on wildlife species, including bighorn sheep and greater sage grouse, as well as their habitat are discussed in Section 3.10 (Biological Resources), specifically Sections 3.10.3.3 (Alternative 1: Modernization of the Fallon Range Training Complex), 3.10.3.4 (Alternative 2: Modernization of Fallon Range Training Complex), and 3.10.3.5 (Alternative 3: Bravo-17 Shift and Managed Access [Preferred Alternative]) of the Final EIS.

Populations of species are distributed throughout current FRTC boundaries. Based on species distribution data, historical coexistence with training activities, and the analysis presented in the Final EIS, populations would not be significantly impacted by proposed training activities. While the analysis indicates a less than significant impact, the Final EIS has been updated to include a discussion of potential impacts on individuals of a species.

1.10.11.2 Greater Sage Grouse/Consistency with State Plans

Currently, state management plans focus on habitat availability, wildfire, and land-based chronic noise sources.

Greater sage grouse lek location data indicates that they are east of the land areas proposed for withdrawal or acquisition. Sage grouse in these areas would be exposed to noise from aircraft overflights. Available science indicates that short-term noise intrusion does not play a significant role in lek success.

The Navy would work closely with BLM and NDOW to manage sage grouse and other species on land under the Navy's control. Because there is no specific literature available regarding overflights and impacts on sage grouse or their leks, the Navy is proposing partnering with NDOW on a future study that would directly address aircraft overflight and its potential impacts, both locally and to the overall population data. The Navy looks forward to assisting in this study with NDOW. The Navy anticipates using the results from the study to help inform potential future actions and adaptive management strategies, if necessary.

1.10.11.3 Noise and Greater Sage Grouse Nesting—Types of Noise Metrics Used

State management plans use L10 and L90 metrics for determining impacts on sage grouse. In the absence of this type of data, the Navy applied maximum decibel level, sound exposure level, the DNL, and equivalent sound level metrics to determine potential impacts. The Navy has determined that the analysis presented in the Final EIS is comprehensive and based on the best available science for assessing potential population impacts. Because there is no specific literature available regarding overflights and impacts on sage grouse or their leks, the Navy is proposing partnering with NDOW on a future study that would directly address aircraft overflight and its potential impacts, both locally and to the overall population data. The Navy looks forward to assisting in this study with NDOW. The Navy anticipates using the results from the study to help inform potential future actions and adaptive management strategies, if necessary.

1.10.11.4 Fencing

Fences would be installed according to BLM and USFWS standards. Strand configuration would be based on the predominant wildlife in the area (e.g., pronghorn antelope, bighorn sheep). Fencing is not

anticipated to impact sage grouse, as individuals or leks were not observed in the proposed withdrawal or acquisition areas during biological surveys and are not likely to occur within the ground range boundaries, per NDOW data (Figure 3.10-27).

1.10.11.5 Sonic Boom Response

As discussed in Section 3.10 (Biological Resources), the response to sonic booms or other sudden disturbance is similar among many wildlife species. Sudden and unfamiliar sounds usually act as an alarm and trigger a "flight" response; however, reaction to a given noise can vary widely depending on factors such as time of day, physical condition of the animal, physical environment, or whether other physical stressors are present. Although the startle effect of a sonic boom can be stressful to an animal, it is difficult to generalize animal responses to noise disturbances across species. Recent literature suggests a startle is a common response across a variety of species and ultimately leads to habituation. It has been reported that the intensities and durations of the startle response decrease as the number and frequency of exposures increase, suggesting no long-term adverse effects. It is recognized that short-term impacts on individual animals may occur from sonic booms; however, overall no long-term adverse effects to populations are expected.

Given the historical use of the airspace and the coexistence of wildlife, animals within the MOA are likely habituated to aircraft overflights and associated noise, such as sonic booms.

Many of the above-listed behavioral and physiological responses to noise are within the range of normal adaptive responses to external stimuli, such as predation, that wild animals face regularly. In many cases, individuals would return to homeostasis or a stable equilibrium almost immediately after exposure to a brief stimulus such as an aircraft overflight or sonic boom. Section 3.10 (Biological Resources), specifically Section 3.10.3.1 (Potential Stressors), of the Final EIS was updated to incorporate the best available science regarding noise and startle effects on wildlife.

