

---

---

# Appendix F: Public Participation



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**APPENDIX F PUBLIC PARTICIPATION .....F-1**

**APPENDIX F PUBLIC PARTICIPATION .....F-1**

**F.1 PROJECT WEBSITE.....F-1**

**F.2 GENERAL SUMMARY OF THE SCOPING PERIOD .....F-1**

F.2.1 PUBLIC SCOPING NOTIFICATION ..... F-1

F.2.1.1 Federal Register Notice..... F-1

F.2.1.2 Tribal Letters ..... F-1

F.2.1.3 Notification Letters ..... F-2

F.2.1.4 Advertisements ..... F-2

F.2.1.5 Press Releases ..... F-2

F.2.1.6 Postcard Mailer ..... F-3

F.2.2 SCOPING MEETINGS..... F-3

F.2.2.1 Attendance..... F-4

F.2.2.2 Public Scoping Comments..... F-4

**F.3 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD FOR THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.....F-4**

F.3.1 FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE ..... F-4

F.3.2 TRIBAL LETTERS..... F-5

F.3.3 NOTIFICATION LETTERS..... F-5

F.3.4 ADVERTISEMENTS ..... F-5

F.3.5 PRESS RELEASES ..... F-5

F.3.6 PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENT..... F-6

F.3.7 POSTCARD MAILER ..... F-6

F.3.8 FLIER ..... F-6

F.3.9 PUBLIC MEETINGS ..... F-6

F.3.10 ATTENDANCE ..... F-6

F.3.11 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PUBLIC COMMENTS..... F-6

**LIST OF TABLES**

TABLE F.2-1: NEWSPAPER DISPLAY ADVERTISEMENTS SCHEDULE .....F-2

TABLE F.2-2: SCOPING MEETING LOCATIONS .....F-3

TABLE F.3-1: FALLON RANGE TRAINING COMPLEX DRAFT EIS COMMENTS .....F-7

TABLE F.3-2: RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM AGENCIES .....F-8

TABLE F.3-3: RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM TRIBES.....F-40

TABLE F.3-3: RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS.....F-43

**LIST OF FIGURES**

There are no figures in this section.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

## APPENDIX F PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

This appendix includes information about the public's participation in the development of the Fallon Range Training Complex (FRTC) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). This appendix summarizes the public scoping process that began with the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) in the *Federal Register* in May 2013. The scoping period allowed a variety of opportunities for the public to comment on the scope of the EIS, and included two public scoping meetings. This appendix also summarizes the public participation in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process through the publication of the Draft EIS.

### F.1 PROJECT WEBSITE

A public website was established specifically for this project (<http://www.FRTCEIS.com/>) and went active on May 24, 2013. This website address was published in the initial NOI and has subsequently been reprinted in all newspaper advertisements, agency letters, and public postcards for both the NOI to Prepare an EIS and Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft EIS. Scoping meeting fact sheets, posters, brochures, and various other materials have been available on the project website throughout the course of the project.

### F.2 GENERAL SUMMARY OF THE SCOPING PERIOD

The scoping period for the FRTC EIS began with the publication of a NOI in the Federal Register on May 24, 2013. The scoping period began on this date and concluded on July 8, 2013. The United States (U.S.) Department of the Navy (Navy) held four scoping meetings in Nevada, from June 10 through 13, 2013, for the FRTC EIS. The purpose of the meetings was to actively involve the public and other agencies in identifying the environmental issues to be addressed in the Draft EIS as well as other potential alternatives to accomplish the purpose and need. Efforts to notify the public, media, federally recognized tribes, government agencies, and elected officials about the scoping meetings were conducted in accordance with the Navy's *Public Involvement Plan* for the FRTC EIS.

#### F.2.1 PUBLIC SCOPING NOTIFICATION

The Navy made significant efforts at notifying the public to ensure maximum public participation during the scoping process. A summary of these efforts follows.

##### F.2.1.1 Federal Register Notice

On May 24, 2013, the Navy published a NOI/Notice of Public Scoping Meetings in the Federal Register, which announced the intent to prepare a Draft EIS to evaluate potential environmental effects associated with current and proposed military readiness activities at FRTC; the proposed action and alternatives; and the dates, locations, and times of the scoping meetings.

##### F.2.1.2 Tribal Letters

A personalized tribal notification letter was mailed to eight federally recognized tribes on May 16, 2013. This letter served to inform the tribes that the Navy was preparing an EIS, provide detailed information about the proposed action, and request input regarding concerns or comments.

### F.2.1.3 Notification Letters

A personalized agency notification letter was mailed to 109 federal, state, and local elected officials and government agencies on May 23, 2013. This letter provided detailed information about the proposed action, the scoping process and the dates, locations, and times of the scoping meetings. Information for submitting comments was also provided.

### F.2.1.4 Advertisements

A project display advertisement was published in three series in the Lahontan Valley News, *Nevada Appeal*, *Reno Gazette-Journal*, and *Battle Mountain Bugle*. As listed in Table F.2-1 below, the first series ran concurrent with availability of the NOI in the Federal Register on May 24, 2013. The series ran for 3 consecutive days in the daily newspapers and for fewer days in the weekly newspapers. The second series of advertisements was published 5–10 days prior to the open house information sessions. The third series was published 3 consecutive days (for weekly papers) prior to the information sessions, with one advertisement appearing on the day of the first information session.

**Table F.2-1: Newspaper Display Advertisements Schedule**

COVERAGE AREA	NEWSPAPER	DATES OF ADVERTISEMENT
Fallon, Fernley, Lahontan Valley and Highway 54 corridor, NV (Nevada)	<i>Lahontan Valley News</i> (twice-weekly – Wednesday, Friday)	Friday, May 24, 2013 Wednesday, May 29, 2013 Friday, May 31, 2013 Wednesday, June 5, 2013 Friday, June 7, 2013
Reno, Carson, NV	<i>Nevada Appeal</i> (daily – Tuesday–Sunday)	Friday, May 24, 2013 Saturday, May 25, 2013 Sunday, May 26, 2013 Wednesday, June 5, 2013 Friday, June 7, 2013 Saturday, June 8, 2013 Sunday, June 9, 2013
Reno, Sparks, Spanish Springs, Fernley, Dayton, Yerington, NV	<i>Reno Gazette-Journal</i> (daily)	Friday, May 24, 2013 Saturday, May 25, 2013 Sunday, May 26, 2013 Wednesday, June 5, 2013 Saturday, June 8, 2013 Sunday, June 9, 2013 Monday, June 10, 2013
Battle Mountain, NV	<i>Battle Mountain Bugle</i> (weekly – Wednesday)	Wednesday, May 29, 2013 Wednesday, June 5, 2013

### F.2.1.5 Press Releases

Two news releases were distributed by the Naval Air Station (NAS) Fallon Public Affairs Officer to local and regional media outlets. The NOI press release was distributed on May 24, 2013 and announced the intent to prepare an EIS. The Notice of Scoping Meetings press release was distributed on June 11, 2013, and emphasized the scoping process. The NOI and Notice of Scoping Meetings press releases included details on the proposed action, scoping meeting dates, locations, times, and comment information.

### F.2.1.6 Postcard Mailer

A postcard mailer announcing the preparation of an EIS, proposed action, comment information, project website, and the scoping meeting dates, locations, and times, was sent out to 143 individuals on the project mailing list on May 23, 2013.

### F.2.2 SCOPING MEETINGS

Four public meetings were conducted in an informal open house format where members of the public could arrive at any time during the 2-hour event. There were no formal presentations or oral comment sessions. The locations, dates, and times of the meetings are listed in Table F.2-2.

**Table F.2-2: Scoping Meeting Locations**

MEETING LOCATION	VENUE	DATE	TIME
Fallon, Nevada (NV)	Churchill County Commission Chambers	June 10, 2013	5 to 7 p.m.
Crescent Valley, NV	Crescent Valley Town Office Boardroom	June 11, 2013	5 to 7 p.m.
Gabbs, NV	Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 3677	June 12, 2013	5 to 7 p.m.
Austin, NV	Emma Nevada Town Hall	June 13, 2013	5 to 7 p.m.

Staffers at the welcome station greeted guests and encouraged meeting attendees to sign in to receive project information and future notifications, and to identify how they learned about the scheduled information session. A fact sheet booklet and comment forms were distributed to attendees, and verbal direction was provided on the format of the meeting and the organization and flow of the poster stations.

The fact sheet booklet included the following topics: (1) an introduction to the Fallon Range Training Complex, (2) military readiness activities at the Fallon Range Training Complex, (3) the Proposed Action and alternatives, (4) environmental resources to be analyzed, (5) natural and cultural resources, (6) public safety and access, and (7) the NEPA process and community involvement.

Poster stations were set up around the room offering visual displays, fact sheet booklets, and comment forms. Posters covered the following topics: (1) welcome and sign-in, (2) importance of the Navy mission and training at the Fallon Range Training Complex, (3) Study Area, (4) Proposed Action and alternatives, (5) environmental resources to be analyzed, (6) cultural resources, (7) natural resources, (8) public safety and access, and (9) NEPA process and community involvement. Navy and contractor subject matter experts staffed each poster station to answer questions and provide project information.

A comment station, which included tables, chairs, pens, comment forms, and a digital voice recorder for oral comments, was also provided to facilitate the submission of public comments. Attendees were encouraged to provide comments for consideration in the development of the Draft EIS. Individuals could submit comments at the meetings, mail them to the address provided, or submit them online at [www.FRTCEIS.com](http://www.FRTCEIS.com).

### **F.2.2.1 Attendance**

Guests were encouraged to sign in at the welcome table. The information below reflects the number of guests who chose to sign in at the welcome table. Media attendance reflects the number of persons who identified themselves as media. In total, 34 people signed in at the welcome table.

- Eight (8) people signed the attendance sheet at the Fallon meeting. Federal, local, and tribal government representation included: Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Tribe, City of Fallon, Churchill County, and Nevada State Health Division.
- Nine (9) people signed the attendance sheet at the Crescent Valley meeting. Federal, local, and tribal government representation included: Crescent Valley Town Advisory Board and the Eureka County Sheriff's Office.
- Eleven (11) people signed the attendance sheet at the Gabbs meeting. There was no Federal, local, or tribal government representation at this meeting.
- Six (6) people signed the attendance sheet at the Austin meeting. Federal, local, and tribal government representation included the Austin County Commission.

### **F.2.2.2 Public Scoping Comments**

During the FRTC scoping period, public and agency comments were submitted via mail, website, and e-mail. A total of eight (8) written comments were received during the public comment period from May 24, 2013 through July 8, 2013. Four (4) written comments were submitted at the information sessions, one (1) comment was submitted via the project website, two (2) comments were submitted via e-mail, and one (1) comment was submitted by mail.

