

Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Fort Lewis Army Growth and Force Structure Realignment



Volume 1

July 2010



**FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE
FORT LEWIS ARMY GROWTH AND FORCE STRUCTURE REALIGNMENT
FORT LEWIS AND YAKIMA TRAINING CENTER, WASHINGTON**

Prepared by:
Fort Lewis Directorate of Public Works

Recommended for Approval by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. J. Daniels', written over a horizontal line.

Michael J. Daniels
Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army
Commanding

Joint Base Lewis-McChord - Yakima Training Center, Washington

Approved by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'T. H. Brittain', written over a horizontal line.

Thomas H. Brittain
Colonel, U.S. Army
Garrison Commander
Joint Base Lewis-McChord, Washington

July 2010

July 2010

Re: Release and review of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Fort Lewis Army Growth and Force Structure Realignment

Dear Reader,

In 2007, the Department of the Army (Army) analyzed the environmental effects of an addition of units (Army Modularity and Global Defense Posture Realignment (GDPR) and growth of new units by up to six Active component BCTs). These effects were documented in the Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (FPEIS) for Army Growth and Force Structure Realignment (2007 GTA FPEIS). This growth is intended to mitigate shortages in units, Soldiers, and time to train that would otherwise inhibit the Army from meeting readiness goals and supporting strategic requirements.

In December 2007, the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7 (Operations, Plans, and Training), signed the Record of Decision (ROD) for the 2007 GTA FPEIS. This ROD validated the Army's plan to grow by approximately 74,200 Active and Reserve component Soldiers and to station these additional Soldiers at various specified installations. Specifically, the ROD states that the Army will proceed with the preferred alternative (Alternative 3) identified in the GTA FPEIS to:

1. Implement realignments and associated activities between Fiscal Year (FY) 2008 and FY 2013 to support the Army's decisions on Modular Transformation and GDPR,
2. Add approximately 30,000 Combat Support (CS) and Combat Service Support (CSS) Soldiers to the Active and Reserve components of the Army to address critical shortfalls in high-demand military skills, and
3. Grow the Army by up to six Active Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs).

Decisions in the ROD about specifically where growth and realignments would occur include stationing about 560 additional Active Duty Soldiers at Fort Lewis and augmenting Fort Lewis' existing units by approximately 1,320 Soldiers, for a total of approximately 1,880 additional Soldiers. Finally, the decisions about stationing actions were made with the understanding that site-specific analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) would be undertaken at the affected installations before the actions were implemented.

This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) documents the site-specific analysis of adding approximately 1,880 Active Duty Soldiers at Fort Lewis as directed by the ROD for the GTA FPEIS. In addition, it analyzes the potential stationing at Fort Lewis of additional CSS units (consisting of up to 1,000 Soldiers) and a medium Combat Aviation Brigade (consisting of approximately 2,800 Soldiers) to support the Stryker Brigade Combat Teams (SBCTs) and other units stationed at Fort Lewis. The EIS also documents the analysis of effects from pertinent, past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions interconnected to the GTA actions. Reasonably foreseeable future actions include updating the Fort Lewis and Yakima Training Center (YTC) Area Development Plans. These actions also include the training of three SBCTs simultaneously at Fort Lewis and YTC with the GTA-directed new units being stationed and the other units already training at Fort Lewis and YTC. The analysis also considers construction of the facilities necessary to support these units.

The Army released the DEIS for public review on September 11, 2009. The comment period closed on October 26, 2009. During the comment period, the Army held public meetings at the Lacey Community

Center in Lacey on September 29, 2009, the Hal Holmes Community Center in Ellensburg on September 30, 2009, and the Howard Johnson Plaza in Yakima on October 1, 2009 to provide the public with the opportunity to ask questions and submit comments on the DEIS in person.

Twenty-seven reviewers of the DEIS submitted comments via letters or e-mails. Overall, comments primarily focused on the NEPA process, alternatives, biological resources, cultural resources, water resources, wildfire, air quality, socioeconomics, and cumulative effects. The comments received during the comment period and the Army's responses to those comments are summarized in an appendix to the FEIS.

The Army anticipates a decision on the implementation of the Proposed Action in August 2010. At that time, we will notify the public of the final decision for the Proposed Action.

If you have any questions or wish to obtain additional copies of this document, please contact:

DIRECTORATE OF PUBLIC WORKS,
ATTN: ENVIRONMENTAL (B VAN HOESEN),
BLDG 2012 LIGGETT AVENUE,
BOX 339500, MS 17
JOINT BASE LEWIS-MCCHORD, WA 98433-9500

Telephone: 253-966-1780, Facsimile: 253-966-4985,
email: bill.vanhoesen@us.army.mil.

Final Environmental Impact Statement

Lead Agency: Department of the Army, Office of the Secretary of the Army, Washington, D.C.

Cooperating Agencies: None

Title to Proposed Action: Fort Lewis Army Growth and Force Structure Realignment

Affected Jurisdictions: Kittitas, Pierce, Thurston, and Yakima Counties

Review: Copies of the FEIS may be obtained from:

DIRECTORATE OF PUBLIC WORKS,
ATTN: ENVIRONMENTAL (B VAN HOESEN),
BLDG 2012 LIGGETT AVENUE,
BOX 339500, MS 17
JOINT BASE LEWIS-MCCHORD, WA 98433-9500

Telephone: 253-966-1780, Facsimile: 253-966-4985, email: bill.vanhoesen@us.army.mil,
Online: http://www.lewis.army.mil/publicworks/sites/envir/EIA_2.htm.

Document Designation: Final Environmental Impact Statement

Abstract: The Proposed Action is to implement those actions from FY 2010 through 2015 needed to support the Army's decisions on growth and realignment at Fort Lewis and YTC. These actions would allow the Army to achieve a size and composition that is better able to meet national security and defense requirements, modify the force in accordance with Army Transformation, sustain unit equipment and training readiness, and preserve quality of life for the Soldiers and their Families. Fort Lewis and YTC must take actions to support the strategic deployment and mobilization requirements of the nation's combatant commanders to ensure they will have the forces necessary to support regional contingency operational requirements.

This EIS examines four alternatives:

- Alternative 1 — No Action,
- Alternative 2 — Take Actions Necessary to Implement GTA Actions and Those Actions Interconnected to GTA,
- Alternative 3 — All Actions under Alternative 2 and the Addition of up to 1,000 Combat Service Support Soldiers to Fort Lewis/YTC, and
- Alternative 4 — All Actions under Alternative 3 and the Addition of a Medium Combat Aviation Brigade to Fort Lewis/YTC.

This EIS will assist the Army in arriving at a decision for the Fort Lewis Army Growth and Force Structure Realignment. The Army has selected Alternative 4 as the Army's Preferred Alternative.

Preface

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) usually is not read like a book — from chapter one to the end. The best way to read an EIS depends on your interests. You may be more interested in effects, whereas others might have more interest in the details of the proposed project or be more concerned about what opportunities were made available to the public to be involved in the environmental assessment process. Many readers probably just want to know what is being proposed and how it will affect them.

This document follows the format established in the National Environmental Policy Act's regulations (Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations Parts 1500 to 1508). The following paragraphs outline information contained in the chapters and appendices so readers may find the parts of interest without having to read the entire document.

- *Summary*: contains a short, simple discussion to provide the reader and the decision makers with a sketch of the more important aspects of the EIS. The reader can obtain additional, more-detailed information from the actual text of the EIS.
- *Chapter 1 — Purpose, Need, and Scope*: identifies the proposed action and describes the purpose of and need for the proposed action, decisions to be made by the Army, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process.
- *Chapter 2 — Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives*: describes the Proposed Action and the alternatives that were carried forward for evaluation. Three alternatives for implementing the proposed action were identified by the Army as reasonable alternatives capable of meeting the Army's need criteria described in Chapter 1 and screening criteria described in Chapter 2. In addition, the No Action Alternative was defined for evaluation in detail.
- *Chapter 3 — Affected Environment for Fort Lewis*: describes the present condition of the environment that would be affected by implementation of the proposed action or any action alternative at Fort Lewis.
- *Chapter 4 — Environmental Consequences at Fort Lewis*: describes the probable direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to the human environment that would result from implementing the Proposed Action or alternatives at Fort Lewis.
- *Chapter 5 — Affected Environment for Yakima Training Center*: describes the present condition of the environment that would be affected by implementation of the proposed action or any action alternative at the Yakima Training Center.
- *Chapter 6 — Environmental Consequences at the Yakima Training Center*: describes the probable direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to the human environment that would result from implementing the Proposed Action or alternatives at the Yakima Training Center.
- *Chapter 7 — References Cited*: lists the references cited in the FEIS.
- *Chapter 8 — Preparers and Contributors*: identifies the people involved in the research, writing, and internal review of the FEIS.
- *Chapter 9 — Distribution and Review of the Draft EIS*: lists the agencies, organizations, and individuals who received a copy of the FEIS.
- *Index*: contains cross references and identifies the pages where key topics can be found.
- *Appendices*: contain information that is important to full comprehension of the NEPA analysis, but that was too long to be included in the primary chapters. The appendices also include the Army's summary of public comments on the DEIS and its responses to those comments.