1.10.12 Cultural Resources

1.10.12.1 Section 106

The Navy abides by stipulations found within the current 2011 Programmatic Agreement between Nevada State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), BLM, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) with respect to withdrawn lands.

The Navy has completed cultural resources surveys in B-16, B-17, and B-20 where there is a reasonable expectation of direct impact from the placement of targets and in construction areas. Additionally, the Navy conducted cultural resource inventories in potential target areas on B-16 and B-17 to provide some latitude for the placement of targets should there be a conflict between targets and eligible cultural properties. The Navy is consulting with Indian Tribes on the identification of any additional known cultural resources and associated potential direct and indirect impacts from the Proposed Action.

Under the withdrawal and acquisition, the Navy acknowledges that it would be restricting access to cultural resources to a considerable extent. Consistent with Executive Order 13007, *Indian Sacred Sites*, the Navy will continue to work with Indian Tribes to develop protocols for access to cultural resources through the creation of an MOU.

The Final EIS was updated with information in Section 3.11 (Cultural Resources) regarding Navy Section 106 consultation with the Nevada SHPO, ACHP, and Indian Tribes, including the proposal for an

amended 2011 Programmatic Agreement to establish protocols for the future management of historic properties and any MOUs with Indian Tribes in association with the Proposed Action.

1.10.12.2 Potential Impact Areas

The Navy determined the Potential Impact Areas (PIAs), a term analogous to the NHPA Section 106 Area of Potential Effect (APE). The SHPO concurred with the Navy's determination that the APE accounts for potential direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that may result from this undertaking. The present analysis, however, differs from Section 106 to the degree that it (1) considers a wide array of proposed actions that are not undertakings per 36 CFR Part 800.16, and (2) considers the impact on a wider range of cultural resources than NRHP-eligible or potentially eligible historic properties alone. Importantly, APEs and assessments of effect to historic properties under Section 106 would be addressed when specific undertakings are proposed and known in detail in the future, consistent with an amended 2011 *Programmatic Agreement Among Naval Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, The Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Identification, Evaluation and Treatment of Historic Properties on Lands Managed by Naval Air Station, Fallon.*

The PIAs addressed in this document are based on activities associated with the Proposed Action and are used to holistically consider the potential impacts on cultural resources. PIA boundaries are defined in consideration of potential impacts on cultural resources from ground disturbance; vibrations from sonic booms, aerial target strikes, and military expended material strikes; visual and auditory intrusions; and changes in access.

1.10.12.3 Programmatic Agreement

The Navy abides by stipulations found within the current 2011 Programmatic Agreement between Nevada SHPO, BLM, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation with respect to withdrawn lands.

Currently, existing withdrawn lands are managed under the prescriptions of the 2011 Programmatic Agreement. The Navy is required to consult with the signatories of the 2011 Programmatic Agreement (ACHP, SHPO, and BLM) for approval of an amendment that would add the newly withdrawn lands. As part of this action, the Navy would revise the 2011 Programmatic Agreement for consultation and completion by 2021 (when the 2011 Programmatic Agreement expires). This amended Programmatic Agreement would stipulate requirements for Navy cultural resources management of all Navy-managed lands (withdrawn and purchased). NAS Fallon undertakings within the operational area of NAS Fallon in the state of Nevada will be carried out in accordance with NAS Fallon's Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan. Section 3.11 (Cultural Resources) of the Final EIS was updated regarding the Programmatic Agreement process.

1.10.12.4 Legacy Issues – Munitions on Walker River Paiute Reservation

The Navy implemented operational changes in November 1989 to eliminate off-range munitions, including reorienting strafing/bomb run-in lines and increasing surveillance of all drops. These operational changes have been effective in reducing off-range ordnance occurrences. A Memorandum of Understanding between NAS Fallon and the Walker River Paiute Tribe establishing protocols for both the Indian Tribe and the Navy to follow in responding to potential future off-range ordnance incidents (e.g., notification and coordinating access to reservation lands) was signed on May 14, 2007. A Memorandum of Agreement between the Indian Tribe and Navy was signed on May 24, 2017, updating and clarifying procedures for addressing any future off-range ordnance incidents on the Reservation. The Navy is actively working with the Indian Tribe to seek a mutually agreeable resolution for the issue

of historical off-range ordnance present on the Reservation. An effort to locate and clear historic ordnance was conducted, and the Navy implemented measures that seek to eliminate (or at least dramatically reduce) the possibility of off-range ordnance near the southern boundary of training range B-19.