Issues and questions submitted at the information sessions or during the comment period (not prioritized) include:

- Noise
- Sonic booms
- Notification of activities, including supersonic areas
- General support for the proposed action
- Flood water mitigation
- Unmanned Autonomous Systems
- Sage grouse and impacts of sonic booms

## **F.3 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD FOR THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

The 45day public comment period on the Draft EIS began with the issuance of the NOA and a Notice of Public Meetings (NOPM) in the Federal Register on January 23, 2015 (Appendix A; Federal Register Notices) and concluded on March 9, 2015. The Navy made every effort to notify the public to ensure maximum public participation during the public comment period, including using letters to local, state, tribal, and federal officials and agencies, postcards, press releases, and newspaper display advertisements.

### **F.3.1 FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE**

On Friday, January 23, 2015, the Navy published an NOPM for the Draft EIS for FRTC in the Federal Register, which announced the availability of the Draft EIS for public review and comment, and the date, location, and time of the public meeting.

### F.3.2 TRIBAL LETTERS

A personalized tribal notification letter was mailed to 11 federally recognized tribes, including the Walker River Paiute Tribe of the Walker Indian Reservation on January 20, 2015. This letter served to formally notify the Tribes of the preparation and availability of the Draft EIS for review. Follow-up phone calls were made to ensure the letters were received and were sent to the correct personnel within each tribe.

### F.3.3 NOTIFICATION LETTERS

A personalized agency notification letter was mailed to 121 federal, state, and local elected officials and government agencies on January 20, 2015. This letter provided detailed information about the proposed action, the public review and comment process, and the date, location, and time of the public meeting. Information for submitting comments was also provided.

### F.3.4 ADVERTISEMENTS

Display advertisements were placed in the following four newspapers: *Lahontan Valley News, Nevada Appeal, Reno Gazette-Journal, and the Battle Mountain Bugle*. As listed below, the newspaper advertisements occurred after the NOA/NOPM was published in the Federal Register.

<i>Lahontan Valley News</i>	Wednesday, February 18, 2015
Friday, January 23, 2015	Thursday February 19, 2015
Wednesday, January 28, 2015	
Friday, January 30, 2015	<i>Reno Gazette-Journal</i>
Wednesday, February 4, 2015	Friday, January 23, 2015
Friday, February 6, 2015	Saturday, January 24, 2015
Wednesday, February 11, 2015	Sunday, January 25, 2015
Friday, February 13, 2015	
Wednesday, February 18, 2015	Wednesday, February 11, 2015
	Tuesday, February 17, 2015
<i>Nevada Appeal</i>	Wednesday, February 18, 2015
Friday, January 23, 2015	Thursday February 19, 2015
Saturday, January 24, 2015	
Sunday, January 25, 2015	<i>Battle Mountain Bugle</i>
Wednesday, February 11, 2015	Wednesday, January 28, 2015
Thursday, February 12, 2015	Wednesday, February 11, 2015
Tuesday, February 17, 2015	Wednesday, February 18, 2015

### F.3.5 PRESS RELEASES

A press release was distributed by Commander, Navy Region Southwest Public Affairs Officer to media outlets, elected officials and other potentially interested parties. The NOPM press release was distributed on January 23, 2015, and announced the availability of the Draft EIS for review and comment. The press release included details on the proposed action, meeting dates, locations, times, and comment information.

### **F.3.6 PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENT**

A public service announcement was distributed by the Commander, Navy Region Southwest Public Affairs Officer to media outlets, elected officials, and other potentially interested parties. The public service announcement announced the public meeting dates, locations, and times.

### **F.3.7 POSTCARD MAILER**

A postcard mailer announcing the preparation of an EIS, proposed action, comment information, project website, and the public meeting date, location, and time, was sent out to individuals on the project mailing list on January 20, 2015.

### **F.3.8 FLIER**

A flier providing the date, location, and time of the public meeting, along with the project website was provided to distribution locations in Fallon, Austin, Crescent City, and Gabbs, Nevada, and included libraries, post offices, chambers of commerce, and local markets. The fliers were distributed on February 12, 2015.

### **F.3.9 PUBLIC MEETINGS**

One public meeting was held on February 19, 2015, from 5 to 7 p.m. at the Churchill County Commission Chambers. The public meeting consisted of an open house session with information poster stations staffed by Navy representatives and a Navy presentation that was conducted at 5:30 p.m. There was no formal oral comment session, but a comment station, which included tables, chairs, pens, and comment forms, was provided to facilitate the submission of written public comments. A certified court reporter was available for the duration of the meeting to record oral public comments. No media attended the meeting. Meeting attendees were also advised that they could submit comments online via the project website, <http://www.frtceis.com/>.

### **F.3.10 ATTENDANCE**

Guests were encouraged to sign in at the welcome table. The information below reflects the number of guests who chose to sign in at the welcome table. In total, nine people signed in at the welcome table; elected official representation included a staff member from the Churchill County Commissioner's office, officials from the Bureau of Land Management, Churchill County Manager's Office, Churchill County Planning Department, and Eureka County; other representation included individuals from the Churchill County Farm Bureau and the National Pony Express, Nevada Division.

### **F.3.11 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PUBLIC COMMENTS**

During the FRTC Draft EIS public comment period, public, tribal, and agency comments were submitted via mail, website, and e-mail. During the public comment period, comments were received from three federal agencies, four state/local/regional agencies, one tribe, and three private individuals.

Commenters provided their input on the Draft EIS in letters submitted through mail, written, or oral comments received at the public meetings, and via the project web site.

Comments addressed various resource areas, from off-range ordnance concerns to climate change and training operations (Table F.3-1).

**Table F.3-1: Fallon Range Training Complex Draft EIS Comments**

<b>Resource Issues</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Off-range Ordnance	8	15%
Soil Contamination	6	11%
Noise	5	9%
Tribal Consultation / Native American Lands	5	9%
Cultural Resources / Pony Express / SHPO	5	9%
Air Quality / Climate Change	5	6%
Transportation	3	6%
NEPA / Public Outreach	3	4%
Land Use	2	4%
Munition Constituent Migration	2	4%
Socioeconomic Effects	2	2%
Threatened and Endangered Species	2	2%
Water Pollution Control Permitting	2	2%
Maps	1	9%
Military Munitions Rule	1	9%
Training Operations	1	4%
<b>ISSUE TOTALS</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

Notes: The number of comments for each resource area will not add to the total number of comments received. Many letters had several comments or one comment could span across several issues. This table only includes a tally of written comments that were received via mail, website and e-mail throughout the scoping process.

Table F.3-2 through Table F.3-4 provide a listing of all comments received on the Draft EIS and the Navy's response. Each row in these tables presents the identification of the commenter, the comment, and the Navy's response to the comment. Because many commenters touched on more than one topic, the commenter's topics were separated into individual comments, assigned a number, and responded to separately. The commenter's name is abbreviated when the comment is broken into more than one topic. The comment numbering system also captures whether the comment was received electronically via [www.frtceis.com](http://www.frtceis.com) or a computer at one of the public meetings, in written form by mail or during a public meeting, or orally during public testimony at a public meeting. For example, the second of the agency comments is by the United States Department of the Interior, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance. Since their comments cover several topics, these are separated into subsequent comments named DOI-02, DOI-03, etc.

Responses to all comments were prepared and reviewed for scientific and technical accuracy and completeness. Comments appear as they were submitted and have not been altered with the exception that expletives and personal information were removed, as necessary.

Table F.3-2 contains comments from federal, state, and local agencies received during the public comment period and the Navy's response.

Table F.3-2: Responses to Comments from Agencies

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
<p>Mark Kautsky Department of Energy Office of Legacy Management</p>	<p>The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Legacy Management appreciates the opportunity to provide comment on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared by the U.S. Department of the Navy. The DOE has responsibility for the subsurface of the Shoal site which is included in the EIS. The Shoal site consists of approximately four square miles (2,560 acres) of withdrawn federal lands that was used for underground nuclear testing. Responsibility for the site is outlined in the Military Land Withdrawals Act of 1999. DOE has no comment on the EIS. DOE would like to ensure long-term protection of Shoal site features (monitoring wells, shaft, tailings, monument, and features of historical significance) and welcomes the opportunity to discuss ways to document the commitment to protect human health and the environment at the site.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the NEPA process. The Navy appreciates your involvement and will continue to work with the Department of Energy to ensure that commitments regarding the Shoal Site are met.</p>
<p>Patricia S. Port Regional Environmental Officer, United States Department of the Interior Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance Pacific Southwest Region (DOI)</p>	<p>Section 3.6 Land Use and Recreation, Page 3.6-2, 3.6.2.3.1 Churchill County, 3rd sentence: The acreage listed for lands under Reclamation's jurisdiction is incorrect. The Lahontan Basin Area Office manages approximately 387,713 acres; of which 381,594 acres are 1st Form withdrawn lands, and 6,120 acres are acquired lands in Churchill County, Nevada. These data are compiled from a July 2014 comprehensive lands review and are available upon request.</p>	<p>The Final EIS includes updated information to reflect the revised acreage provided in the comment.</p>
<p>DOI-2</p>	<p>We are concerned that the Pony Express National Historic Trail (NHT), in particular, could sustain significant adverse impacts from this</p>	<p>Section 3.9 (Cultural Resources) of the Final EIS includes updated information describing historic-trail related</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
	<p>undertaking, as proposed currently. The Navy’s awareness of historic-trail related properties that are listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) within the project area appears to be incomplete. The Draft EIS (page 3.9-13) states, “Only two NRHP-listed resources are located near the Supersonic Operating Area B: the Grimes Point Archaeological Area and Hidden Cave, and the Sand Springs Pony Express Station (U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management 2013b).”</p> <p>However, judging from the schematic project map (page 3.9-12), several other historic trail-related properties lie within that Indirect Area of Potential Effect (IAPE). These include the first and second Cold Springs Pony Express Stations, both of which are listed on the NRHP.</p> <p>The second Cold Springs Station, also known as Rock Creek Stage Station, was a stop on the Overland Stage route as well. Associated with these stations and included in their NR listing is an 1861 telegraph repeater and maintenance station that served the transcontinental telegraph: completion of the telegraph rendered the Pony Express obsolete and contributed to its closure.</p> <p>Edwards Creek and Smith Creek Pony Express Stations, both on private lands, also appear to be within the IAPE. New Pass Station, another Overland Stage Station, appears to be within the IAPE as defined on that map, too. The Central Overland route is under study by the National Park Service (NPS), at the direction of Congress, for possible addition to the California National Historic Trail.</p> <p>We further observe that although Sand Springs Station is identified in the Draft EIS as an archeological site, it and the other stations named above also possess sensitive architectural components, mostly but not exclusively consisting of standing walls of dry-laid stone (see Donald Hardesty’s 1979 archaeological report, The Pony Express in Central Nevada). Very few buildings or structures associated with the Pony Express, or for that matter with the Central Overland</p>	<p>properties that are listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) within the Indirect Area of Potential Effect.</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
	stagecoach operation, remain as intact as these.	
DOI-3	<p>On page 3.9-21 appears this statement: “Although vibrations from sonic booms have the potential to cause structural instability in sensitive natural features associated with archaeological sites located under the Supersonic Operating Area B (e.g., caves, rockshelters, and rock faces containing petroglyphs and pictographs), procedures are in place for the identification, evaluation, and protection of such resources as defined in the PA (Naval Air Station Fallon et al. 2011).” Similar statements appear elsewhere.</p> <p>Potential to cause structural instability in sensitive cultural features, such as the architectural remains of the Pony Express, telegraph, and stage stations, is not addressed. We recommend that possible impacts to these buildings and structures be clearly identified and evaluated in preparing the Final EIS.</p>	Section 3.9 (Cultural Resources) of the FEIS includes additional analysis of potential impacts on historic-trail related properties that are listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) within the Indirect Area of Potential Effect.
DOI-4	<p>The 2011 Programmatic Agreement between Naval Air Station Fallon and the Nevada State Historic Preservation Office (cited in the Draft EIS) is specifically for “the Identification, Evaluation and Treatment of Historic Properties on Lands Managed by Naval Air Station, Fallon.” National Register-listed or -eligible properties such as the station sites on BLM, state, or private lands that may be impacted by Navy activities are not specifically covered therein, but are to be addressed “in accordance with the policies and procedures of the Federal agency with control and jurisdiction over the affected lands” (Naval Air Station Fallon et al. 2011:3).</p> <p>As a result, potential effects on the Pony Express NHT properties and the feasibility study route on BLM lands must be given consideration as part of the National Landscape Conservation System and in accordance with BLM Manual 6280.</p> <p>However, the Draft EIS does not address whether this coordination with BLM has occurred nor, if so, what the resulting determinations may be. Moreover, according to the Draft EIS, determinations of</p>	Following publication of the Draft EIS, the Navy completed consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act with the Nevada State Historic Preservation Office and Native American Tribes. In addition, the Navy coordinated with the Bureau of Land Management as a cooperating agency to this EIS. The Nevada State Historic Preservation Office concurred with the Navy’s determination of no adverse effect to Historic Properties on August 19, 2015 (see Appendix C of Final EIS).