Acronyms and Abbreviations used in this EIS

Acronym	Spelled Out
$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	micrograms per cubic meter
AAFES	Army Air Force Exchange Service
ACP	access control point
ACSIM	Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management
ACUB	Army Compatible Use Buffer
ADA	average daily attendance
ADNL	A-weighted day-night sound level
ADP	Area Development Plan
AERMOD	American Meteorological Society/EPA Regulatory Model
AFB	Air Force Base
AGL	above ground level
AH	attack helicopter
AIA	artillery impact area
AICUZ	Air Installation Compatible Use Zone
AIRFA	American Indian Religious Freedom Act
AMF	Army Modular Force
AQCR	air quality control region
AR	Army Regulation
ARFF	Aircraft Rescue Fire Fighting
Army	Department of the Army
ARPA	Archaeological Resources Protection Act
ASIL	acceptable source impact level
ASIP	Army Stationing and Installation Plan
ATC	Air Traffic Control
ATTACC	Army Training and Testing Area Carrying Capacity
AUL	Authorized Use List
AVIM	Aviation Intermediate Maintenance
BA	Biological Assessment
BAX	Battle Area Complex
BCT	Brigade Combat Team
BEA	Bureau of Economic Analysis
BMP	best management practice
BNSF	Burlington Northern Santa Fe
BOD	Biological Oxygen Demand
BPA	Bonneville Power Administration
BRAC	Base Realignment And Closure

Acronym	Spelled Out
BSA	brigade support area
ca	circa
CAB	Combat Aviation Brigade
CACTF	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility
CALFEX	combined arms live-fire exercise
CC	compliance-related cleanup
CDC	child development center
CDNL	C-weighted day-night sound level
CEMML	Center for Environmental Management of Military Lands
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation And Liability Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
cfs	cubic feet per second
CH	cargo helicopter
CIA	central impact area
CIS	capital investment strategy
cm	centimeter
CNRMP	Cultural and Natural Resource Management Plan
CO	carbon monoxide
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
COF	Company Operations Facility
CRM	Cultural Resources Manager
CS	Combat Support
CSAIA	central small arms impact area
CSS	Combat Service Support
CUA	Controlled Use Area
CWA	Clean Water Act
DAHP	Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibel
DCA	Directorate of Community Activities
DEIS	Draft EIS
DERP	Defense Environmental Restoration Program
DES	Directorate of Emergency Services
DFMWR	Directorate of Family and Morale, Welfare, and Recreation
DHSVM-HEM	Distributed Hydrology Soil Vegetation Model – Hillslope Erosion Model

Acronym	Spelled Out
DMPRC	Digital Multipurpose Range Complex
DMPTR	Digital Multipurpose Training Range
DNL	day-night sound level
DoD	Department of Defense
DoDI	Department of Defense Instructions
DOE	Directorate of Environment
DOIM	Director of Information Management
DOL	Directorate of Logistics
DPS	distinct population segment
DPTM	Director of Plans, Training and Mobilization
DPTMS	Directorate of Plans, Training, Mobility and Security
DPW	Directorate of Public Works
DRMO	Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office
DU	depleted uranium
e.g.	for example
EA	Environmental Assessment
ED	Environmental Division
EEAP	Energy Engineering Analysis Program
EFH	Essential Fish Habitat
EIFS	Economic Impact Forecast System
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EMS	Environmental Management System
ENMP	Environmental Noise Management Program
ENRD	Environment and Natural Resources Division
EO	Executive Order
EOD	explosives ordnance disposal
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EPCRA	Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act
EPP	Environmental Protection Plan
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESC	Expeditionary Sustainment Command
ESU	evolutionary significant unit
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FAC	Fire Alarm Central
FARRP	forward area rearming and refueling point
FEIS	Final EIS
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIFRA	Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act

Acronym	Spelled Out
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FM	Field Manual
FMTV	family of medium tactical vehicle
FOB	Forward Operating Base
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FPEIS	Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
FRP	Facility Response Plan
ft/s	feet per second
FTE	full time equivalent
FY	fiscal year
g/p/d	gallons per person per day
GAAF	Gray Army Airfield
GDPR	Global Defense Posture Realignment
GHG	greenhouse gases
GIS	geographic information system
gpd	gallons per day
gpm	gallons per minute
GPP	Green Procurement Program
GTA	Grow the Army
ha	hectares
HABS	Historic American Building Survey
HAP	hazardous air pollutant
HBCT	Heavy Brigade Combat Team
HCM	Highway Capacity Manual
HEMTT	heavy expanded mobility tactical truck
HET	heavy equipment transport
HIMARS	High Mobility Artillery Rocket System
HM	hazardous material
HMA	Housing Market Analysis
HMCC	hazardous materials control center
HMMP	Hazardous Material Management Plan
HMMWV	high mobility multi-wheeled vehicle
HOV	high-occupancy vehicle
HQ	Headquarters
HQDA	Headquarters, Department of the Army
HVAC	heating, ventilating, air conditioning
HW	hazardous waste
Hz	Hertz

Acronym	Spelled Out
i.e.	that is
I-405	Interstate 405
I-5	Interstate 5
I-82	Interstate 82
I-90	Interstate 90
IAFF	International Association of Fire Fighters
IBCT	Infantry Brigade Combat Team
ICP	Installation contingency plan
ICRMP	Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plan
ICS	incident command system
ICUZ	installation compatible use zone
IFR	instrument flight rules
INRMP	Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
IPMP	Integrated Pest Management Plan
IRP	Installation Restoration Program
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
ISWM	Integrated solid waste management
ISWMP	Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan
ITAM	Integrated Training Area Management
IWFMP	Integrated Wildland Fire Management Plan
JBLM	Joint Base Lewis-McChord
JBLM-YTC	Joint Base Lewis-McChord-Yakima Training Center
JGA and AMEC	John Gallup and Associates and AMEC Earth and Environmental, Inc.
kg	kilogram
km	kilometer
kph	kilometers per hour
kV	kilovolt
L	liter
L/min	liters per minute
L/p/d	liters per person per day
LAV	Light Armored Vehicle
LBP	lead-based paint
LCTA	Land Condition Trend Analysis
L_{dn}	day-night average sound level
LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
L_{eq}	equivalent noise levels
LID	low impact development

Acronym	Spelled Out
L_{\max}	maximum noise level event
LOS	level of service
LRC	long-range component
LUPZ	Land Use Planning Zone
m	meter
m^3	cubic meters
MAD	management action decision
MAMC	Madigan Army Medical Center
MBTU	million British thermal unit
MCA	military construction, Army
MCL	maximum contaminant level
METL	Mission Essential Task List
mgd	million gallons per day
MGS	mobile gun system
MH or MVH	Medivac helicopters
mi^3	cubic miles
MIA	main impact area
MIL-CLASS	Military Class
MILCON	military construction
min	minute
mm	millimeter
MMRP	Military Munitions Response Program
MOA	Military Operations Area
mph	miles per hour
MPMG	multi-purpose machine gun
MPRC	Multi-Purpose Range Complex
MPTR	Multi-Purpose Training Range
MRF	modified record fire
MSDS	Material Safety Data Sheet
MSL	mean sea level
mVA	megavolt-ampere
MW	megawatt
MWH	megawatt hour
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standard
NAGPRA	Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act
NCO	non-commissioned officer
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NESHAP	national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants

Acronym	Spelled Out
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NLR	noise level reduction
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NO ₂	nitrogen dioxide
NOA	Notice of Availability
NODR	Notification of Demolition and Remediation
NOE	Nap-of-the-Earth
NOI	Notice of Intent
NOTAM	Notice to Airmen
NO _x	nitrogen oxides
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPL	National Priorities List
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NSAIA	north small arms impact area
NSPS	New Source Performance Standards
NSR	New Source Review
NTC	National Training Center
ORTC	Operational Readiness Training Center
P2	pollution prevention
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PAM	Army Pamphlet
PAM	Army Pamphlet
PAO	Public Affairs Office/Public Affairs Officer
PBMS	Performance-based Management Strategy
PBT	persistent bioaccumulative toxic
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyl
PK15	unweighted peak, 15% metric
PM	particulate matter
PM ₁₀	particulate matter less than 10 microns
PM _{2.5}	particulate matter less than 2.5 microns
POL	petroleum, oils, and lubricants
PPA	Pollution Prevention Act
ppb	parts per billion
ppm	parts per million
PSCAA	Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
PSD	prevention of significant deterioration
PSE	Puget Sound Energy