Per Navy policy (OPNAVINST 3710.7 [Series]), the release of any air-to-surface ordnance should be accomplished within Restricted Airspace, and all such releases should impact on Navy land. As required by the Department of Defense Military Munitions Rule Implementation Procedures (April 2017), ordnance that inadvertently lands outside Navy property would be retrieved as soon as possible once the Navy learns that it has landed off range. NAS Fallon has conducted cleanup operations in the past and repaired facilities in accordance with tribal wishes, and is planning to conduct additional cleanup operations in the near future.

Resolution of legacy off-range munitions will continue to be addressed with the Walker River Paiute Tribe as a separate issue from the FRTC Modernization EIS. Since the Navy's requirements do not call for an expansion of B-19, legacy off-range ordnance is beyond the scope of this EIS and therefore is discussed only for purposes of background information.

1.10.12.5 Tribal Consultation

In accordance with Executive Order 13175, *Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments*, Department of Defense policies, the National Historic Preservation Act, and Navy instructions, the Navy engaged in Tribal consultations during scoping and following the public release of the Draft EIS. The Navy invited culturally affiliated Indian Tribes to participate in the NEPA process as Tribal Participants for this EIS (Appendix C, Tribal Correspondence). The Navy invited these Indian Tribes to (1) participate in project meetings, (2) provide additional information related to cultural resources, (3) provide internal document review (e.g., the Class III Cultural Resources Inventory Report), and (4) review the draft reports in order to provide additional information regarding site locations during the development of the Draft EIS to assist the Navy in making the final determinations of eligibility of sites for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

The Navy invited and engaged in Government-to-Government consultations with the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada and the following federally recognized Indian Tribes: the Duckwater Shoshone Tribe, Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Tribe, Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribes, Lovelock Paiute Tribe, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony, Summit Lake Paiute Tribe, Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada (consisting of the Battle Mountain Band, Elko Band, South Fork Band, and Wells Band), Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, Walker River Paiute Tribe, Winnemucca Paiute Tribe, Yerington Paiute Tribe, and Yomba Shoshone Tribe. Appendix C (Tribal Correspondence) of the Final EIS was updated to include a summary of all outreach conducted by the Navy and official correspondence.

1.10.13 Recreation

1.10.13.1 Loss of Recreation

The Navy acknowledges the concerns regarding potential closures of some recreational areas and analyzes potential impacts in Section 3.12 (Recreation). Closure of existing recreational areas would likely result in the public shifting their recreational activities to other areas.

While recreational activities such as running, hiking, horseback riding, rock collecting, fossil hunting, and sightseeing would not be allowed in the bombing ranges, these activities could continue to occur in the DVTA and surrounding areas.

1.10.13.2 Off-Highway Vehicle Areas

Off-Highway Vehicles (OHV) use would continue to be allowed within the DVTA. The BLM has proposed to open/un-restrict OHV use in the Sand Mountain and the proposed Dead Camel Mountain Special Recreation Management Areas, as well as on the playa north of the DVTA. Continued OHV use would also be allowed in the Special Land Management Overlay and potentially within new areas of the withdrawn portions of the Clan Alpine Mountains, Job Peak, and Stillwater Range Wilderness Study Areas after Congress removes any Wilderness Study Area designation. Due to safety reasons, OHV activities would not be allowed within the proposed withdrawal areas associated with B-16, B-17, and B-20.

Topography and OHV trails similar to those in B-17 also occur in the DVTA or other nearby public lands and could be used by recreationists. These areas would not be impacted by the proposed withdrawal or acquisition and would continue to be available for full public use and recreation, as discussed in Section 3.12 (Recreation).

1.10.13.3 De-Designating Wilderness Study Areas

The proposed de-designation of portions of Wilderness Study Areas is necessary to meet certain training requirements, such as installing stationary and mobile electronic threat emitters, landing helicopters, and maneuvering by special operations forces (along with other non-hazardous training activities, such as night vision goggle training and low-altitude flights). This type of training within Wilderness Study Areas is not currently permitted, and any de-designation would require Congressional action, as discussed in Section 3.12 (Recreation).