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
	<p>effect under §106 of the National Historic Preservation Act are yet to be made “pending consultation with the SHPO [Nevada State Historic Preservation Office] and Native American Tribes.” If consultation with SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation is actively underway as a parallel or coordinated process, which is recommended by both Council on Environmental Quality and §106 implementing regulations, then the determinations of effect for these properties should be presented in the Final EIS.</p> <p>If it is not actively underway at this stage in the NEPA process, we recommend that impacts and effects on NHT properties and other cultural resources be fully accounted for early in preparing the administrative draft Final EIS. Since §106 compliance does not appear to be integrated into or adequately explained by this Draft EIS, reviewers with concerns about cultural resources are at a loss to know whether the process has been initiated, how far along it might be, whether and how historic properties may be adversely affected, whether a treatment plan is to be developed, and what interested parties may have been invited to participate in that process.</p> <p>If determinations of adverse effect to historic trail properties eventually are made, the NPS requests opportunity to participate in the §106 and treatment plan development processes as an interested organization.</p>	

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
DOI-5	<p>To summarize, it is uncertain whether adverse impacts/effects to historic trail-related properties will inevitably result from implementing the Navy’s preferred alternative. However, the Draft EIS does state that significant impacts to those properties could occur “if unresolved by the Section 106 process”. In preparing the Final EIS, it is recommended that all potentially affected NHT-related historic properties within or near the boundaries of the IAPE be identified; that potential impacts to them be systematically addressed; that affected agencies and the interested public be fully informed of any adverse impacts under the National Environmental Policy Act and adverse effects under the National Historic Preservation Act; and that interested parties, including the NPS, be given opportunity to participate in the §106 process.</p> <p>Again, we appreciate this opportunity to review the Draft EIS prepared for this proposed undertaking. If the NPS can assist by providing GIS shape files or other information related to NHT resources, please contact Lee Kreutzer, Archeologist/Cultural Resources Specialist, National Trails Intermountain Region, at (801) 741-1012 ext. 118 or at <a href="mailto:lee_kreutzer@nps.gov">lee_kreutzer@nps.gov</a>.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to review this project.</p> <p>Sincerely, Patricia Sanderson Port</p>	<p>Section 3.9 (Cultural Resources) of the Final EIS includes additional analysis to address potential impacts on historic-trail related properties that are listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) within the Indirect Area of Potential Effect. Following publication of the Draft EIS, the Navy completed consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act with the Nevada State Historic Preservation Office and Native American Tribes. In addition, the Navy coordinated with the Bureau of Land Management as a cooperating agency to this EIS. The Nevada State Historic Preservation Office concurred with the Navy’s determination of no adverse effect to Historic Properties on August 19, 2015 (see Appendix C of Final EIS).</p>
<p>Lisa Hanf, Assistant Director, Strategic Planning Branch Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX (EPA-1)</p>	<p>Based on our review, we have rated the Preferred Alternative 2 as Environmental Objections – Insufficient Information (EO-2) (see enclosed “Summary of Rating Definitions”). Our objections are based on potential impacts from unexploded ordnance (UXO) and off-range munitions contamination on the Walker River Tribal Reservation, which is adjacent to bombing range B-19, and the lack of information regarding mitigation and range clearance. If not promptly retrieved, UXO and munitions that land off-range are considered wastes under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and, according</p>	<p>For a detailed response regarding Tribal Consultation/Impacts from Munitions and Unexploded Ordnance to the Walker River Paiute Reservation, please refer to the response in EPA-5 and EPA-7, which presents the background on off-range munitions as well as procedures employed (both past and present) to reduce or eliminate off-range munitions and the revisions being made to the Final EIS as a result of your comments.</p> <p>The detailed response in EPA-5 also discusses the MOU with the Walker River Paiute Tribe expired in May 2012. The Tribe</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
	<p>to the DEIS, it is Department of Defense policy to comply with the Military Munitions Rule of RCRA. There is no indication in the DEIS that such retrieval is occurring, since the Memorandum of Understanding with the Tribe to address this issue has expired and no discussion of range clearance on tribal land is included in the DEIS or the Operational Range Clearance Plan. Instead, the DEIS states that munitions expenditures at B-19 range do not appear to result in off-range migration of munitions constituents, despite the history of recovery of significant live and inert ordnance on the Reservation.</p>	<p>and the Navy held a meeting on June 1, 2015 to discuss the MOU and other topics. Until a new MOU is signed, the Navy intends to follow the May 2007 MOU.</p>
EPA-2	<p>We also have concerns regarding the completeness and accuracy of the noise impact analysis, since the Naval Air Station Fallon airfield operations for aircraft utilizing the range were segmented into a separate Environmental Assessment and the noise impacts of those operations were not included in the cumulative impact analysis for this Fallon Range EIS. We raised these issues of scope and cumulative impacts in both our scoping comments for this EIS and our comments on the Draft EA for airfield operations. Finally, we have concerns regarding the sufficiency of the sampling design for characterizing contamination from munitions constituents on the bombing ranges, and the conclusions regarding the potential for off-site contaminant migration.</p>	<p>The detailed response in EPA-14 discusses the noise analysis in the Draft EIS, potential segmentation, and the cumulative noise analysis. EPA-14 also presents the changes that have been made in the Final EIS as a result of your comments. Detailed responses regarding contamination from munitions and potential for off-site migration are presented in EPA-16 through EPA-20.</p>
EPA-3	<p>Tribal Consultation / Impacts from Munitions and Unexploded Ordnance to the Walker River Indian Reservation</p> <p>The Bravo-19 (B-19) range is adjacent to the Walker River Indian Reservation on its southern border and there is a history of munitions landing on the Reservation.</p>	<p>The legacy issue of inadvertent release of munitions on the Walker River Paiute Reservation became apparent in February 1989. The Navy implemented operational changes in November 1989 to reduce or eliminate subsequent off-range munitions, including reorienting strafing/bomb run-in lines and increasing surveillance of all drops. These operational changes have been effective based on Naval Aviation Warfighting Development Center (NAWDC) Range Office data, which show no incidents of off-range munitions at B-19 from 2001 through present (September 2015).</p> <p>In addition to the operational changes, the Navy conducted</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
		<p>unexploded ordnance (UXO) survey and clearance on affected portions of the Reservation in 1989–1990 and 1998–1999. The Tribe and Navy have considered several alternatives to bring closure to the legacy issue, but have not yet reached a final resolution. Resolution of the legacy off-range munitions issue will continue to be addressed with the Walker River Paiute Tribe and is not considered further in this EIS.</p>
<p>EPA-4</p>	<p>The DEIS references a Memorandum of Agreement with the Walker River Paiute Tribe that the Navy signed in 2005 for the safe removal of munitions found on tribal lands (p. 3.9-16), but nothing more is mentioned on the issue. We requested and received a copy of the MOU from the Navy. It is not clear whether the Navy regularly conducts range cleaning operations on the Reservation or whether the MOU is still in effect, since it appears to have expired in 2012. The Tribe’s website indicates that the problem of unexploded ordnance on the Reservation poses a legal and technical burden for the Tribe and they believe that it poses a serious safety hazard to anyone who may venture into this area, which has no warning signs or fencing. The expired MOU included intentions to meet with the Tribe twice a year to foster better communications, and once a year to conduct a safety demonstration for the Tribe regarding the identification and procedures to take when Tribal members come in contact with military or non-military ordnance. The range clearance commitments made by the Navy in the MOU are important for addressing safety concerns, especially with the increased training under the proposed action.</p>	<p>The Walker River Paiute Tribe and Navy signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on May 14, 2007. This MOU entered into for the purpose of establishing a reporting and assistance process for the Navy to follow in the event that: (1) off-range munitions, flares, or other military munitions land on the Walker River Paiute Reservation; (2) a hazardous material incident occurs that poses a health or safety risk to the Tribe; (3) an aircraft mishap occurs on or adjacent to the Reservation; (4) a military training activity poses a potential or perceived danger to the health, safety, or economic well being of the Tribe. The MOU delineated certain communication/reporting requirements and established emergency entry and assistance procedures that allowed NAS Fallon personnel to enter the Reservation in certain circumstances to assess and address impacts or hazards resulting from military training. The MOU did not address actions related to previous instances of off-range munitions (i.e., the legacy issue of inadvertent release of munitions on the Reservation, which became apparent in February 1989). The MOU expired in May 2012. The Navy intends to follow the May 2007 MOU as much as possible until an updated MOU or other agreements with the Tribe are in place. The Tribe and the Navy held a meeting on June 1, 2015, to discuss the EIS and other topics. Follow-up communications have occurred since the meeting. The Navy initiated Government-to-</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
		Government contact with the Tribe in April 2015 to formalize an agreement to enhance communications and foster a long-term working relationship on items of mutual interest.
EPA-5	All munitions that land off-range that are not promptly retrieved would be considered to be a solid or hazardous waste under EPA's 1997 Military Munitions Rule (40 CFR Parts 260-266, and Part 270 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, in particular Section 266.202(d)). The DEIS states that it is Department of Defense policy to implement the Military Munitions Rule (p. 3.1-1), yet there is no substantive discussion of this issue.	Very infrequently, munitions are dropped and by accidental miss or skip/bounce can land beyond the range boundary. The Navy complies with the Military Munitions Rule at FRTC by implementing Navy policies and procedures. Per Navy policy, the release of any air-to-surface weapons or stores must be accomplished within Restricted Airspace and must impact on Navy land. As required by the Navy Military Munitions Rule Implementation Policy (July 1998), a munition that may land off-range inadvertently would be retrieved as soon as possible following notification that it has landed off range. Section 4.7.2 (General Air-to-Surface Procedures) of the FRTC Range Operations Manual (NAWDC INST 3752.1H) requires that any no spot, off-target, or off-range munitions or stores be reported to Range Control and a Range Incident Report be prepared. This includes munitions impact location (if known), parameters at release/jettison, and time of incident. In addition, the Navy performs an aerial survey (by helicopter) of the Reservation property boundary on a yearly basis to confirm that no munitions have landed on the Reservation.
EPA-6	It appears that additional UXO and munitions contamination could occur as a result of the increased training scenario under the Preferred Alternative and it is not clear that the Navy is taking responsibility for the existing off-range impacts, since the DEIS states that munitions expenditures at B-19 range do not appear to result in off-range migration of munitions constituents (p.3.7-17, 3.7-19).	The increased training scenario under the Preferred Alternative is not expected to result in additional munitions landing off-range. The probability of munitions landing outside the boundaries of B-19 is very low under the No Action Alternative and Alternatives 1 and 2 (Preferred Alternative) because the Navy implemented operational changes in November 1989 to reduce or eliminate potential for off-range munitions. These measures have been effective based on NAWDC Range Office data, which show no incidents of off-range munitions at B-19 from 2001 through present