Acronym	Spelled Out
psi	pounds per square inch
PSWQA	Puget Sound Water Quality Authority
PX	Post Exchange
QRP	Qualified Recycling Program
QTR	Qualification Training Range
RC	Range Control
RCO	Residential Communities Office
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RCW	Revised Code of Washington
RDN	Robert D. Niehaus, Inc.
RFFA	reasonably foreseeable future action
RMO	Fort Lewis Resource Management Office
RNA	Research Natural Area
ROD	Record of Decision
ROI	Region of Influence
ROTC	Reserve Officer Training Corps
ROW	right-of-way
RPMP	Real Property Master Plan
RSTA	reconnaissance, surveillance, and target acquisition
RTLA	Range and Training Land Assessment
RTV	rational threshold values
RUL	Restricted Use List
RUSLE	Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation
SARA	Superfund Amendments Reauthorization Act
SAS	school aged services
SAW	squad automatic weapon
SBCT	Stryker Brigade Combat Team
SCWSSC	South Central Washington Shrub-Steppe Collaborative
SDZ	surface danger zone
SEL	sound exposure level
SF	square feet
SFF	sniper field fire
SGPA	sage-grouse protection area
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SIMDSS	Spreadsheet Implemented Multi-objective Decision Support System
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SJA	Staff Judge Advocate
SO ₂	sulfur dioxide

Acronym	Spelled Out
SOF	Special Operations Forces
SOP	standard operating procedure
SO _x	sulfur oxides
SPCCP	Spill Prevention, Countermeasure, and Control Plan
SR	State Route
SRC	short-range component
SRKW	southern resident killer whale
SSAIA	south small arms impact area
STRAC	Standards in Training Commission
SUA	Special Use Airspace
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
t/ac/y	tons per acre per year
TA	training area
TAA	training assembly area
TC	Training Circular
TCE	trichloroethylene
TCP	traditional cultural properties
TIP	Transportation Improvement Program
TMDL	total maximum daily loads
TOC	tactical operations center
tpy	tons per year
TRI	Toxic Release Inventory
TSCA	Toxic Substances Control Act
TSS	total dissolved solids
UAS	unmanned aerial system
UESC	Utility Energy Savings Contract
UFGS	United Facilities Guide Specifications
UH	utility helicopter
UMTU	Unexploded Munitions Treatment Unit
USAAAD	U.S. Army Air Ambulance Detachment
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USACHPPM	U.S. Army Center for Health Promotion and Preventive Medicine
USC	United States Code
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Service
UXO	unexploded ordnance
VAH	Vagabond Army Heliport

Acronym	Spelled Out
VEC	Valued Environmental Component
VFR	visual flight rules
VOC	volatile organic compound
WAARNG	Washington Army National Guard
WAC	Washington Administrative Code
WAU	watershed administrative units
WDFW	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
WDNR	Washington Department of Natural Resources
WFPM	Wildland Fire Program Manager
WHPA	wellhead protection areas
WNHP	Washington Natural Heritage Program
WRIA	water resource inventory area
WSDOT	Washington State Department of Transportation
WTU	Warrior Transition Unit
WWTP	wastewater treatment plant
YRCAA	Yakima Regional Clean Air Agency
YRS	Yakima Research Station
YTC	Yakima Training Center

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) analyzes the addition of Soldiers at Fort Lewis and the potential stationing of additional units to support Army Growth and transformation. The Department of the Army (Army) is in a period of critical transition. It has embarked on a 30-year process to transform its forces. This transformation includes modernizing its doctrine, equipment, leadership, organizational structure, facilities, business processes, and virtually every component of its operations.

Since the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (FPEIS) for Army Transformation was signed in 2002, the Army has been implementing the Transformation process. Organizationally, the Army is transitioning from large powerful, fixed organizations constituted at the Division level (10,000 to 12,000 personnel) to an Army designed around smaller, standardized, self-contained, rapidly deployable Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs) (3,500 to 4,000 personnel). There are three types of modular BCTs: Heavy BCTs (HBCTs), Infantry BCTs (IBCTs), and Stryker BCTs (SBCTs). Each type of BCT has different needs for equipment, training, maneuver, and support.

The Army has almost completed the transformation to a modular or standardized force structure designed around the three types of BCTs. Subsequent phases of Transformation are focusing on analyzing and realigning Combat Support (CS) and Combat Service Support (CSS) units. This realignment of CS and CSS units will ensure the Army is fielding the proper force to support its modular BCTs and its operational mission requirements.

Recently, the Army identified the need to increase its overall size while continuing to restructure its forces in accordance with modular Transformation decisions:

- to further Army Transformation,
- to meet the 21st Century's requirements for increased national security and defense,
- to maintain training and operational readiness levels of the force, and
- to preserve a high quality of life for Soldiers and their Families.

This increase in the numbers and configurations of units will enhance operational readiness by allowing Soldiers more time to train and maintain their equipment. It also will afford Soldiers and Families more time together at home station while providing the nation with greater capability to respond to the increased challenges to national defense and security.

In 2007, the Army analyzed the environmental effects of an addition of units (to support Army Modularity and Global Defense Posture Realignment [GDPR] and growth of new units by up to six Active component BCTs). These effects were documented in the FPEIS for Army Growth and Force Structure Realignment (Grow-the-Army or GTA). This growth is intended to mitigate shortages in units, Soldiers, and time to train that would otherwise inhibit the Army from meeting readiness goals and supporting strategic requirements.

In December 2007, the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, G-3/5/7 (Operations, Plans, and Training), signed the ROD for the 2007 GTA FPEIS. This ROD validated the Army's plan to grow by approximately 74,200 Active and Reserve component Soldiers and to station these additional Soldiers at various specified installations. Specifically, the ROD states that the Army will proceed with the preferred alternative (Alternative 3) identified in the GTA FPEIS to:

1. Implement realignments and associated activities between Fiscal Year (FY) 2008 and FY 2013 to support the Army's decisions on Modular Transformation and GDPR,
2. Add approximately 30,000 CS and CSS Soldiers to the Active and Reserve components of the Army to address critical shortfalls in high-demand military skills, and
3. Grow the Army by up to six Active BCTs.

Decisions in the ROD about where growth and realignments would occur include stationing about 560 additional Active Duty Soldiers at Fort Lewis and augmenting Fort Lewis' existing units by approximately 1,320 Soldiers, for a total of approximately 1,880 additional Soldiers. Finally, the decisions about stationing actions were made with the understanding that site-specific analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) would be undertaken at the affected installations before the actions were implemented (Thurman 2007).

This EIS documents the site-specific analysis of adding approximately 1,880 Active Duty Soldiers at Fort Lewis as directed by the ROD for the GTA FPEIS. In addition, it analyzes the potential stationing at Fort Lewis of additional CSS units (consisting of up to 1,000 Soldiers) and a medium Combat Aviation Brigade (CAB) (consisting of approximately 2,800 Soldiers) to support the SBCTs. The EIS also documents the analysis of effects from pertinent past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (RFFAs) connected to the GTA actions. These RFFAs also include the training of three SBCTs simultaneously at Fort Lewis and Yakima Training Center (YTC) with the GTA-directed new units being stationed and the other units already training at Fort Lewis and YTC. The analysis also considers construction of the facilities necessary to support these units.

To accommodate GTA actions and other changes at Fort Lewis, the newly developed Area Development Plans (ADPs) are being prepared as part of the Fort Lewis and YTC Master Plans. NEPA analysis of such master plan changes are required by Army Regulation (AR) 210-20.

This EIS provides decision makers, regulatory agencies, and the public information on the potential environmental and socioeconomic effects of implementing the 2007 GTA stationing decision at Fort Lewis and YTC. Decision-makers will be able to compare the alternatives analyzed in detail and assess their environmental and socioeconomic effects to make informed decisions.

On February 1, 2010, Fort Lewis and McChord Air Force Base became Joint Base Lewis-McChord (JBLM). On this date, it reached initial operational capability and began a phased consolidation to Army management under the Joint Base Garrison, which will be complete on October 1, 2010. Although the names of Fort Lewis and YTC have officially changed to JBLM-Lewis and JBLM-YTC, the Army decided to continue using the previous naming conventions for Fort Lewis and YTC in this document. This decision was made to ensure consistency throughout the current NEPA process, including consistency with the 2009 DEIS and with the 2007 FPEIS for Army Growth and Force Structure Realignment.

Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to implement the decisions made in the ROD for the 2007 GTA FPEIS as well as other potential Army decisions to station additional CSS and CAB Soldiers at Fort Lewis. Fort Lewis must provide adequate permanent administrative facilities, ranges, and training areas to support all Soldiers assigned to Fort Lewis given the assignment of new units to Fort Lewis and the likelihood that all three SBCTs will be present at Fort Lewis simultaneously. Fort Lewis must ensure that sufficient firing ranges are available to support these units. It must also meet the Army's goals of sustaining global force readiness. Fort Lewis' Soldiers must be able to train as they fight. Fort Lewis must

also preserve/enhance Soldier and Family quality of life. This includes analyzing the requirements for units like 1,000 CSS Soldiers and a medium CAB that have not yet been designated to come to Fort Lewis. This enables the Army to anticipate possible needs. The information also will be made available to Army decision makers and planners who might be considering the assignment of additional units to Fort Lewis.

Fort Lewis currently houses and trains about 34,000 Soldiers. The Proposed Action and all those recent past and (reasonably foreseeable) future actions (including now having the three SBCTs present and training simultaneously at Fort Lewis and YTC) will add up to 5,680 Soldiers (and about 8,640 Family members), which would stretch current facilities. Fort Lewis must provide adequate cantonment area and training area resources for all of the Soldiers that will be assigned to it.

The Army already supports the following primary units and organizations at Fort Lewis:

- I Corps Headquarters
- 4th Brigade, 2nd Infantry Division SBCT
- 555th Engineer Brigade
- 62nd Medical Brigade
- 17th Fires Brigade
- 4–6 Air Cavalry Squadron
- 2nd Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment
- 6th Military Police Group (CID)
- Madigan Army Medical Center
- US Army Garrison
- 81st Infantry Brigade Combat Team, Heavy (Washington Army National Guard)
- 191st Infantry Brigade, U.S. Army Reserve
- 66th Combat Aviation Brigade (Washington Army National Guard)
- 3rd Brigade, 2nd Infantry Division SBCT
- 5th Brigade, 2nd Infantry Division SBCT (reflags to (2nd Brigade, 2nd Infantry Division SBCT in late 2010)
- 42nd Military Police Brigade
- 593rd Sustainment Brigade
- 1st Joint Mobilization Brigade
- 201st Battlefield Surveillance Brigade
- 20th Support Command
- 404th Army Field Support Brigade
- 1st Special Forces Group (Airborne)
- 4th Battalion, 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment (Airborne)
- 8th Brigade, U.S. Army Cadet Command

Although three SBCTs have been stationed at Fort Lewis since April 2007, there has never been a period during which all three were training simultaneously at full intensity at Fort Lewis or YTC. This is because at least one of the SBCTs has been deployed in combat or to an Army Training Center outside of Fort Lewis and YTC or was in an Army Force Generation “Reset” mode following return from a combat deployment at any given time since the third SBCT arrived. These serial deployments will not last indefinitely. Part of the purpose of the proposed action is to support the presence of and full-intensity training requirements for all three SBCTs simultaneously. The associated need is to upgrade infrastructure in the cantonment area for the third SBCT so that it meets current standards and improves the training range capability to meet the collective firing range requirements for all three SBCTs at Fort Lewis and YTC.

In addition, since the SBCTs were stationed at Fort Lewis, their annual training requirements have increased from roughly 44,000 miles (71,000 kilometers [km]) per year to 530,000 miles (853,000 km) per year (totals include all vehicles in a single SBCT driving on Military Class 4 and 5 roads and off road). This is due to evolving doctrine for the SBCT as the Army has determined how it should be employed. Much of the requirements are based on lessons learned from SBCT deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan.

As described above, the ROD for the Army’s 2007 GTA PFEIS assigned about 1,880 additional Soldiers to Fort Lewis, with stationing to occur between FY 2008 and FY 2013. The same decision also chose to

keep at Fort Lewis several units that were scheduled to leave Fort Lewis, totaling about 380 Soldiers. Because stationing was to begin in 2008, many of these new Soldiers have already arrived.

Army Growth was extremely important to the war efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan and had to occur throughout the United States before full planning and analysis could take place at installations such as Fort Lewis. The new units that have arrived were placed in existing buildings and have trained on existing ranges within previously approved range capacities. Eventually, however, the units will require additional cantonment area construction. Upon the return of all three SBCTs to Fort Lewis, the 1,880 GTA Soldiers will also contribute to the need for new ranges and increased training area use. So another part of the purpose of the proposed action is to support the presence of and training requirements for the GTA Soldiers, whether their units have already arrived or not. The associated need is to upgrade infrastructure in the cantonment area for the units so that it meets current standards and improves the training range capability to meet the collective firing range requirements for all units scheduled to be assigned to Fort Lewis, including those GTA Soldiers who have already arrived.

In addition to the stationing actions at Fort Lewis directed by the ROD for the GTA FPEIS, the growth at the installation may include the stationing of CSS units and stationing of a medium CAB. The CSS units perform logistic (sustainment) functions and could consist of transportation, quartermaster, medical, headquarters, or other CSS units. The CSS units would include as many as 1,000 Soldiers (and about 1,520 Family members), and they would support operations at Fort Lewis and YTC.

The medium CAB is the standard design for Army aviation brigades under the Army Modular Force (AMF) plan. Formerly called the multi-functional aviation brigade, the medium CAB is part of Army Transformation. Stationing a medium CAB to support the three SBCTs and other units already stationed at Fort Lewis would enhance integrated training at Fort Lewis and YTC. The Army is considering Fort Lewis and several other locations for stationing of a medium CAB in the 2010 to 2013 timeframe. Because of this, the Army has included an evaluation of the potential impacts of stationing a medium CAB at Fort Lewis in this EIS.

Stationing these 1,000 CSS Soldiers and the medium CAB (about 2,800 Soldiers and 4,260 Family members) would involve constructing new facilities to support additional Soldiers and their Families, upgrading existing training ranges, constructing new training ranges, and continuing the use of training ranges and maneuver areas. Facilities for training, garrison operations, and Soldiers' quality of life are critical for supporting the operations of the new units that would be stationed at Fort Lewis and those units already at Fort Lewis undergoing strength increases from GTA-directed augmentations. Current facilities at Fort Lewis or YTC are not adequate to accommodate the new units. Therefore, construction of facilities would be required.

Scope of the Analysis

This EIS addresses environmental and socioeconomic impacts at Fort Lewis and YTC because of stationing Soldiers at the installation. This site-specific EIS has been developed in accordance with NEPA; the regulations issued by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Parts 1500–1508; and the Army's implementing procedures published in 32 CFR Part 651, *Environmental Analysis of Army Actions*. The potential stationing of additional CSS units and a medium CAB is also analyzed in this document for the reasons stated in **Section 1.2**. Additional analysis may be required to evaluate the site-specific components and effects of these actions that cannot be projected currently, such as the proportional distribution of the 1,000 CSS Soldiers among the various CSS units (e.g., transportation, medical, quartermaster, and headquarters).

The decisions on these stationing actions have been made at Headquarters, Department of the Army (HQDA), many in the ROD for the 2007 GTA FPEIS. Future decisions on the 1,000 CSS Soldiers and medium CAB will also be made at HQDA. Although the *decisions* themselves whether to send these units to Fort Lewis are outside the scope of the proposed action and the analysis in this EIS, we have analyzed the *impact* of stationing these units at Fort Lewis should the decision be made to do so.

This EIS incorporates the analysis of the 2007 GTA FPEIS by reference and provides the baseline conditions of the No Action Alternative.

Public Involvement

On December 22, 2008, the Army published in the *Federal Register* an NOI to prepare an EIS for GTA actions at Fort Lewis, Washington (73 *Federal Register* 78336). In addition, letters were sent to parties on a mailing list of those interested in activities and actions at Fort Lewis and YTC. Notices of three public scoping meetings were published in local newspapers.

Public scoping meetings were held at the Lacey Community Center in Lacey on January 20, 2009, the Hal Holmes Community Center in Ellensburg on January 21, 2009, and the Howard Johnson Plaza in Yakima on January 22, 2009. All three scoping meetings were conducted in an open house format during the hours of 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Approximately two weeks before the public scoping meetings, notices of the meetings were published in the following seven general circulation papers: Seattle Times, Seattle Post Intelligencer, The News Tribune, Olympian, Yakima Herald Republic, Ellensburg Daily Record, and Columbia Basin Herald. These public notices provided information on the background and purpose of the Proposed Action, requested public comments, and provided information on the public scoping meetings.

At each meeting, the Army was represented by Fort Lewis and YTC staff. Approximately 20, 3, and 7 members of the public, including local media representatives, attended the three meetings, respectively.

At each of the meetings, the members of the public were greeted upon arrival; requested to sign an attendance record form listing their name, address, and affiliation (if any); and given an information sheet. All attendees were given comment forms to provide written comments or concerns that they would like addressed in the EIS. They were asked to either complete and return the forms before leaving the meeting or return the forms to the Army no later than the close of the scoping period on February 5, 2009.