1.10.13.4 Loss of Hunting Opportunities

The Navy would allow access to B-17 for an annual bighorn sheep hunt. NDOW would be the managing agency and would set quotas, distribute permits, and maintain wildlife habitat. The Navy is developing a Memorandum of Agreement with NDOW for managed access to B-17 for the hunting program. Further details are provided in Section 3.12 (Recreation).

The Navy acknowledges the potential loss of hunting opportunities for species other than bighorn sheep and would conduct an annual review to determine if additional hunts may be feasible and compatible with the Navy mission.

The Navy would continue to coordinate with NDOW for access to maintain guzzlers and manage wildlife.

1.10.13.5 Aviation – Gabbs and Eureka Airports

The Navy would implement a 3-nautical mile radius and a surface-to-1,500 feet AGL airspace exclusion zone around the Gabbs Airport to allow for safe arrivals and departures, as discussed in Section 3.6 (Airspace).

1.10.14 Socioeconomics

1.10.14.1 Future Projections—Payment in Lieu of Taxes

A detailed Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) analysis is included in the *Supporting Study: Socioeconomic Report*, available at https://frtcmodernization.com and discussed in Section 3.13 (Socioeconomics). There would be no change in PILT for Churchill, Mineral, Nye, and Pershing counties, and very little change in PILT for Lyon County. Therefore, there would be no significant impact from lost revenue from reduced PILT under any of the action alternatives.

1.10.14.2 Tourism

In Section 3.13 (Socioeconomics) of the EIS, the Navy determined that there would be no significant impacts on tourist areas, such as Fairview Peak earthquake fault, Berlin Ichthyosaur State Historic Park, Middlegate Station, Sand Mountain Recreation Area, and Lahontan State Recreation Area because these areas would be available for public use. In addition, tourism activities would continue to be allowed on lands surrounding the proposed withdrawal and acquisition area.

1.10.15 Public Health and Safety

1.10.15.1 Wildland Fire Management

The Navy has implemented and would continue to implement operational and administrative controls to reduce wildfires. The Navy is developing a Wildland Fire Management Plan; where possible, proposed plan elements and goals are included in the Final EIS. For further information on wildfire and wildfire mitigation, see Section 3.14 (Public Health and Safety and Protection of Children), specifically Section 3.14.2.1.2 (Wildfire Management).

1.10.15.2 Hazardous Materials and Wastes

The safety of the public and military personnel is of utmost importance to the Navy. As discussed in Section 3.14 (Public Health and Safety and Protection of Children), the Navy has implemented a strict Hazardous Material Control and Management Program and a Hazardous Waste Minimization Program for all activities. The Navy continuously monitors its operations to find ways to minimize the use of hazardous materials and to reduce the generation of hazardous wastes. Spills would be managed and cleaned up in accordance with applicable state and federal regulatory requirements. If a spill were to exceed reportable quantities as defined by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for regulated material, it would be immediately reported to the NAS Fallon Environmental Division for appropriate action per the Integrated Contingency Plan (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2009).

Additionally, the Department of Defense created the Installation Restoration Program to identify, evaluate, and clean up contamination from past operations on military bases. The program was designed to ensure Department of Defense compliance with federal and state environmental laws and regulations.

Lastly, the Navy complies with Chief of Naval Operations Instruction 3571.4, Operational Range Clearance Policy for Navy Ranges, which establishes the policy and requirements for performing operational range clearance on Navy ranges. Under this program the impact areas are routinely swept of ordnance and target debris. This debris is disposed of or, if possible, recycled in accordance with all applicable regulations.

1.10.15.3 Munitions Constituent Migration

While impact areas have been identified, the Navy has not yet determined specific target placement. The placement of the targets within the impact areas would avoid washes. The Navy has revised sections in the Final EIS, specifically in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) and Section 3.14 (Public Health and Safety and Protection of Children), with this information.