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
		<p>(September 2015).</p> <p>The Navy would also like to clarify any misunderstanding about statements in the Draft EIS regarding “migration of munitions constituents off-range.” Conclusions in the Draft EIS indicating no off-range migration of munitions constituents were based on detailed analyses conducted during Range Condition Assessments at FRTC (see Section 3.1.1.2.2.1, Range Sustainability Environmental Program Assessment) and analysis or proposed changes in training activities. This process evaluates the potential for migration of munitions constituents from an operational range to an off-range area, not munitions landing off-range.</p> <p>As explained in response to EPA comment 3, the Navy has taken several steps to address the legacy off-range munitions issue. Resolution of legacy off-range munitions issue will continue to be addressed with the Walker River Paiute Tribe and is not considered further in this EIS.</p>
<p>EPA-7</p>	<p>Tribal consultation with the Walker River Tribe has consisted, thus far, solely of two letters sent to the Tribe – one announcing the scoping period in 2013, and one announcing the availability of the DEIS. Our conversations with the Tribe indicated that they had not been notified that the DEIS was available for public review, and they showed great interest when EPA shared the information. We understand the Navy considers tribal consultation to be ongoing; however, we are concerned that the Navy’s efforts, thus far, fell short of ensuring that the Tribe was aware of the public comment period for the DEIS. The public comment period provides an important opportunity for the Tribe to comment publically and be a part of the public record, should they choose to do so.</p>	<p>In accordance with Executive Order 13175, <i>Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments</i>, DoD policies, the National Historic Preservation Act, and Navy instructions, Navy engaged in Tribal consultations during scoping, during the public comment period for the Draft EIS, and following release of the Draft EIS (additional written correspondence via Certified Mail, invitations for face-to-face meetings, and follow up phone calls). The Navy is consulting with the following tribes: Battle Mountain Paiute, Duckwater Shoshone, Elko Band, Fallon Paiute-Shoshone, Lovelock Paiute, Pyramid Lake Paiute, South Fork Band, Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians, Walker River Paiute, Winnemucca Paiute, Yerington Paiute, and Yomba Shoshone. In addition the Navy is</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
		<p>consulting with the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada.</p> <p>The Walker River Paiute Tribe was the only tribe that accepted the Navy's invitation for a meeting. The meeting was held June 1, 2015, and additional communications have occurred since the meeting. The Navy has initiated Government-to-Government contact to express its desire to pursue a Memorandum of Agreement with the Tribe to enhance communications and foster a long-term working relationship with the Tribe on items of mutual interest.</p>
EPA-8	<p>Recommendations: In the FEIS, provide a discussion of the history of munitions expenditure on the Walker River Reservation. Because the MOU includes a reporting procedure, we assume that data are available on the frequency and extent of aircraft mishaps and of off-range ordnance, flares, or other military munitions landing on Tribal lands. The FEIS should include this information, since it is central to the impact assessment. Disclose whether and, if so, how off-range UXO and munitions on the Walker River Indian Reservation are being managed in compliance with the Military Munitions Rule.</p>	<p>As explained in the response to EPA comments 3 and 4, NAWDC Range Office data indicate that procedures implemented by the Navy in November 1989 to reduce or eliminate off-range munitions at B-19 have been effective and the Proposed Action is not expected to result in munitions landing off-range. This legacy issue has no bearing on the impact analysis; therefore, the history of off-range munitions on the Reservation is not discussed in the Final EIS.</p> <p>Procedures described in response to EPA comment 5 would continue to be followed to prevent and address any off-range munitions under the Proposed Action. Resolution of legacy off-range munitions issues will continue to be addressed with the Walker River Paiute Tribe and is not discussed further in this EIS.</p>
EPA-9	<p>Informed by the above history, revisit the conclusions that munitions expenditures at B-19 range do not appear to result in off-range migration of munitions constituents.</p>	<p>Conclusions in the Draft EIS indicating no off-range migration of munitions constituents were based on detailed analyses conducted during Range Condition Assessments at FRTC (see Section 3.1.1.2.2.1, Range Sustainability Environmental Program Assessment) and analysis of proposed changes in training activities. This process evaluates the potential for migration of munitions constituents from an operational range to an off-range area. The increased training scenario under the</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
		<p>Preferred Alternative is not expected to result in additional munitions landing off-range. The probability of munitions landing outside the boundaries of B-19 is very low under the No Action Alternative and Alternatives 1 and 2 (Preferred Alternative) because the Navy implemented operational changes in November 1989 to reduce or eliminate potential for off-range munitions. These measures have been effective based on NAWDC Range Office data, which show no incidents of off-range munitions at B-19 from 2001 through present (September 2015).</p> <p>As explained in response to EPA comment 3, the Navy has taken several steps to address the legacy off-range munitions issue. Resolution of legacy off-range munitions issue will continue to be addressed with the Walker River Paiute Tribe and is not considered further in this EIS.</p>
EPA-10	<p>Consider the information and concerns expressed on the Walker River Tribe's website; consult with the Tribe; and adjust, as appropriate, the discussions on environmental justice regarding impacts to the Tribe. Provide an update on the tribal consultation with the Walker River Tribe in the FEIS. Disclose that the referenced MOU is expired and discuss any plans to renegotiate an MOU to address current and future off-range ordnance on Tribal land. Establish a new MOU with the Tribe that reflects the increased risk of off-range munitions that could occur as a result of increased training. We strongly recommend that any such MOU reestablish or enhance the coordination and safety education provisions of the expired MOU.</p>	<p>As explained in response to EPA comment 4, the Navy consulted for the EIS with several Tribes, including the Walker River Paiute Tribe. The Navy initiated Government-to-Government contact in April 2015 with the Walker River Paiute Tribe to express its desire to pursue a Memorandum of Agreement with the Tribe to enhance communications and foster a long-term working relationship with the Tribe on items of mutual interest. Section 3.9 (Cultural Resources) of the Final EIS includes a summary of these consultations.</p>
EPA-11	<p>Explain, in the FEIS, how the Navy is complying, and would comply under the proposed action, with the Military Munitions Rule for munitions that land off-range on the Walker River Indian Reservation.</p>	<p>The Navy complies with the Military Munitions Rule at FRTC by implementing Navy policies and procedures. In accordance with the Navy's Policy to Implement the Military Munitions Rule (MRIP 1998), any off-range munitions are retrieved from the off-range areas as soon as possible following notification that munitions have landed off range. Section 4.7.2 (General</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
		<p>Air-to-Surface Procedures) of the <i>FRTC Range Operations Manual</i> (NAWDC INST 3752.1H) requires that any no spot, off-target, or off-range munitions or stores be reported to Range Control and a Range Incident Report be prepared. This includes munitions impact location (if known), parameters at release/jettison, and time of incident. In addition, the Navy performs an aerial survey (by helicopter) of the Reservation property boundary on an approximately yearly basis to confirm that no munitions have landed on the Reservation. These combined actions ensure that the Navy complies with off-range munitions provisions of the Military Munitions Rule. Section 3.1 (Soils) of the Final EIS includes information about the Military Munitions Rule.</p>
<p>EPA-12</p>	<p>Discuss whether the beneficial procedure outlined in the Native American Lands Environmental Mitigation Program (NALEMP) Implementation Manual is applicable and whether any components of it are being implemented.</p>	<p>The NALEMP procedure involves a direct relationship between the Department of Defense through the Senior Tribal Liaison, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the various tribes. Substantive components of the manual that relate directly to environmental assessment and mitigation are similar to analogous components of the Navy Military Munitions Rule Implementation Policy and of off-range munitions response activities carried out by the Navy under its own authority. As outlined with the NALEMP process, any work on tribal land would involve establishing a direct relationship with the tribe, visiting the site, records search, reviewing historical documents, and interviewing tribal members and knowledgeable military employees. The Navy process, like the NALEMP process, makes protection of human health and safety, as well as health of the environment the goals. Assessing human and environmental health would indirectly address Lifeways and economics, because the analysis would have to specifically consider how the tribe uses the area that is subject to mitigation.</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
EPA-13	<p>Discuss, in the FEIS, additional mitigation measures that could eliminate or minimize future ordnance and munitions expenditures on the Reservation, such as the possibility of moving the target areas away from the Reservation border, utilizing only inert munitions on Range B-19, as is done with Range B-16, installing warning signs or fencing, or the provision of other benefits to the Tribe, as informed by Tribal consultation.</p>	<p>As explained in response to EPA comment 3, the Navy implemented operational changes at B-19 in November 1989 to reduce or eliminate inadvertent release of munitions on the Walker River Paiute Reservation. These operational changes have been effective based on NAWDC Range Office data, which show no incidents of off-range munitions at B-19 from 2001 through present (September 2015). Therefore, mitigation measures are not needed to eliminate or minimize future off-range munitions on the Reservation.</p>
EPA-14	<p>Noise Impacts and NEPA Segmentation</p> <p>The Navy conducted an Environmental Assessment for the airfield operations at Naval Air Station (NAS) Fallon during the same general time period in which this EIS was being initiated, yet the Navy chose to separate the actions of aircraft takeoff and landings from NAS Fallon with the flight activity of those same planes in the Special Use Airspace (SUA). This could represent improper segmentation.</p> <p>The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA Regulations state that similar actions – those which “when viewed with other reasonably foreseeable or proposed agency actions, have similarities that provide a basis for evaluating their environmental consequences together, such as common timing or geography” should be evaluated in the same EIS “when the best way to assess adequately the combined impacts of similar actions or reasonable alternatives to such actions is to treat them in a single impact statement” (40 CFR 1508.25 (a) 3). We are especially concerned that the noise impacts from these actions were not evaluated together in the same impact assessment.</p> <p>In this case, there is both common timing and geography. The Fallon Range Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS was published (July 2013) before the completion of the EA for Airfield Operations at Naval Air Station Fallon (August 2013), therefore both actions were under</p>	<p>Although there may be similar timing between the Environmental Assessment for the NAS Fallon Airfield (hereinafter Airfield EA) and the FRTC EIS, the geography is distinct and separate. The Airfield EA focused on the area potentially affected by proposed airfield operations at NAS Fallon within Class D airspace. Aircraft arriving and departing from NAS Fallon do not all train in the FRTC, nor do all aircraft using the FRTC originate from NAS Fallon. Even if no aircraft flights were initiated from NAS Fallon, the Navy and other services would continue to train on the FRTC. In contrast, the FRTC EIS provides an evaluation of the potential environmental effects of all training operations, air and ground, by all range users within the FRTC, irrespective of the origin of the users conducting the training operations. Therefore, airfield activities clearly have independent utility from the training activities conducted in the FRTC. The Airfield EA was identified as a related environmental analysis in Chapter 1 (Purpose and Need of the Proposed Action) of the FRTC EIS. As well, NAS Fallon airfield operations as assessed in the Airfield EA were evaluated in the analysis of Cumulative Impacts (Chapter 4) in the FRTC EIS. Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts) of the Final EIS has been updated and a figure has been developed depicting the noise contours associated with</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