Individuals, organizations, and governmental representatives provided written comments on the scope of the EIS during the scoping period. Comments received were grouped based on comment threads or topics, and a primary issue statement was prepared for each group of comments. Twelve issues were incorporated into the NEPA analysis. They are:

- The effects of increased military usage of YTC on deer and elk hunting
- Traffic impacts resulting from increased military personnel and civilian employment at Fort Lewis
- The effects of Army Growth and Force Structure Realignment on surface water resources (waters of the United States and waters of the state) at Fort Lewis and YTC
- The effects of construction and demolition activities and long-term operations on surface and groundwater quality, including drinking water sources, and hydrology
- The effects on air quality, and resulting effects on human health and climate change, from proposed construction/demolition activities and long-term operations associated with GTA actions at Fort Lewis and YTC

- The effects on the environment from a potential release of hazardous/toxic chemicals during operations or because of an accident
- The effects of increased training activities at Fort Lewis and YTC on rare species and habitats on the installations
- The effects of GTA actions on the spread of noxious weeds/invasive species, and their resulting environmental effects
- Temporary and permanent land use effects from implementing the GTA initiative
- The effects of Army expansion at Fort Lewis on the availability of off-post housing and community facilities
- The potential for increased fire danger resulting from increased live-fire training use of YTC
- The potential for disproportionate adverse impacts to minority and low-income populations from implementation of the project

Additional details regarding the scoping process and results are available in the *Scoping Summary for the Fort Lewis Army Growth and Force Structure Realignment Environmental Impact Statement* (ARCADIS 2009), which is available for review at http://www.lewis.army.mil/publicworks/sites/envir/EIA_2.htm.

The DEIS was available for public review and comment from September 11, 2009 through October 26, 2009. The Army encouraged reviewers to submit written comments on the document during this period. In addition, the Army held public meetings at the Lacey Community Center in Lacey on September 29, 2009, the Hal Holmes Community Center in Ellensburg on September 30, 2009, and the Howard Johnson Plaza in Yakima on October 1, 2009 to provide the public with the opportunity to ask questions and submit comments on the DEIS in person.

Twenty-seven reviewers of the DEIS submitted comments via letters or e-mails. Overall, comments primarily focused on the NEPA process, alternatives, biological resources, cultural resources, water resources, wildfire, air quality, socioeconomics, and cumulative effects. Appendix G to the FEIS contains a summary of the comments received on the DEIS and the Army's responses to those comments.

Proposed Action

The proposed action is to implement those actions from FY 2010 through 2015 needed to support the Army's decisions on growth and realignment at Fort Lewis and YTC. These actions would allow the Army to achieve a size and composition that is better able to meet national security and defense requirements, modify the force in accordance with Army Transformation, sustain unit equipment and training readiness, and preserve quality of life for the Soldiers and their Families. Fort Lewis and YTC must take actions to support the strategic deployment and mobilization requirements of the nation's combatant commanders to ensure they will have the forces necessary to support regional contingency operational requirements.

Specifically, the Proposed Action includes:

- training of all three SBCTs simultaneously with other currently stationed major subordinate units at Fort Lewis and YTC,
- stationing the new units and accommodating the augmented units identified in the Fort Lewis portions of the ROD for the 2007 GTA FPEIS,
- upgrading infrastructure in the cantonment area for the third SBCT and GTA units so that it meets current standards,

- updating the Fort Lewis and YTC ADPs to accommodate these defined and potential stationing actions,
- potentially stationing at Fort Lewis and YTC CSS units with up to 1,000 Soldiers, and
- potentially stationing at Fort Lewis and YTC a medium CAB with up to 2,800 Soldiers.

The Proposed Action would:

- **Troop-Level Increase** – Accommodate an overall increase in Soldiers who would work, live, and train at Fort Lewis and YTC. Under the proposed action, up to 5,700 new Soldiers (new GTA units, existing units augmented under GTA, new CSS units, and a medium CAB) would be stationed at Fort Lewis. In addition, Fort Lewis must construct the facilities needed to support the additional Soldiers and to replace substandard facilities currently occupied by the third SBCT stationed at Fort Lewis with facilities meeting Army standards. An SBCT consists of approximately 4,100 Soldiers, 1,000 unit vehicles, and all accompanying equipment.
- **Staged Stationing of Troops** – Include continuous stationing and transformation of Fort Lewis' force structure. Implementation of full stationing and transformation is expected to be complete by 2013. As the Army proceeds with Transformation planning, the total unit strength may vary throughout the implementation period (although these variations relate to smaller units below the BCT level). Troop arrival schedules at Fort Lewis from stationing and deployment, and availability of facilities for the SBCT, would affect the timing of implementing new training requirements.
- **Facility Construction/Renovation and/or Deconstruction/Demolition** – Remove facilities and infrastructure that are no longer needed, relocate facilities to support new construction, construct new facilities and infrastructure, and renovate existing facilities and infrastructure to support the new population and training activities. Construction under the proposed action would take place at Fort Lewis and at YTC.
- **Timing of Construction Projects** – Accomplish construction in phases throughout the implementation period. The timing of construction projects would be contingent upon funding availability and priorities.
- **Live-Fire Training and Maneuvers** – Provide for training for existing and new units stationed at Fort Lewis while balancing additional or different maneuver training, live-fire training, and environmental management to meet the Army's integrated goals of maintaining military training readiness and sustaining lands for continued use. Live-fire training and maneuver activities under the proposed action would be similar to those described for the No Action Alternative. The requirements of training three SBCTs simultaneously with all other major units, however, could result in increased frequency of use of maneuver training areas and weapons firing ranges. YTC is anticipated to support most of the requirements for maneuver training at the battalion level and above.
- **Training Strategy** – Continue training under the proposed action throughout Fort Lewis and YTC in accordance with the suitability of the land for different training activities (e.g., maneuver or live-fire) and the ability to sustain the land.
- **Environmental and Training Conditions** – Change in response to factors beyond the Army's control, such as troop deployments, and climatic conditions, affect the implementation of training. Because environmental and training conditions are dynamic, the Army would monitor training activity under the proposed action and respond to changing conditions to sustain the land for training and provide maximum troop readiness.

Alternative 1 — No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative serves as the baseline condition for analysis and includes those stationing decisions that have already been made by the Army, including stationing actions recommended by the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission, as well as Army GDPR actions that took place prior to 2009. The addition of upgraded SBCT facilities and approximately 1,880 GTA Soldiers, the potential stationing of CSS units, and the potential stationing of a medium CAB would not be implemented (Table S-1). Force structure, assigned personnel, and equipment would remain as they exist at Fort Lewis and YTC.

Although none of the facilities required for the new and augmented units under the GTA ROD, the potential CSS units, or the potential medium CAB would be constructed under this Alternative, a substantial number of other projects would be constructed. Fort Lewis is undergoing substantial modernization of its facilities, and many projects have been constructed recently, are being constructed, or are planned for construction. Projects include replacing outdated buildings and improving infrastructure. These actions have previously been evaluated and are not further analyzed under this EIS.

A variety of known projects is included in the No Action Alternative. Nonetheless, additional and yet unidentified facility construction and training activities may be required in the future to support current activities. These projects would undergo separate NEPA review before implementation in accordance with regulations and current practice.

Alternative 2 — Take Actions Necessary to Implement GTA Actions and Those Actions Interconnected to GTA

Under this alternative, Fort Lewis would take the actions necessary to implement GTA and Transformation decisions. This alternative would require supporting the training of all three SBCTs at one time along with all support and other BCTs on Fort Lewis and YTC. In addition to the GTA unit changes, this alternative includes the proposal to house (in facilities that meet current standards), train, and supply support services for three SBCTs and all other Major Subordinate Commands on Fort Lewis and YTC. This alternative would also implement the cantonment area planned construction for FY 2010 through FY 2015 as well as updating the Fort Lewis and YTC ADPs.

Alternative 3 — All Actions under Alternative 2 and the Addition of up to 1,000 Combat Service Support Soldiers to Fort Lewis/YTC

Under this alternative, Fort Lewis would take the necessary actions to implement GTA and Transformation decisions as identified in Alternative 2 and the actions needed for the stationing of up to 1,000 CSS Soldiers and their Families at Fort Lewis and YTC. This alternative provides for the construction of facilities and the necessary live-fire and maneuver training to support the stationing of the CSS Soldiers and their Families.