1.10.15.4 Abandoned Mines

As discussed in Section 3.14 (Public Health and Safety and Protection of Children), the Navy would be responsible for abandoned mines in B-16, B-17, B-19, and B-20 and would follow risk-based evaluations and procedures established by the State of Nevada if securing such abandoned mines were required for

public health and safety needs. The BLM would be responsible for securing abandoned mines in the DVTA.

1.10.16 Environmental Justice

The Navy used the Environmental Protection Agency's Environmental Justice Screening and Mapping Tool (EJSCREEN) to initially screen for areas with minority and low-income populations, potential environmental quality issues, and environmental and demographic indicators. Data was also pulled from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2010 Census and 2012-2016 American Community Survey to characterize minority and Hispanic or Latino populations and to define low-income populations. Populations associated with Indian Tribes are included in the county populations. The Fallon Paiute Shoshone Tribe identified themselves as a minority community. Based on the analysis of all action alternatives, minority and low-income populations are present within the affected area. However, implementation of any of the action alternatives would not cause disproportionately high or adverse human health or environmental effects on minority and low-income populations. The approach to analysis is further discussed in Section 3.15 (Environmental Justice), specifically Section 3.15.1.3 (Approach to Analysis) of the Final EIS.

1.10.17 Cumulative Impacts

1.10.17.1 Local Projects considered for cumulative impacts

Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts) lists past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions that have had or are expected to have impacts either within, or within distances of up to 30 miles from, the FRTC. This includes the counties of Churchill, Elko, Eureka, Lander, Lyon, Mineral, Nye, Pershing, and Washoe. In determining which projects to include in the cumulative impacts analysis for a given resource area, the Navy made a preliminary determination regarding each past, present, or reasonably foreseeable action. Specifically, using criteria included in Section 4.2 (Approach to Analysis), the Navy determined whether a relationship exists such that the affected resource areas of the Proposed Action (included in this EIS) might interact with the affected resource area of a past, present, or reasonably foreseeable action. If no such potential relationship existed, the project was not carried forward into the cumulative impacts analysis. In accordance with CEQ guidance (Council on Environmental Quality 2005), those actions considered but excluded from further cumulative effects analysis are not catalogued in the Final EIS, because the intent is to focus the analysis on the meaningful actions relevant to inform decision making.

1.10.17.2 Military Actions – Nevada Test and Training Range Military Land Withdrawal at Nellis Air Force Base

The Nevada Test and Training Range (NTTR) Military Land Withdrawal at Nellis Air Force Base and the FRTC Modernization EIS are distinct and separate actions based on their mission, type of training activities, and training schedules.

The proposed action for NTTR was evaluated in Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts) in the Final EIS. There would be no overlap between the residents or resources affected by aircraft noise in the FRTC range areas and those affected by aircraft noise in the areas surrounding the NTTR (Figure 4-1, 4-2, and 4-3). However, the Navy determined, based on the analysis in the Final EIS, that Nye County would experience a significant impact on recreation and economic resources due to the cumulative nature of the NTTR Proposed Action (refer to Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts, in particular Sections 4.4.12, Recreation; and 4.4.13, Socioeconomics) and the FRTC Preferred Alternative, and the loss of lands for

recreation activities such as hunting, which generate economic resources for the county (see Section 3.13, Socioeconomics). The Navy is working and will continue to work with Nye County and other impacted counties to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts when feasible and consistent with the Navy's authority.

1.10.17.3 Cumulative Noise Impact Analysis

The Navy's model for noise impacts included the quantitative analysis of potential cumulative impacts from existing operations (baseline) plus each alternative. Section 4.4.7 (Noise) details the full cumulative impact analysis from noise. Military and construction activities, such as development of a new facility, demolition or renovation of existing facilities, or road construction/maintenance, make up the majority of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable Navy actions considered as part of the cumulative impacts of noise.

A detailed discussion of noise modeling is found in Section 3.7 (Noise), specifically Section 3.7.3 (Environmental Consequences). The results of the modeling include noise contour maps, which provide a visual depiction of areas exposed to different noise levels associated with the Proposed Action. Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions where there would be overlap with the Navy's noise contours were noted to account for potential cumulative impacts.

1.10.18 Mitigation

1.10.18.1 General Mitigation

The Navy has developed and proposed specific mitigation for each alternative that can be implemented and would avoid or minimize impacts. As such, alternatives include actions specifically designed to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential impacts, to the extent practicable under existing authorities and consistent with military training activities.