	<p>NEPA review simultaneously and could have been coordinated, as we suggested in our July 8, 2013 scoping comments for Range Operations, as well as raised as a scope of analysis issue in our July 18, 2013 comments on the Draft EA for Airfield Operations. We understand that aircraft may arrive for training in the Fallon Range from other air stations; however, the DEIS states that aircraft “typically originate at NAS Fallon for training in the Fallon Range” (p. 3.4-21). According to the Navy, the actions of aircraft at the airfield were separated from the actions of those same aircraft in the greater Fallon range because of different controlling commands and different timing. If the Navy found evaluating the airfield operations together with the Fallon Range operations unworkable, the EIS should have ensured that the cumulative impact analysis in the EIS accounted for the noise impacts from the aircraft at NAS Fallon. According to the Navy, the noise increases for the airfield operations were not represented in the noise contours under the EIS’s No Action Alternative, which represents the existing condition. The Navy states that this was because the airfield action has not yet occurred. The Navy could have ensured the noise impacts from the airfield operations were represented in the cumulative noise analysis, regardless of whether they were yet occurring. We note that there is precedent for doing this in the Guam and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) Military Relocation EIS. In the Guam EIS, the noise impacts from the ISR/Strike Force at Anderson Air Force Base, which were not yet occurring, were included in the noise contours and analysis for the increased training proposed in the Guam and CNMI Military Relocation EIS. This would be an appropriate way to evaluate cumulative noise in the Fallon Range EIS since the airfield actions were absent from the EIS scope of analysis. This is especially concerning since the EA revealed noise impacts at levels that could induce hearing loss (&gt;80 A-weighted decibels) to 9 new receptors (p. 4-28). It is important that the noise impact modeling for the Fallon Range EIS account for these high noise</p>	<p>aircraft operations at NAS Fallon airfield and those associated with the FRTC. As can be seen from this figure, there is no overlap between the residents affected by aircraft noise in the range areas and those affected by aircraft noise in the areas surrounding the NAS Fallon airfield.</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
	<p>impacts that would occur within the range airspace.</p> <p>Recommendation: Revise the noise analysis to include the predicted noise estimates from the Airfield Operations EA, from which the majority of aircraft utilizing the Fallon Range originate. This would represent the noise analysis that would have been estimated had the Navy not separated the connected and similar actions of airfield and airspace use.</p>	
EPA-15	<p>Include a map of aircraft noise for Range B-19, since this was not included in the DEIS.</p>	<p>The DEIS states in Section 3.4 (Noise [Airborne]) that MR_NMAP was used to calculate the 60–85 dB Ldnmr contours, in 5 dB increments, for sorties occurring at B-19. The resulting Ldnmr contours for all FRTC aircraft operations combined do not reach or exceed 60 dB. This is due to the low number of events and the relatively high altitude of 7,000–15,000 ft. (2,133.6–4572 m) AGL for fixed-wing operations. Even though the helicopters operate at altitudes of 100–3,000 ft. (30.5–914.4 m) AGL, their numbers of operations combined with their single-event noise levels are insufficient to generate an Ldnmr of 60 dB or greater, and lands underneath this airspace are within Noise Zone I. Therefore, no noise map was made for Bravo 19 for aircraft activities.</p>
EPA-16	<p>Soils / Munitions Contamination Fallon Range Condition Assessment</p> <p>The DEIS indicates that Range Condition Assessments are required every 5 years (p. 3.1-2) and are reevaluated whenever significant changes (e.g., changes in range operations, site conditions applicable statutes, regulations, DoD issuances, or other policies) occur that affect determinations made during the previous assessment (p. 3.1-2). The most recent RCA was performed in 2008, but it is not clear whether an RCA is currently being performed according to the 5-year</p>	<p>The Navy's Range Sustainability Environmental Program Assessment (RSEPA) is a proactive way to ensure the Navy remains a good steward of the environment. The Range Condition Assessment (RCA) answers two primary questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Is the range in compliance with environmental laws and regulations? and</li> <li>2) Are munitions constituents migrating off range?</li> </ol> <p>The FRTC RCA 5-year update is currently (as of November</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
	<p>requirement or would be performed as a result of the change in range operations.</p> <p>We requested and received a copy of the 2008 RCA from the Navy. We are concerned that the sampling design may not have been sufficient to accurately represent the contamination on the sites. The 2008 RCA indicates that sampling occurred by compositing 5 samples in the field. DoD’s own studies show that 5 sample composites for explosives residues on bombing ranges performed very poorly in comparison to the incremental sampling methodology/multi-incremental sampling method in EPA Method 8330B using a minimum of 30 sampling increments.</p> <p>Recommendation: We recommend that the RCA be updated per the 5-year requirement and due to the changes in range operations that would occur under this action. We recommend that sampling occur in accordance with EPA Federal Facilities Forum Issue Paper: Site Characterization for Munitions Constituents, January 2012 to more accurately assess the level of contamination and the potential for off-site migration. The appropriate sampling design is discussed in EPA publication SW-846, Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, Physical/Chemical Methods, Method 8330B, Appendix A.</p>	<p>2015) being drafted as part of the 5-year requirement. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations for the update can be provided when complete. At a minimum, the RCA update would be initiated at the regular 5-year interval (around 2020). If a decision is made to implement Alternative 1 or 2, the RCA update could be initiated sooner, if deemed necessary based on the actual timing of changes in range operations. It should be noted that the proposed changes in range operations would be implemented gradually, rather than all at once.</p> <p>The intent of the sampling performed during the 2008 RCA was to verify the modeling conducted as part of the RCA to adequately answer the two primary questions of RSEPA (see above). The results were roughly the order of magnitude of the modeled potential munitions constituents in soil at FRTC targets. The analytical method that was used during the 2008 RCA update was appropriate given the data quality objectives of the investigation. The intent of the sampling (based on the RCA data quality objectives) was not to perform a site characterization like effort that would be appropriate for a munitions response site supporting a potential change in land use. The target areas have been and will continue to be used for many years for military training activities such as bombing practice using high explosives. Realistic target practice using live munitions is a necessary part of training the warfighter for the realities of war. Based on the results from the last RCA update and current range operations, additional sampling was not performed and is not required to meet the objectives of the next RCA update.</p> <p>The Navy’s RCAs use multiple lines of evidence to develop findings, conclusions, and recommendations that are based on sound science to confirm munitions constituents are not</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
		<p>migrating off range and ensure compliance with appropriate environmental laws and regulations. The 2008 RCA as well as the current RCAs adequately answer the two questions using data quality objectives that are appropriate for the assessments.</p> <p>An increase of 10–15% in munitions usage would not exceed a threshold that would necessitate a revision to the conclusions made in the RCA.</p>
EPA-17	<p>Perchlorate</p> <p>The DEIS concludes there are no potential impacts from perchlorate compounds (3.1-13). The RCA states that the soil samples were analyzed for all munitions constituents (MCs) listed in the Range Sustainability Environmental Program Assessment manual except for perchlorate, and that a qualitative review of the mechanisms for release of perchlorate was conducted. This evaluation showed that potential perchlorate releases would be widely distributed across the ranges, and only a very small total mass of perchlorate could potentially be released, which would result in concentrations of perchlorate that would be well below typical detection limits. The Navy also concluded that it expects that perchlorate from other sources (i.e., geologic) may be present in greater concentrations, and any sampling effort would provide a documentation of perchlorate concentration from sources other than range operations (RCA, p. 5).</p> <p>We are concerned that the Navy has eliminated this compound from testing and has not followed the guidance of the Range Sustainability Environmental Program Assessment manual. Without quantitative sampling data, there is insufficient information to support the conclusions in the RCA and DEIS that perchlorate levels result in no potential impacts. Perchlorate is very soluble and exhibits little to no soil adsorption. Surface and groundwater contamination concentrations would build as a function of perchlorate loading. There is insufficient evidence in the DEIS that any deposition of</p>	<p>The Navy follows all DoD and DoN directives, instructions, policy, and guidance (including the RSEPA manual) for performing its range assessments. As discussed above, the current RCA update is ongoing. The RCAs use the data quality objective process and multiple lines of evidence that are based on sound science to support the conclusions.</p> <p>The informed and reasonable conclusions about perchlorate reached in the 2008 RCA were based on multiple lines of evidence including: (1) the numbers and types of munitions or training devices that are used; (2) how the devices are used, where the devices are used, where the devices will land; (3) the fact that perchlorate is nearly 100 percent consumed in a properly functioning device; (4) the fact that the ORC program regularly clears the ranges preventing an accumulation and potential source; and (5) mass loading modeling and vertical transport modeling conducted during the 2004 RCA (U.S. Department of the Navy 2004).</p> <p>During the 2004 RCA, predictive modeling was conducted in two stages to determine the potential for off-range release of perchlorate and the need for further analysis. The first stage, known as mass loading modeling, predicted potential concentrations of perchlorate in soil using munitions usage data, information about the compounds in munitions, conservative estimates of perchlorate consumption during use</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
	<p>perchlorate is likely to be below detection limits. Additionally, natural occurring perchlorate would likely occur in very small quantities, usually less than 1 part per billion, and would not render quantitative test results meaningless, as the DEIS implies.</p> <p>Recommendation: In the FEIS, indicate which munitions proposed for use on the ranges contain perchlorate, as identified in DoD's Munitions Items Disposition Action System (MIDAS) database, and the quantities that are expected to be released across the ranges. We strongly recommend that the Navy follow the guidance in the Range Sustainability Environmental Program Assessment manual and, in the next RCA, conduct the testing for perchlorate that was eliminated from the 2008 RCA sampling. Clarify, in the FEIS, when the next RCA will be conducted. If the Navy intends, in future RCAs, to continue to utilize the rationale that naturally-occurring background perchlorate levels would be present in greater concentrations than that originating from Navy training, we recommend that background sampling and testing using isotopic analysis methods be conducted to distinguish natural from man-made sources of perchlorate.</p>	<p>of the munitions, and information about sizes of targets. The second stage used the mass loading information and transport models to predict the potential vertical migration of perchlorate through soil to 1.64 ft. (0.5 m) below land surface and 24.6 ft. (7.5 m) below land surface (i.e., soil-groundwater interface).</p> <p>Vertical transport modeling predicted that perchlorate could migrate through soil to the soil-groundwater interface (24.6 ft. [7.5 m] below land surface), but the concentrations would be extremely low. The mass loading modeling predicted that perchlorate concentrations in surface soils could range from 0.000021 to 0.00046 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg). These values are likely overestimates given the conservative assumptions used. The vertical transport modeling predicted that perchlorate concentrations in soils at the soil-groundwater interface could reach 0.000005–0.000013 mg/kg after approximately 300–400 years. All of these values are well below analytical detection limits for perchlorate in soils (approximately 0.002 mg/kg).</p> <p>During the 2008 RCA update, perchlorate was evaluated by reviewing the 2004 RCA modeling effort, reviewing usage of perchlorate-containing munitions, evaluating potential mechanisms of release, and conducting additional mass loading calculations. This analysis showed that the total mass of perchlorate that could potentially be released would be very small, and any perchlorate concentrations in soil would be well below typical detection limits. Therefore, perchlorate sampling and analysis was deemed unnecessary during the 2008 RCA update. The fact that perchlorate occurs naturally in the environment was a minor consideration in determining that perchlorate sampling and analysis was not necessary during the 2008 RCA update. Based on current training</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