Table S-1 Summary of the Key Attributes of the Alternatives

Attribute	Alternative 1—No Action	Alternative 2—GTA Actions	Alternative 3—GTA Actions + CSS Soldiers	Alternative 4—GTA Actions + CSS Soldiers + Medium CAB
Approx. Number of New Soldiers ¹	None	1,880 Soldiers	2,880 Soldiers (1,880 + 1,000)	5,680 Soldiers (1,880 + 1,000 + 2,800)
Approx. Number of New Soldiers and Family Members	None	4,740 Soldiers and Family	7,260 Soldiers and Family (4,740 + 2,520)	14,320 Soldiers and Family (4,740 + 2,520 + 7,060)
New Cantonment Area Construction:				
<i>Fort Lewis</i>	Several new SBCT facilities throughout cantonment area	Several additional new SBCT facilities throughout cantonment area	Several CSS facilities to be located in the North Fort area	Several medium CAB facilities to be located near Gray Army Airfield and East Division areas
<i>YTC</i>	No construction	No construction	No construction proposed	No construction proposed
New Range Construction				
<i>Fort Lewis</i>	No construction	5 range construction projects	No additional construction proposed	No additional construction proposed
<i>YTC</i>	No construction	2 range construction projects	No additional construction proposed	No additional construction proposed
Medium CAB Training	None	None	None	29,000 hours total annual flight time (1,450 hours at YTC) and 55,100 total takeoffs and landings (2,900 at YTC)
Units Training Simultaneously at Full Intensity	2 SBCTs + all other Fort Lewis units	3 SBCTs + GTA Units + all other Fort Lewis units	3 SBCTs + GTA Units + CSS Units + all other Fort Lewis units	3 SBCTs + GTA Units + CSS Units + Medium CAB unit + all other Fort Lewis units
Number of Annual Maneuver Miles (by Units)				
<i>SBCT:</i>	4,520,000 miles Fort Lewis: 2,710,000 miles; YTC: 1,810,000 miles	6,770,000 miles Fort Lewis: 4,060,000 miles; YTC: 2,710,000 miles	6,770,000 miles Fort Lewis: 4,060,000 miles; YTC: 2,710,000 miles	6,770,000 miles Fort Lewis: 4,060,000 miles; YTC: 2,710,000 miles
<i>GTA Units:</i>	0 miles	144,000 miles Fort Lewis: 91,000 miles; YTC: 53,000 miles	144,000 miles Fort Lewis: 91,000 miles; YTC: 53,000 miles	144,000 miles Fort Lewis: 91,000 miles; YTC: 53,000 miles
<i>CSS Units:</i>	0 miles	0 miles	421,000 miles Fort Lewis: 330,000 miles; YTC: 91,000 miles	421,000 miles Fort Lewis: 330,000 miles; YTC: 91,000 miles
<i>CAB Vehicles:</i>	0 miles	0 miles	0 miles	354,000 miles Fort Lewis: 270,000 miles; YTC: 84,000 miles
Total²:	4,520,000 miles Fort Lewis: 2,710,000 miles; YTC: 1,810,000 miles	6,910,000 miles Fort Lewis: 4,150,000 miles; YTC: 2,760,000 miles	7,340,000 miles Fort Lewis: 4,480,000 miles; YTC: 2,860,000	7,700,000 miles Fort Lewis: 4,750,000 miles; YTC: 2,950,000 miles

Note:

1 All stationing would occur at Fort Lewis. Training of new Soldiers would occur at both Fort Lewis and YTC. Total may not match precisely with the value obtained by adding unit numbers because of rounding conventions.

Alternative 4 — All Actions under Alternative 3 and the Addition of the Realignment of a Medium Combat Aviation Brigade to Fort Lewis/YTC

Under this alternative, Fort Lewis would take the necessary actions to implement GTA and Transformation decisions as identified in Alternative 2, the actions needed for the stationing of up to 1,000 CSS Soldiers and their Families as stated in Alternative 3, and the stationing of a medium CAB to Fort Lewis and YTC. This alternative provides for the construction of facilities and the necessary live-fire and maneuver training to support the stationing of the medium CAB Soldiers and their Families.

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Fort Lewis is an 86,176-acre (34,874-hectare [ha]) military reservation located in western Washington, in Pierce and Thurston Counties, approximately 35 miles (56 km) south of Seattle and 7 miles (10 km) northeast of Olympia. Interstate 5 (I-5), which is the main transportation corridor in the Puget Sound region, runs through the installation. Fort Lewis is bordered on the north by McChord Air Force Base (AFB), municipalities, and urban unincorporated areas in Pierce County; on the east and south by urban unincorporated and rural unincorporated areas in Pierce County, and several small communities, such as Roy; and on the west by Puget Sound, the Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge, the Nisqually Indian Reservation, and the Lacey and Yelm Urban Growth Areas.

YTC is a training installation located in central Washington northeast of the City of Yakima and west of the Columbia River. YTC encompasses approximately 327,231 acres (132,426 ha) in Yakima and Kittitas Counties. Although the active Army units assigned to Fort Lewis and the 81st HBCT of the Washington Army National Guard are the principal users of YTC, other units and forces also use YTC. They include the Special Operations Command, Marine Corps, Air Force, Navy, Coast Guard, local and federal law enforcement, and allied forces from Canada and Japan.

The affected environment varies between the Fort Lewis and YTC sites. Details of the affected environment are provided in Chapter 3 of this EIS for Fort Lewis and Chapter 5 for YTC.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

The primary study area includes all land within the boundaries of Fort Lewis and YTC. Baseline conditions and effects to areas surrounding Fort Lewis and YTC are described and considered as appropriate based on the Region of Influence (ROI) for environmental resource areas. For instance, effects to biological and cultural resources would primarily occur within the boundaries of Fort Lewis and YTC, but effects to other resource areas, such as socioeconomics, utilities, and transportation, could be regional in nature. Cumulative effects involve a more extensive analysis of resource areas, combining a historic perspective with present and anticipated future effects for each resource area. Cumulative effects consider Fort Lewis, YTC, and surrounding areas.

The tables below provide a comparative summary of the potential impacts of implementing each alternative for the project. The tables exhibit the composite impact (direct and indirect impacts and cumulative impacts) for each Valued Environmental Component (VEC) resulting from implementation of each alternative. Tables S-2 and S-3 summarize the effects for Fort Lewis and Tables S-4 and S-5 summarize the effects for YTC.

Contents

CHAPTER 1 PURPOSE, NEED, AND SCOPE	1-1
1.1 Introduction	1-1
1.2 Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action.....	1-3
1.3 Scope of the Analysis.....	1-6
1.4 Public Involvement	1-6
1.5 Legal Framework.....	1-9
CHAPTER 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES	2-1
2.1 Introduction	2-1
2.2 Proposed Action.....	2-6
2.3 Alternatives Considered in Detail.....	2-37
2.4 Alternatives Considered but Dismissed	2-44
CHAPTER 3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT — FORT LEWIS.....	3-1
3.1 Soil Erosion	3-1
3.2 Water Resources	3-1
3.3 Biological Resources.....	3-8
3.4 Wetlands.....	3-32
3.5 Wildfire Management	3-34
3.6 Cultural Resources	3-38
3.7 Air Quality.....	3-42
3.8 Noise	3-46
3.9 Land Use Conflict/Compatibility.....	3-55
3.10 Traffic and Transportation.....	3-60
3.11 Socioeconomics	3-76
3.12 Hazardous Materials and Wastes	3-82
3.13 AirSpace.....	3-90
3.14 Facilities	3-91
3.15 Energy Demand/Generation	3-98
CHAPTER 4 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES – FORT LEWIS.....	4-1
4.1 Soil Erosion	4-2
4.2 Water Resources	4-7
4.3 Biological Resources.....	4-17
4.4 Wetlands.....	4-52
4.5 Wildfire Management	4-56
4.6 Cultural Resources	4-62
4.7 Air Quality.....	4-69
4.8 Noise	4-90
4.9 Land Use Conflict/Compatibility.....	4-98
4.10 Traffic and Transportation.....	4-104
4.11 Socioeconomics	4-125
4.12 Hazardous Materials and Wastes	4-150
4.13 AirSpace.....	4-159
4.14 Facilities	4-164
4.15 Energy Demand/Generation	4-174
4.16 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.....	4-178

4.17	Relationship Between Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity	4-179
4.18	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources	4-180
CHAPTER 5 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT – YAKIMA TRAINING CENTER		5-1
5.1	Soil Erosion	5-1
5.2	Water Resources	5-5
5.3	Biological Resources	5-13
5.4	Wetlands	5-29
5.5	Wildfire Management	5-30
5.6	Cultural Resources	5-36
5.7	Air Quality	5-38
5.8	Noise	5-40
5.9	Land Use Conflict/Compatibility	5-49
5.10	Traffic and Transportation	5-53
5.11	Socioeconomics	5-57
5.12	Hazardous Materials and Wastes	5-61
5.13	Airspace	5-64
5.14	Facilities	5-66
5.15	Energy Demand/Generation	5-69
CHAPTER 6 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES – YAKIMA TRAINING CENTER		6-1
6.1	Soil Erosion	6-2
6.2	Water Resources	6-12
6.3	Biological Resources	6-22
6.4	Wetlands	6-50
6.5	Wildfire Management	6-54
6.6	Cultural Resources	6-64
6.7	Air Quality	6-68
6.8	Noise	6-82
6.9	Land Use Conflict/Compatibility	6-89
6.10	Traffic and Transportation	6-97
6.11	Socioeconomics	6-102
6.12	Hazardous Materials and Wastes	6-113
6.13	Airspace	6-120
6.14	Facilities	6-125
6.15	Energy Demand/Generation	6-133
6.16	Unavoidable Adverse Effects	6-138
6.17	Relationship between Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity	6-138
6.18	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources	6-140
CHAPTER 7 REFERENCES		7-1
CHAPTER 8 PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS		8-1
CHAPTER 9 DISTRIBUTION AND REVIEW OF THE FEIS		9-1