1.10.18.2 Reducing the Withdrawal and Acquisition

There are a variety of comments about reducing the extent of the proposed expansion of different Bravo ranges for a variety of reasons (specific to each commenter). For the majority of comments, reasons include the proposed withdrawal bringing Navy activities too close to property/housing in certain Bravo ranges as a result of the Proposed Action; causing the loss of mining claims, grazing allotments, and water resources; or causing access loss for recreational purposes.

The Navy acknowledged the significance of the potential impacts and instead revised its proposal to only include the minimum 180-degree requirement for realistic training events; it also reduced the size of the overall area requested and proposed for withdrawal, to the extent consistent with mission requirements.

The Navy added figures (Figure 2-13 and Figure 2-14) in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) of the Final EIS that illustrates the proposed withdrawal and requested acquisition lands included in the Draft EIS and highlights additional reductions that have been made to the lands requested for withdrawal and proposed for acquisition between the Draft and Final EIS under Alternative 3.

For the Navy to reach full tactics, techniques, and procedures compliance that would allow air and ground forces to train in a realistic 360-degree combat scenario for all training scenarios, the Navy would need to withdraw or acquire almost twice the amount of land requested under the Proposed Action (approximately 1.3 million acres), as well as make extensive revisions to special use and civilian

airspace. The Navy considered this as an alternative, but did not carry it forward for detailed analysis in the EIS due to disruptive impacts on the local area. For example, this alternative would greatly increase the amount of public lands that would need to be closed for weapons safety considerations.

1.10.18.3 Mitigation for Loss of Grazing Areas

The Navy would make payments to federal grazing permit holders for losses as a result of the withdrawal or other use of former federal grazing lands for war or national defense purposes (43 U.S.C. section 315q of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, as amended).

The Final EIS, specifically Section 3.4.3.2.6 (Process for Determining Payment Amounts for Losses Resulting from Permit Modification or Cancellation), describes the Navy's proposed process for determining payments for losses due to cancelled or modified federal grazing permits.

1.10.18.4 Mitigation for Access Loss

Alternative 3 (the Preferred Alternative) would allow limited public access to the extent compatible with mission training requirements and public safety. Certain types of water development, mining, and geothermal development would be allowed in the DVTA. Grazing would continue to be allowed in the DVTA.

Because of public safety concerns, areas defined as WDZs are not compatible with public access. However, the Navy would allow certain activities, such as wildlife management, cultural visits, bighorn sheep hunting, and events that are coordinated with the Navy in advance.

Mitigation for loss of access generally was determined to be either not possible because of mission requirements or not warranted because many of the affected activities (e.g., grazing, mining, recreation) could be conducted in adjacent or nearby areas (refer to Section 3.4, Livestock Grazing; Section 3.3, Mining and Mineral Resources; and Section 3.12, Recreation).

1.10.18.5 Mitigation for Socioeconomic Loss

The Navy recognizes the potential socioeconomic impacts on the community. To mitigate these impacts, affected private landowners would receive just compensation for loss of any privately owned land and all rights associated with that land acquired by the United States. Claim holders for mining and water would be compensated as described in Section 3.3 (Mining and Mineral Resources) and Section 3.9 (Water Resources).

Pursuant to the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. section 315q), the Navy would make payments to federal grazing permit holders for losses as a result of the withdrawal or other use of former federal grazing lands for war or national defense purposes.

1.11 Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision

This Final EIS includes updates and revisions to the Draft EIS, a complete set of all substantive comments received on the Draft EIS, and the Navy's responses to such comments (Appendix F, Public Comments and Responses). Response to public comments may also take other forms, including correction of data, clarifications of and modifications to analytical approaches, and inclusion of additional data or analysis.

A 30-day waiting period will follow the issuance of the Final EIS. The Navy will sign a ROD after consideration of the Final EIS and public comments. The Navy will publish a *Notice of Availability of the ROD* in the *FR*; distribute the ROD to Indian Tribes, agencies, interested parties, and local newspapers; and post it on the FRTC EIS website. The ROD will document the Navy's final decision on the Proposed

Action (to include identifying an action alternative as a proposal to be submitted to Congress for action), the rationale behind that decision, and any commitments to mitigation and monitoring. Congress will then review the Navy's proposal and ROD and will consider legislation for the proposed land withdrawal.