		<p>activities, additional sampling is not required to meet the data quality objectives of the ongoing RCA update.</p> <p>Munitions containing perchlorate that would be used under the No Action Alternative are limited to illumination flares (e.g., LUU-2 and LUU-19) and Smokey Surface-to-Air Missile (SAM) simulators. The LUU-2 and LUU-19 are airborne parachute flares that are deployed to illuminate targets. The candle igniter disks in both flare units use small amounts of ammonium perchlorate (0.08 ounces [2.3 grams]), which is completely consumed when the flare functions as designed (U.S. Department of the Navy 2008). Specific failure rates for LUU-2 and LUU-19s are not available, but would be expected to be within the range of values presented in Table 3.1-1 of the Final EIS. Any flare that failed to ignite would be recovered during routine range clearance. Material recovered during the course of range clearance operations, including expended practice munitions, range scrap, and debris is inspected, certified, demilitarized, and processed for recycling or disposal in accordance with appropriate DoD regulations and standard operating procedures in the FTRC Operational Range Clearance Plan (U.S. Department of the Navy 2013). Approximately 16 LUU-2 and LUU-19s would be used on B-16, B-17, B-19, and B-20 annually under the No Action Alternative. Accumulation of measurable concentrations of perchlorate in soils from illumination flares is extremely unlikely for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The small amount of ammonium perchlorate in the flare igniters would be completely consumed unless a flare failed to function as designed.</li> <li>• A relatively small percentage of the total flares used would fail to operate.</li> </ul>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flares that fail to ignite would be recovered and handled in accordance with the FTRC Operational Range Clearance Plan.</li> </ul> <p>The Smokey SAM is a small (15 in. [38 cm] long) rocket with a cardboard case and Styrofoam fins that is used to simulate the launch of a surface-to-air missile during flight crew training. It has an ammonium perchlorate/zinc-based rocket motor containing approximately 1.53 pounds (lb.) (0.69 kg) of propellant, 44 percent (0.67 pounds [0.30 kg]) of which is ammonium perchlorate (Godwin 2015; U.S. Department of the Navy 2008). The Smokey SAM is launched from a four-bay launcher having a metal plate at its base, thus preventing direct contact of the exhaust plume with the soil. As a solid rocket fuel, the ammonium perchlorate/zinc mixture is completely consumed after the rocket motor is ignited. Misfired rockets or igniters would not be released to the environment, but would remain in control of the Smokey SAM team and handled in accordance with the FTRC Operational Range Clearance Plan. In addition, the Smokey SAM team attempts to retrieve all expended rocket bodies on the day of launch. If time or conditions do not permit same day recovery, the team attempts to retrieve the expended rocket bodies no more than two weeks after launch (U.S. Department of the Navy 2008). Any expended rocket bodies missed by the Smokey SAM team would be recovered during routine range clearance. As noted above, material recovered is inspected, certified, demilitarized, and processed for recycling or disposal in accordance with appropriate DoD regulations and standard operating procedures in the FTRC Operational Range Clearance Plan. Approximately 300 Smokey SAMs would be used annually under the No Action Alternative. Accumulation of measurable concentrations of perchlorate in soils from</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
		<p>Smokey SAMs is extremely unlikely for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Smokey SAM launchers have a metal base plate that prevents direct contact of the exhaust plume with the soil.</li> <li>• The ammonium perchlorate/zinc mixture is completely consumed after the rocket motor is ignited.</li> <li>• Misfired rockets are not released into the environment.</li> <li>• Expended rocket bodies are recovered after launch.</li> </ul> <p>Perchlorate would not be expected to have a measureable effect on soils under the No Action Alternative. Concentrations of perchlorate in soils would not represent a substantial threat of a release to an off-range area that poses unacceptable risk to human health or the environment. There would be no significant impacts on soils from possible contamination under the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>No new perchlorate-containing munitions would be used under Alternatives 1 or 2. Additionally, annual usage of illuminations flares and Smokey SAMs under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 would remain the same as the No Action Alternative. Accumulation of measurable concentrations of perchlorate in soils from illuminations flares and Smokey SAMs is extremely unlikely under Alternatives 1 and 2 for the same reasons discussed for the No Action Alternative. Section 3.1 (Soils) of the Final EIS provides additional information and analysis regarding the potential for perchlorate contamination from training activities at FRTC.</p>
EPA-18	<p>Operational Range Clearance Plan and Impacts</p> <p>The DEIS states that the Fallon Operational Range Clearance Plan was completed in 2013 for NAS Fallon and the FRTC. The Plan was not included in the DEIS, but the DEIS states that its continued implementation would substantially reduce potential impacts on</p>	<p>Section 3.3 (Water Quality) of the Final EIS provides additional specifics about the Operational Range Clearance Plan, including discussion and analysis of potential impacts associated with BIP detonations used during range clearance. When a munition is identified by EOD personnel as UXO and</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
	<p>groundwater, and concludes that potential impacts on groundwater at the training ranges would not be significant (pp. 3.3-22 – 3.3-24) and, overall, would be negligible (p. 3.3-26).</p> <p>While regular range clearance may reduce concentrations of munitions constituents, the DEIS does not identify the potential risk of contamination from range clearance when blow in place (BIP) detonations of unexploded ordnance (UXO) are performed. BIP of UXO can result in a greater amount of residue deposition than if the munitions functioned as designed on impact. High order detonations and occasionally low-order detonations can cause significant deposition of MCs.</p> <p>Recommendation: Include as an appendix and/or summarize the Operational Range Clearance Plan in the FEIS. Disclose the impacts from high order and low-order BIP detonations that are part of range clearance activities, and discuss the effectiveness of the Plan as mitigation, taking such impacts into consideration.</p>	<p>unsafe to move, BIP is required to address the acute and extreme explosive safety hazard. BIP is performed to ensure a safe work environment for range personnel and is unavoidable. Typically, C4 is used for BIP with both it and the explosive from the munition being nearly 100% consumed in the resulting detonation. The risk from not addressing explosive safety concerns from UXO far outweighs any potential chronic hazard from potential munition constituents being unconsumed in a BIP event. The RSEPA process takes into account the necessity to perform BIP to ensure a safe work environment by factoring in this requirement into the two primary questions.</p>
EPA-19	<p>Lead Contamination from Small Arms Ranges</p> <p>The proposed action would substantially increase the amount of small- and medium-caliber live rounds expended on the ranges. The tons per year of live rounds would more than double on range B-16 (from 15 to 32 tons per year) (p. 3.3-11), and increase by 5 tons per year across the other ranges. The DEIS indicates that lead is the primary constituent of concern because of its toxicity and ability to persist in the environment, but states that lead is relatively immobile because of the pH of the soils and the limited precipitation in the project area (p. 3.3-12). The latter factors are relevant to transport through soil; however, studies show that lead mobilization occurs chiefly by wind and surface water erosion, generally not by dissolution and leaching through soil. The type and frequency of</p>	<p>Section 3.1 (Soils) of the Final EIS includes an updated discussion of small arms range configuration and potential accumulation of lead. Sections 3.1 (Soils) and 3.3 (Water Quality) of the Final EIS include BMPs to monitor and adaptively manage lead accumulation. Four small arms ranges (pistol/shotgun range, M16 zero range, automatic record fire range, and rifle/machine gun range) are located within the B-19 boundary. The ranges are adjacent to each other and the firing lines run east-west along the main access road. All down range target lines are in a northern direction to the B-19 High Explosive Impact Area. Given the available space, terrain of the area, and use of the existing impact area, these small arms ranges do not have berms or backstops. Therefore, some</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
	<p>maintenance performed on the backstop and range floors affects the ability for off-site transport. The DEIS states that spent small- and medium-caliber rounds would not be removed at regular intervals, but would slowly accumulate in soils over long periods of time in areas of concentrated use (p. 3.1-14). The DEIS does not identify any best management practices or maintenance measures to prevent erosion of berms and backstops, which are highly susceptible to erosion during rainstorms and could provide a transport mechanism for lead attached to soil particles. The increased intensity of rainstorms predicted and already occurring under climate change add to the risk for eroded soil to be transported off-site by stormwater. The DEIS indicates that several major ephemeral stream channels converge northwest of B-16 and cross the training area as they flow to Carson Lake (p. 3.3-8).</p> <p>An additional route of transport that was not discussed in the DEIS is air transport. At small arms ranges, lead dust may enter the air from the small arms barrel plume or fugitive dust generation. The transport of lead through the air, with final deposition to surface water or soil, is an important transport mechanism; therefore, lead's ability to contaminate adjacent lands can be expected to be proportional to the amount of lead loading at ranges.</p> <p>Recommendation: Discuss the potential impacts of lead mobilization by wind and water erosion. Identify best management practices to reduce this potential and ensure they are implemented on the ranges as part of the proposed action. The following practices are identified in the U.S. Army document Prevention of Lead Migration and Erosion from Small Arms Ranges and should be evaluated in the FEIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Physical removal of lead from backstops on a regularly scheduled basis. A sifting/screening process is described in the above</li> </ul>	<p>BMPs for small arms ranges with berms are not appropriate for use on the FRTC small arms ranges. Lead accumulation on the small arms ranges would be monitored and adaptively managed by implementing appropriate management practices such as erosion control, lead removal, and pH monitoring and modification.</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
	<p>document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Soil pH monitoring and modification if necessary. The DEIS indicates that soils in B-16 are strongly alkaline (p. 3.1-5) and are mildly to strongly alkaline on the other ranges, with pH levels ranging from 7.0 – 9.4 (p. 3.1-14). Lead is least mobile between a pH of 6.5 and 8.5.</li> <li>• Contouring or reshaping backstops to direct or reduce the velocity of runoff. Soil erosion on backstops is the principal mechanism for transport of lead on training ranges to surface water.</li> </ul>	
<p>EPA-20</p>	<p>Fugitive dust</p> <p>The DEIS does not evaluate the fugitive dust impacts quantitatively, but identifies various activities that would generate fugitive dust and concludes that Best Management Practices would minimize dust (p. 3.2-17). The list of BMPs includes the following: “When warranted, water or another dust palliative product would be used as necessary to minimize generation and downwind migration of fugitive dust, especially on dry, windy days”.</p> <p>Recommendation: In the FEIS, provide more information on how this BMP would be implemented, including how personnel would determine when this BMP is warranted, and whether water or dust palliative products would be present onsite during training.</p>	<p>Section 3.2 (Air Quality) of the Final EIS includes an updated discussion of management practices to minimize dust. The Navy uses practical methods to prevent particulate matter from becoming airborne during training activities at FRTC. Fugitive dust is moderated by adhering to standard operating procedures contained in Chapter 5 of the <i>FRTC Range Operations Manual</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicles shall be operated only on established roads; and</li> <li>• Vehicles shall adhere to posted speed limits and drive at safe speeds commensurate with conditions.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, conditions could be evaluated before starting a large-scale ground training event to determine if additional dust abatement measures, such as watering high use areas or other measures in the NAS Fallon Dust Control Plan (NAS Fallon 2004), are warranted. The need for additional dust abatement measures would be determined on a case-by-case basis during pre-exercise planning with input from the NAS Fallon Environmental Division. Factors considered in determining the need for additional dust abatement include the locations, duration and number of vehicles involved in the exercise; soil moisture conditions prior to the exercise; and predicted precipitation, wind speed, and wind direction during</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
		<p>the exercise. As described in the Dust Control Plan, water and watering equipment are available at NAS Fallon for use in FRTC. In addition, some units training at FRTC may choose to use water trucks in their equipment inventory or dust palliatives other than water.</p>
EPA-21	<p><b>Climate Change</b></p> <p>The DEIS includes a good general discussion of climate change and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The discussion includes a percentage breakdown of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions of various domestic transportation sources, revealing that the largest sources are passenger cars and light-duty trucks (61% of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions) and medium- and heavy-duty trucks (22%), with commercial aircraft at 7% (p. 4-38).</p> <p>While aviation, in general, represents a small percentage of fossil fuel use, it is important to discuss the unique impacts aviation emissions contribute due to their release at altitude. The majority of aircraft emissions occur high in the atmosphere and the impact of burning fossil fuels at altitude is approximately double that of burning the same fuels at ground level. In addition, the mixture of exhaust gases discharged from aircraft perturbs radiative forcing (the heating effect caused by GHGs in the atmosphere) 2 to 4 times more than if the exhaust was CO<sub>2</sub> alone. Emissions from jet aircraft also lead to the formation of cirrus clouds, as the condensation trails (contrails) of water vapor and sulfur particles emitted from engines at high altitudes form ice crystals that persist as clouds under some atmospheric conditions. Scientists are uncertain how to measure the occurrence and impact of such clouds, but they are reasonably certain that the clouds add to the greenhouse effect of aircraft emissions, perhaps substantially.</p> <p>The DEIS provides predictions of annual GHG emissions that would</p>	<p>(1) Section 4.5 (Climate Change), Subsection 4.5.3 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions in the United States) of the Final EIS includes a discussion of the unique climate change impacts of burning fossil fuels at altitude, as follows:</p> <p>While aviation, in general, represents a small percentage of fossil fuel use, it is important to note the unique impacts aviation emissions contribute due to their release at altitude. The majority of aircraft emissions occur high in the atmosphere and the impact of burning fossil fuels at altitude is greater than burning the same fuels at ground level (particularly with regard to NO<sub>x</sub>) (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 1999). In addition, the mixture of exhaust gases discharged from aircraft perturbs radiative forcing directly through the heating effect and indirectly through affecting the microphysical processes of cirrus clouds formations. Due to the uncertainties associated with various physical and chemical modeling, it is difficult to accurately estimate the climate impact from the GHG emissions from this proposed project. The total aviation radiation forcing, including the aviation-induced cirrus effect, is estimated to be 78 milliwatts per square meter, which represents 4.9% of total anthropogenic forcing (Lee et al. 2009).</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