Tables

Table 2–1	Summary of Grow-the-Army Strength Changes at Fort Lewis and YTC	2–9
Table 2–2	SBCT Personnel and Equipment Breakdown	2–10
Table 2–3	Units in a Stryker Brigade	2–10
Table 2–4	Scheduled Range/Training Infrastructure Construction FY 2010–2015	2–14
Table 2–5	Garrison Facilities for 1,000 Combat Support Service Soldiers	2–20
Table 2–6	Standard Medium Combat Aviation Brigade Cantonment Facilities Set	2–20
Table 2–7	Annual Authorization for Training Ammunition for SBCTs, CSS Units, and Medium CABs	2–22
Table 2–8	SBCT Training Land Requirement	2–23
Table 2–9	Summary of the Key Attributes of the Alternatives	2–39
Table 2–10	Major Equipment Items Assigned to Fort Lewis and Yakima Training Center	2–40
Table 3–1	Native Graminoid Cover of Fort Lewis Prairies	3–11
Table 3–2	Special Status Plant Species That May Occur On or Near Fort Lewis	3–12
Table 3–3	Fish Species Found in Fort Lewis Lakes, Ponds, and Marshes	3–17
Table 3–4	Fort Lewis Stream Characteristics and Fish Species	3–18
Table 3–5	Special Status Fish Species That May Occur on or Near Fort Lewis	3–20
Table 3–6	Special Status Wildlife Species that may be Found on or in the Vicinity of Fort Lewis	3–27
Table 3–7	National Ambient Air Quality Standards	3–42
Table 3–8	2007 Air Emission Inventory from Fort Lewis Stationary Sources	3–46
Table 3–9	Land Use Planning Guidelines for Noise	3–49
Table 3–10	Level of Service Definitions	3–72
Table 3–11	Level of Service and Vehicle Delay for Study Intersections	3–73
Table 3–12	Summary of Current Enrollment in Fort Lewis Childcare Programs	3–79
Table 3–13	Summary of Planned Future Childcare Programs, 2009–2011	3–80
Table 3–14	Schools in the Fort Lewis Cantonment Area	3–95
Table 4–1	Summary of Direct and Indirect Effects at Fort Lewis by Alternative	4–1
Table 4–2	Summary of Cumulative Effects at Fort Lewis by Alternative	4–2
Table 4–3	Summary of Potential Effects to Soil Erosion at Fort Lewis	4–3
Table 4–4	Summary of Potential Effects to Water Resources at Fort Lewis	4–8
Table 4–5	Summary of Potential Effects to Vegetation at Fort Lewis	4–18
Table 4–6	Annual Impacts of Training on Vegetation at Fort Lewis	4–19
Table 4–7	Summary of Potential Effects to Fish and Aquatic Resources at Fort Lewis	4–27
Table 4–8	Summary of Potential Effects to Wildlife Resources at Fort Lewis	4–36
Table 4–9	Summary of Potential Effects to Wetlands at Fort Lewis	4–52
Table 4–10	Summary of Potential Effects to Wildfire Management at Fort Lewis	4–57
Table 4–11	Summary of Potential Effects to Cultural Resources at Fort Lewis	4–63
Table 4–12	Mitigation of Adverse Effects to the Fort Lewis Garrison Historic District	4–70
Table 4–13	Mitigation Measures for Impacts to Archaeological Resources	4–71
Table 4–14	Summary of Potential Effects to Air Quality at Fort Lewis	4–72
Table 4–15	Emissions Sources and Calculation Methods	4–74
Table 4–16	Total Estimated Annual Construction Emissions at Fort Lewis under Alternative 2	4–78
Table 4–17	Sources and Estimated New Emissions Annually at Fort Lewis under Alternative 2	4–79
Table 4–18	Air Pollutant Concentrations Modeled at Fort Lewis Installation Boundary (including Monitored Background) Under Alternative 2	4–81

Table 4-19	Sources and Estimated New Emissions Annually at Fort Lewis under Alternative 3	4-82
Table 4-20	Total Estimated Construction Emissions at Fort Lewis under Alternative 3.....	4-83
Table 4-21	Air Pollutant Concentrations Modeled at Fort Lewis Installation Boundary (including Monitored Background) Under Alternative 3	4-84
Table 4-22	Sources and Estimated New Emissions Annually at Fort Lewis under Alternative 4	4-85
Table 4-23	Annual Fort Lewis Emissions from Construction Equipment During 7-year Construction Period under Alternative 4.....	4-86
Table 4-24	Air Pollutant Concentrations Modeled at Fort Lewis Installation Boundary (including Monitored Background) Under Alternative 4	4-88
Table 4-25	Summary of Potential Effects to Noise at Fort Lewis	4-91
Table 4-26	Summary of Potential Effects to Land Use Conflict/Compatibility at Fort Lewis ...	4-100
Table 4-27	Summary of Potential Effects to Traffic and Transportation at Fort Lewis	4-105
Table 4-28	Existing (2008) and Alternative 1 (2015) Intersection Levels of Service	4-106
Table 4-29	2015 Intersection Levels of Service under Alternatives 1 and 2.....	4-111
Table 4-30	FY 2015 Intersection Levels of Service under Alternatives 1 and 3.....	4-116
Table 4-31	FY 2015 Intersection Levels of Service under Alternatives 1 and 4.....	4-120
Table 4-32	Summary of Potential Effects to Socioeconomics at Fort Lewis	4-127
Table 4-33	Cost Breakdown by Year of Projects Identified Under Alternative 1	4-128
Table 4-34	Economic Impacts from Construction at Fort Lewis under Alternative 1.....	4-129
Table 4-35	Cost Breakdown by Year of Projects identified under Alternative 2.....	4-132
Table 4-36	Economic Impacts from Construction and Increase in Population at Fort Lewis under Alternative 2.....	4-133
Table 4-37	Summary of Potential Effects to Hazardous Materials and Wastes at Fort Lewis....	4-152
Table 4-38	Summary of Potential Effects to Airspace at Fort Lewis	4-160
Table 4-39	Summary of Potential Effects to Facilities at Fort Lewis.....	4-165
Table 4-40	Summary of Potential Effects to Energy Demand/Generation at Fort Lewis.....	4-175
Table 4-41	Summary of Best Management Practices at Fort Lewis.....	4-182
Table 4-42	Summary of Mitigation Measures at Fort Lewis for the Preferred Alternative	4-186
Table 5-1	Suitability Ratings for Selected Military Operations at YTC.....	5-3
Table 5-2	Vehicle Trafficability – Type 5 Vehicles – of YTC Soils	5-4
Table 5-3	Yearly Sediment Yield at YTC.....	5-4
Table 5-4	Upland Plant Communities Occurring on Yakima Training Center	5-15
Table 5-5	Special Status Plant Species that may Occur on or Near Yakima Training Center	5-16
Table 5-6	Yakima Training Center Streams and Known Fish Presence on or Near the Installation	5-20
Table 5-7	Special Status Fish Species On or Near Yakima Training Center	5-21
Table 5-8	Wildlife Species of Concern Found on or Near Yakima Training Center.....	5-25
Table 5-9	Land Use Planning Guidelines for Noise	5-42
Table 6-1	Summary of Direct and Indirect Impacts at YTC by Alternative	6-1
Table 6-2	Summary of Cumulative Effects at YTC by Alternative.....	6-2
Table 6-3	Summary of Potential Impacts to Soil Erosion at YTC.....	6-3
Table 6-4	Annual Impacts of Training on Soils at YTC	6-5
Table 6-5	Anticipated Sediment Yield at YTC Under Alternative 2.....	6-7
Table 6-6	Summary of Potential Impacts to Water Resources at YTC.....	6-13
Table 6-7	Summary of Potential Impacts to Vegetation at YTC.....	6-23
Table 6-8	Annual Impacts of Training on Vegetation at YTC.....	6-25
Table 6-9	Summary of Potential Impacts to Fish and Aquatic Resources at YTC.....	6-32
Table 6-10	Summary of Potential Impacts to Wildlife Resources at YTC	6-38
Table 6-11	Summary of Potential Impacts to Wetlands at YTC	6-50