Should Congress decide to authorize the Proposed Action, it is anticipated that the Navy's Office of Economic Adjustment Program will provide technical and financial assistance to state and local governments to undertake Compatible Use Studies (formally known as Joint Land Use Studies) in response to Military Department compatibility concerns. Compatible Use Studies represent a planning process that promotes open, continuous dialogue among the Military, surrounding jurisdictions, and states to support long-term sustainability and operability of military missions. The last Joint Land Use Study was completed for NAS Fallon in May 2015 and serves as a comprehensive strategic plan with specific implementation actions to address and prevent incompatible civilian development that could impair the operational utility of military missions or impact available resources (e.g., air, land, electromagnetic spectrum).

The following discusses the funding process for certain payments and other anticipated costs associated with potential implementation of the Proposed Action. Under the Proposed Action, the Navy would need to acquire certain privately held property in conjunction with the proposed expansion of the Bravo ranges and the DVTA—around 360 total parcels totaling approximately 67,000 acres, from around 100 different owners. (Discussion of action alternatives can be found in Chapter 2, Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives.) Private land owners would receive just compensation for any loss of privatelyowned land acquired by the United States, to be determined by calculating the fair market value of parcels in accordance with federal appraisal rules codified in the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions. Additionally, as discussed in Chapter 5 (Management Practices, Monitoring, and Mitigation), the EIS identifies a variety of measures to avoid, minimize, or otherwise mitigate certain anticipated environmental impacts of the Navy's Proposed Action. While not all such measures identified in the EIS would necessarily be implemented, any mitigation measures committed to in the ROD would be binding upon the Navy. Further, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. section 315q of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, as amended, the Navy would make payments to federal grazing permit holders for losses suffered by the permit holders as a result of the withdrawal or other use of former federal grazing lands for war or national defense purposes.

The EIS acknowledges these projected costs and/or analyzes the environmental impacts associated with them; however, the actual funding for these costs would be provided outside the EIS and the Navy's NEPA process, as part of any legislative authorization of the Proposed Action subsequent to issuance of a Navy ROD. For example, implementation of mitigations would be paid for either (1) through project-specific appropriations associated with any potential overall legislative implementation of the Proposed Action as part of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) (which directs DoD action and policy and authorizes construction and mitigation, but does not make appropriations of funds) and the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (MCON) (which appropriates funding for military construction projects such as the Proposed Action, including funding for project-specific mitigations); or (2) through funds appropriated for general Navy operations through the Department of Defense Appropriations Act (DoDAA) (which appropriates funding for operations and maintenance of military installations, including range and environmental management).

The NDAA, MCON and DoDAA are annual legislative actions. The overall proposed land withdrawal is projected to be included as part of the NDAA for Fiscal Year (FY) 2021. Funding for the proposed acquisition of non-federal property (to include valid and existing compensable water rights) and for any

payments under 43 U.S.C. section 315q is projected for MCON FY 2021. Funding for range and environmental management is projected for DoDAA FY 2021 and subsequent years.

REFERENCES

- Bureau of Land Management. (2008). *Land Use Planning Handbook*. (H-1601-1). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (1998). *Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement Renewal of the B-20 Land Withdrawal Naval Air Station Fallon, Nevada*. Fallon, NV: Naval Air Station Fallon.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2000). *Final Environmental Impact Statement, Proposed Fallon Training Range Complex Requirements*. Fallon, NV: Department of the Navy.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2013). *Final Environmental Assessment of Airfield Operations at Naval Air Station Fallon, Nevada*. Fallon, NV: Naval Air Station Fallon.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2014). *Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Addition of Training Activities and Range Enhancements at Naval Air Station Fallon on Training Range Bravo-16*. Churchill County, NV: U.S. Department of Defense.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015a). *Military Readiness Activities at Fallon Range Training Complex Environmental Impact Statement*. Fallon, NV: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015b). *Ninety Days to Combat: Required Training Capabilities for the Fallon Range Training Complex 2015–2035*. Fallon, NV: Naval Aviation Warfighting Development Center.

This page intentionally left blank.