	<p>occur under the alternatives and calculates these values as a percentage of total U.S. GHG emissions (Table 4-4, p. 4-39). The Council on Environmental Quality recently released revised draft guidance for Federal agencies on the consideration of GHG emissions and climate change impacts under NEPA. Recognizing that climate impacts are not attributable to any single action, but are exacerbated by a series of smaller decisions, the draft guidance discourages unqualified statements in NEPA documents that the emissions from a particular proposed action represent only a small fraction of local, national, or international emissions, as not helpful to the decision-maker or public (CEQ draft guidance, p. 6).</p> <p>The climate change discussion also identifies the Navy’s goals of improving energy security and environmental stewardship and reducing reliance on fossil fuels (p. 4-37). While the DEIS identifies the general actions that the Navy is taking to address climate change, it does not identify DoD’s specific actions regarding aircraft emissions, which relate more closely to the proposed action. According to the U.S. Aviation Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan, DoD and its various branches have a number of specific military propulsion programs and initiatives underway to improve aircraft energy efficiency, which will also reduce GHGs. These include the VAATE (Versatile Affordable Advanced Turbine Engines) Program and several technology development programs under VAATE that strive to meet specific energy goals; the Adaptive Versatile Engine Technology (ADVENT) Program, which is developing critical technologies to provide military turbofan engines with 25 percent improved fuel efficiency to reduce fuel burn and provide more range, persistence, speed and payload; and the Adaptive Engine Technology Development (AETD) program, which seeks to accelerate technology maturation and reduce risk for transition of these technologies to a military engine in the 2020+ timeframe. Such technology would be</p>	<p>(2) Based on Navy understanding of the Council on Environmental Quality recently released revised draft guidance for Federal agencies on the consideration of GHG emissions and climate change impacts under NEPA, the Navy will retain computations of project GHG emissions as a percentage of total U.S. GHG emissions (Table 4-4, p. 4-39). The draft guidance discourages unqualified statements in NEPA documents that the emissions from a particular proposed action represent only a small fraction of local, national, or international emissions, as not helpful to the decision-maker or public (CEQ draft guidance, p. 6). However, the statements made in the FRTC EIS are not unqualified and therefore the Navy believes that the percentages shown in Table 4-4 are helpful to the decision –maker and public.</p> <p>3) Section 4.5 (Climate Change), Subsection 4.5.2 (Regulatory Framework) of the Final EIS includes a few paragraphs highlighting the programs the DoD and the Navy is investing in to increase fuel efficiency for military aircraft, as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">DoD is taking specific actions regarding aircraft emissions. According to the U.S. Aviation Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan (International Civil Aviation Organization 2012), DoD and its various branches have a number of specific military propulsion programs and initiatives underway to improve aircraft energy efficiency, which will also reduce GHGs. These include the VAATE (Versatile Affordable Advanced Turbine Engines) Program and several technology development programs under VAATE that strive to meet specific energy goals; the Adaptive Versatile Engine Technology (ADVENT) Program, which is developing critical technologies to provide military turbofan engines with 25 percent improved fuel</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
	<p>applicable to a range of military aircraft (fighters, bombers, etc.).</p> <p>Recommendations: We recommend that the FEIS: (1) include a discussion of the unique climate change impacts of burning fossil fuels at altitude, as explained above; (2) remove computations of project GHG emissions as a percentage of total U.S. GHG emissions; and (3) highlight the programs the DoD is investing in to increase fuel efficiency for military aircraft.</p>	<p>efficiency to reduce fuel burn and provide more range, persistence, speed and payload; and the Adaptive Engine Technology Development (AETD) program, which seeks to accelerate technology maturation and reduce risk for transition of these technologies to a military engine in the 2020+ timeframe. Such technology would be applicable to a range of military aircraft (fighters, bombers, etc.).</p> <p>In a complementary effort, the President directed the Navy, DOE, and USDA to make investments in the construction and operation of three biorefineries that will produce up to 100 million gallons of cost competitive alternative diesel and jet fuel beginning in 2016 (International Civil Aviation Organization 2015). The FAA and DoD are working together with industry to coordinate and fund alternative jet fuel testing activities that support fuel approval. NASA, FAA and the U.S. Air Force are leading efforts to understand the benefits of alternative jet fuels on emissions that impact air quality and contrail formation.</p> <p>The Navy is taking other actions ashore to implement Executive Order 13693 (Planning For Federal Sustainability in the Next Decade). The Navy is implementing sustainable practices for energy efficiency, greenhouse gas emissions avoidance or reduction, and petroleum products use reduction. Pursuant to OPNAV Instruction 4100.5E-Shore Energy Management (22 Jun 2012), it is the Navy policy to ensure energy security and legal compliance by increasing infrastructure energy efficiency and</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
		<p>integrating cost-effective and mission-compatible alternative energy technologies while providing reliable energy supply ashore. Among several mandates, according to OPNAV Instruction 4100.5E, the Navy shall achieve a 30 percent facility energy intensity reduction by 2015; reduce consumption of fossil fuel and increase the use of alternative fuels by the Navy’s non-tactical vehicle fleet; and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. In the most cost effective manner, the Navy will meet the following DoN shore energy goals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Fifty percent ashore consumption reduction by 2020.</li> <li>2) Fifty percent total ashore energy from alternative sources by 2020.</li> <li>3) Fifty percent of installations net-zero consumers by 2020.</li> <li>4) Fifty percent reduction in petroleum used in the commercial vehicle fleet by 2015.</li> </ol>
<p>JJ. Goicoechea Eureka Board of Commissioners</p>	<p>Dear Ms. Kelley: Eureka County, Nevada is a unit of local government under and adjacent to the Fallon Range Training Complex. We have been following with interest the Navy’s efforts to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement to accommodate increased levels of training on the Complex. Eureka County Commissioner Mike Sharkozy attended the Scoping meeting in Crescent Valley on June 11, 2013. We were also represented at the DEIS public meeting on February 19, 2015. We appreciate the unique nature of the FRTC and the service it provides for military training, readiness and emergency response. We are also a participant in the Fallon NAS Joint Land Use Study and EIS preparation. In reviewing the FRTC Draft EIS, we noticed that some</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the NEPA process. Where appropriate, the Final EIS has been revised to indicate the location and distance information for the Town of Eureka.</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
	<p>maps show the Town of Eureka, our County seat, and some do not. For the purposes of understanding the location of the eastern boundary of the FRTC in Eureka County, it would be helpful to have the map expanded to show Eureka, and some information on the distance between the boundary's eastern edge and the town of Eureka.</p>	
<p>Eureka Board of Commissioners - 2</p>	<p>Eureka County supports, invests in and promotes the use and development of the Eureka County Airport (05U) in Diamond Valley, just east of the FRTC. Obviously operations in the FRTC affect our ability to attract users and promote businesses. In considering airports under and near the FRTC, the Eureka Airport was not listed, but for example the Elko and Ely airports (also not under the FRTC) were. For our planning purposes as well as yours, we respectfully request that the DEIS address impacts to general aviation east of the FRTC including impacts to the Eureka airport.</p>	<p>The Final EIS Transportation section (Section 3.8) has been updated to include information regarding the Eureka Airport. As stated in the FEIS, there would be no adverse impacts to general aviation regarding access or usability of the current training area because the Navy is not proposing to add or change any of the boundaries or operating hours of the current Military Operating Areas or Restricted Areas that comprise the FRTC Study Area. General aviation outside the FRTC airspace (which includes Eureka airport) would not be adversely impacted by the Proposed Action.</p>
<p>Eureka Board of Commissioners - 3</p>	<p>We have the following specific comments, noted below: Table ES-2, 3.7 Socioeconomic et al. Effects and throughout document: Alternatives 1 and 2 state that "local activities would need to schedule use of airspace, but there would be no significant impact of change in economic activity related to farming and ranching operations." This appears to be a change from the No Action Alternative. If this is correct, please explain what "local activities" means, and describe what economic activities would be impacted by the change.</p>	<p>The analysis of the No Action Alternative in Section 3.7 (Socioeconomics) indicates that aviation activities need to schedule with NAWDC for use of military airspace. There is no change in this requirement from the No Action Alternative. Most SUA is established for military or government use; however, it may also be accessed for civilian air traffic when not reserved for military or government use. Close coordination between military and civilian air traffic control facilities enables safe, effective, real-time use of the FRTC SUA. Under this procedure, regardless of the schedule for the use of a military airspace, civilian aircraft may use SUA until a military aircraft is actually en route to that area. The bulletized list in the Executive Summary of the Final EIS has been updated to include this conclusion from the No Action Alternative.</p>
<p>Eureka Board of</p>	<p>Table ES-2 3.8 Transportation: Please rewrite third bullet in all three</p>	<p>The bulletized list in both the Executive Summary and the</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
Commissioners - 4	columns: Sentence meaning is unclear.	Transportation section (3.8) of the Final EIS has been revised for clarity.
Eureka Board of Commissioners - 5	Page 1-2, Figure 1-1 and throughout document: Please expand map to the east to help readers understand where the eastern boundary of the FRTC is in relation to the Town of Eureka. For example, Figure 3.4-8 on page 3.4-17 does extend beyond the eastern FRTC border which is more helpful with the notation of Roberts Mountain.	Where appropriate, the Final EIS has been revised to indicate the location and distance information for the Town of Eureka.
Eureka Board of Commissioners - 6	Page 3.6-3, 3.6.2.3.3 Eureka County: Third paragraph, second sentence is not accurate and should be deleted. Page 3.7-13 3.7.2.6 Please refer to and incorporate Eureka County's Socioeconomic Report for the most recent socioeconomic data including current enrollment statistics. <a href="http://www.yuccamountain.org/trends14/education.htm">http://www.yuccamountain.org/trends14/education.htm</a> . Eureka County School District description is incomplete. The District also operates an elementary school in Crescent Valley. The school district's student population in 2013 was 278. Also, "City of Eureka" is incorrect; Eureka is an unincorporated town.	Thank you for providing additional information regarding Eureka County. Socioeconomic information is presented from the U.S. Census Bureau rather than regional sites to allow for a standardized set of data that can be compared over time. The information in Section 3.6.2.3.3 (Eureka County), third paragraph, second sentence was updated to be consistent with information on the Eureka County website. The information regarding current enrollment Eureka County School District has been revised in the FEIS to reflect the latest information from Nevada Department of Education for the 2014–2015 school year, which is 247 students combined in the three schools.
Eureka Board of Commissioners - 7	Page 3.7-18 and 3.7-21, Economics and Usability: Second paragraph is unclear as to whether the Alternatives proposed will or will not affect economic activity, especially related to the use of the Eureka airport. Is scheduling of airspace going to be more difficult? Are there any changes for private pilots flying aircraft to and from the Eureka airport? Does the increase in training prevent or inhibit the use of the Eureka airport for economic development projects? These comments also affect Table 3.7-7.	The increase under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 would not affect local aviation traffic or the process of scheduling use of military airspace. Local aviators still need to coordinate activities that require entrance into Restricted Airspace during active hours with air traffic control. Additionally, the increase in air activities under Alternative 1 and 2 do not result in changes to the rules private pilots follow flying to and from Eureka airport. Therefore, the proposed increase in training does not prevent or inhibit the use of the Eureka airport for economic development projects.
Eureka Board of Commissioners - 8	Page 3.8-10 Table 3.8-2 FAA Registered Airfields Under or Near the FRTC SUA: Table does not list Eureka Airport (05U) which is closer to	Where appropriate, the Final EIS has been revised to indicate the location and distance information for the Eureka Airport.