Table 6-12	Summary of Potential Impacts to Wildfire Management at YTC.....	6-55
Table 6-13	Summary of Potential Impacts to Cultural Resources at YTC	6-64
Table 6-14	Summary of Potential Effects to Air Quality at YTC	6-69
Table 6-15	Emissions Sources and Calculation Methods	6-70
Table 6-16	Sources and Estimated New Emissions at YTC under Alternative 2.....	6-73
Table 6-17	Air Pollutant Concentrations Modeled at the YTC Installation Boundary (Including Monitored Background ¹) under Alternative 2.....	6-75
Table 6-18	Sources and Estimated New Annual Emissions at YTC under Alternative 3.....	6-76
Table 6-19	Air Pollutant Concentrations Modeled at the YTC Installation Boundary (Including Monitored Background) under Alternative 3.....	6-77
Table 6-20	Sources and Estimated New Annual Emissions at YTC under Alternative 4.....	6-78
Table 6-21	Air Pollutant Concentrations Modeled at the YTC Installation Boundary (Including Monitored Background) under Alternative 4.....	6-80
Table 6-22	Summary of Potential Effects to Noise at and around YTC.....	6-82
Table 6-23	Summary of Potential Effects to Land Use at YTC	6-91
Table 6-24	Summary of Potential Effects to Traffic and Transportation at YTC	6-98
Table 6-25	Summary of Potential Socioeconomic Impacts at YTC	6-104
Table 6-26	YTC Projected Population Under Alternative 1	6-105
Table 6-27	Proposed Construction Projects at YTC Under Alternative 2	6-106
Table 6-28	Economic Impacts from Construction and Population Change at YTC under Alternative 2	6-107
Table 6-29	Summary of Effects to Hazardous Materials and Wastes at YTC	6-114
Table 6-30	Summary of Potential Effects to Airspace at YTC	6-121
Table 6-31	Summary of Potential Effects on Facilities and Utility Infrastructure at YTC.....	6-126
Table 6-32	Summary of Potential Effects on Energy Demand and Generation at YTC.....	6-134
Table 6-33	YTC Best Management Practices Summary for Preferred Alternative, Record of Decision for Fort Lewis Army Growth and Force Structure Realignment.....	6-141
Table 6-34	YTC Mitigation Summary for Preferred Alternative, Record of Decision for Fort Lewis Army Growth and Force Structure Realignment.....	6-147
Table 8-1	U.S. Army Staff	8-1
Table 8-2	ARCADIS U.S.....	8-3
Table 8-3	AECOM.....	8-4
Table 8-4	Fehrs & Peers.....	8-4
Table 8-5	Historical Research Associates, Inc. (HRA).....	8-5
Table 8-6	Plexus Scientific Corporation	8-5

Figures

Figure 2-1 Relative Locations of Fort Lewis and Yakima Training Center 2-2

Figure 2-2 Primary Training Facilities on Fort Lewis..... 2-4

Figure 2-3 Primary Training Facilities on the Yakima Training Center 2-5

Figure 2-4 Trends in the Fort Lewis and YTC Populations..... 2-8

Figure 2-5 Distribution of “No Action” Projects and Projects Proposed for Construction in the Fort Lewis Cantonment Area to Implement the 2007 Grow-the-Army Decision, CSS Units, and Medium CAB..... 2-15

Figure 2-6 Locations of Training Ranges Proposed for Construction or Upgrade on Fort Lewis..... 2-16

Figure 2-7 Locations of Training Ranges Proposed for Construction on Yakima Training Center 2-17

Figure 2-8 Major Land and Environmental Constraints on Future Development in the Fort Lewis Cantonment Area..... 2-29

Figure 2-9 Major Land and Environmental Constraints on Training Areas at Fort Lewis..... 2-30

Figure 2-10 Major Land and Environmental Constraints on Training Areas at YTC..... 2-31

Figure 2-11 Distribution of the 14 Area Development Plans for Fort Lewis and YTC 2-32

Figure 3-1 Water Resources at Fort Lewis 3-3

Figure 3-2 General Plant Communities on Fort Lewis..... 3-9

Figure 3-3 Water Howellia Locations on Fort Lewis..... 3-15

Figure 3-4 Bald Eagle Nests on Fort Lewis..... 3-29

Figure 3-5 Distribution of Wetlands across Fort Lewis 3-33

Figure 3-6 Class I Areas in Washington State 3-44

Figure 3-7 Air Quality Maintenance and Nonattainment Areas in the Vicinity of Fort Lewis 3-45

Figure 3-8 Fort Lewis Contemporary Operating Environment Demolition and Large Caliber Operational Noise Contours..... 3-50

Figure 3-9 Gray Army Airfield Contemporary Operation Environment – Operational Noise Contours..... 3-52

Figure 3-10 Fort Lewis Small Caliber Operational Noise Contours..... 3-53

Figure 3-11 Fort Lewis Contemporary Operating Environment Complaint Risk Contours for Demolition and Large Caliber Operations 3-54

Figure 3-12 Major Land Use Areas on Fort Lewis 3-57

Figure 3-13 Major Land Use Areas within the Fort Lewis Cantonment Area..... 3-58

Figure 3-14 Fort Lewis Existing Traffic Characteristics..... 3-61

Figure 3-15 Public Transit Service to Fort Lewis..... 3-65

Figure 3-16 Existing AM/PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes 3-69

Figure 3-17 Existing Gate and Roadway Link Traffic Volumes 3-70

Figure 3-18 2008 Average Weekday Inbound Traffic Volumes 3-71

Figure 3-19 Average Weekday Traffic Volumes near Gates..... 3-71

Figure 4-1 Fort Lewis – Projected Operating Environment, Demolition and Large Caliber Operational Noise Contours..... 4-94

Figure 4-2 Fort Lewis – Gray Army Airfield, Projected Operation Environment, Operational Noise Contours..... 4-99

Figure 4-3 No Action Traffic Characteristics Future Lane Configurations..... 4-107

Figure 4-4 No Action AM/PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes 4-108

Figure 4-5 ACP Traffic Volumes under Alternatives 1 and 2 4-111

Figure 4-6 Alternative 2 GTA AM/PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes 4-113

Figure 4-7 ACP Traffic Volumes under Alternatives 1 and 3 4-115

Figure 4-8 Alternative 3 CSS Soldiers AM/PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes 4-117

Figure 4-9	ACP Traffic Volumes under Alternatives 1 and 4	4-120
Figure 4-10	Alternative 4 Medium CAB AM/PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	4-121
Figure 5-1	Water Resources of Yakima Training Center	5-7
Figure 5-2	Vegetation Communities on Yakima Training Center	5-14
Figure 5-3	Sage-grouse Leks and Protection Areas on Yakima Training Center	5-28
Figure 5-4	Distribution of Environmental Sensitive Areas, including Wetlands, at Yakima Training Center	5-31
Figure 5-5	Firebreaks on the Yakima Training Center.....	5-35
Figure 5-6	Air Quality Maintenance Areas in the Vicinity of Yakima Training Center.....	5-39
Figure 5-7	Yakima Training Center Baseline Conditions Demolition and large Caliber Operational Noise Contours.....	5-44
Figure 5-8	Yakima Training Center Baseline Conditions Vagabond Army Heliport Operational Noise Contours.....	5-46
Figure 5-9	Yakima Training Center Small Arms Operational Noise Contours.....	5-47
Figure 5-10	Yakima Training Center Demolition and Large Caliber Complaint Risk Noise Contours	5-48
Figure 5-11	Land Use Zones Surrounding Yakima Training Center	5-52
Figure 5-12	Yakima Training Center Vicinity Map.....	5-54
Figure 5-13	Yakima Training Center 2007 Volumes.....	5-55
Figure 6-1	Proposed Sage-Grouse Mitigation	6-49
Figure 6-2	Containment Areas on the Yakima Training Center	6-63
Figure 6-3	Yakima Training Center Forecast Conditions Demolition and Large Caliber Operational Noise Contours.....	6-86
Figure 6-4	Yakima Training Center Forecast Conditions Vagabond Army Heliport Operational Noise Contours.....	6-87
Figure 6-5	Yakima Training Center Corridor Annoyance Buffer.....	6-90

Appendices (Volume 2)

Appendix A	MILCON Projects at Fort Lewis Associated with Each Alternative
Appendix B	Impact Methodology
Appendix C	Soil Erosion and Vegetation Impact Assumptions and Estimates
Appendix D	Programmatic Agreement Concerning the Management of Historic Properties on Fort Lewis and Yakima Training Center
Appendix E	Air Quality Emissions Calculations
Appendix F	Biological and Essential Fish Habitat Assessment
Appendix G	Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Appendix H	Scientific Names of Plants and Animals
Appendix I	Summary of Tribal Consultation Efforts Conducted for the EIS