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
	<p>the FRTC than Elko Airport or Ely airport. We believe that it is appropriate to list the Eureka Airport because activity at the airport is subject to and influenced by FRTC flight rules and activity.</p>	
<p>Nevada Division of Environmental Protection Bureau of Water Pollution Control (NDEP-BWPC)</p>	<p>The Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP), Bureau of Water Pollution Control (BWPC) has received the aforementioned State Clearinghouse item and offers the following comments:</p> <p>The project may be subject to BWPC permitting. Permits are required for discharges to surface waters and groundwater's of the State (Nevada Administrative Code NAC 445A.228). BWPC permits include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stormwater Industrial General Permit</li> <li>• De Minimis Discharge General Permit</li> <li>• Pesticide General Permit</li> <li>• Drainage Well General Permit</li> <li>• Temporary Permit for Discharges to Groundwater's of the State</li> <li>• Working in Waters Permit</li> <li>• Wastewater Discharge Permits</li> <li>• Underground Injection Control Permits</li> <li>• Onsite Sewage Disposal System Permits</li> <li>• Holding Tank Permits</li> </ul> <p>Please note that discharge permits must be issued from this Division before construction of any treatment works (Nevada Revised Statute 445A.585).</p> <p>For more information on BWPC Permitting, please visit our website at: <a href="http://ndep.nv.gov/bwpc/index.htm">http://ndep.nv.gov/bwpc/index.htm</a>.</p>	<p>The Navy has reviewed the proposed training activities and the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP), Bureau of Water Pollution Control (BWPC) permitting requirements, and has determined that BWPC permits are not applicable to the proposed training activities.</p>
<p>(NDEP-BWPC-02)</p>	<p>Additionally, the applicant is responsible for all other permits that may be required, which may include, but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dam Safety Permits - Division of Water Resources</li> <li>• Well Permits - Division of Water Resources</li> <li>• 401 Water Quality Certification - NDEP</li> </ul>	<p>The Navy has reviewed the proposed training activities and the other permitting requirements, and has determined that other permits are not applicable to the proposed training activities.</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 404 Permits - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</li> <li>• Air Permits - NDEP</li> <li>• Health Permits - Local Health or State Health Division</li> <li>• Local Permits - Local Government</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for the information and the opportunity to comment.</p>	
<p>Skip Canfield State Land Use Planning Agency</p> <p>Nevada Division of State Lands</p> <p>Department of Conservation and Natural Resources</p>	<p>As part of the DEIS - NAS Fallon Range Training Complex - Readiness Activities project, please consider the cumulative visual impacts from development activities (temporary and permanent).</p> <p>Utilize appropriate lighting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilize consistent lighting mitigation measures that follow “Dark Sky” lighting practices.</li> <li>• Effective lighting should have screens that do not allow the bulb to shine up or out. All proposed lighting shall be located to avoid light pollution onto any adjacent lands as viewed from a distance. All lighting fixtures shall be hooded and shielded, face downward, located within soffits and directed on to the pertinent site only, and away from adjacent parcels or areas.</li> <li>• Any required FAA lighting should be consolidated and minimized wherever possible.</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Action does not include any new temporary or permanent development or construction activities. Therefore, no new lighting sources are proposed.</p>
<p>John Christopherson, Natural Resource Program Manager Nevada State Division of Forestry</p>	<p>The EIS does not address potential impacts to plants on the Nevada State List of Critically Endangered Plants. On Page 3.5-10 of the document, Section 3.5.2.2.1 “Special Status Species”, the EIS states there are no Federally listed plant species known to exist on Navy-administered lands of the FRTC. However, there is no mention made of State-listed plants. It is not clear if the EIS authors checked with the Nevada Natural Heritage Program for the potential for state-listed plants in FRTC.</p>	<p>The Nevada Natural Heritage Program was checked for listing of all species in Churchill County and cross checked with the plant inventory listed in the 2014 Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan for NAS Fallon. The statement on page 3.5-10 of the Final EIS has been updated to indicate that there are 4 species of plants that could occur on NAS Fallon-administered lands (none greater than an S2S3 status). These species are included in the analysis on vegetation from ground-disturbing activities at FRTC.</p>

Table F.3-3 contains comments from tribes received during the public comment period and the Navy's response. Responses to these comments were prepared and reviewed for scientific and technical accuracy and completeness. Comments appear as they were submitted and have not been altered with the exception that expletives, addresses, and phone numbers have been removed, as necessary.

**Table F.3-3: Responses to Comments from Tribes**

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
Cynthia Ocegüera	<p>01/23/2015 federal Register sites the Notice of Public Meeting for the draft environmental impact statement for Military Readiness Activities at the Fallon Range Training complex. I have not seen improved signage for this site for years. Walker River Paiute Reservation consists of over 323,406 acres of which the training site is located. I have learned we were not included in the communications as indicated per federal register. I encourage notification of future activities be directed to our Tribal Chairman Bobby Sanchez and the Tribal Council Members in a timely manner for our leadership to attend consultations. We Learned about the meeting in Fallon on the 23 of Febuary that was held on the 19th. To be respectful of our leadership I find myself disappointed we have not been included through not fault of ours. I further understand their has been two Naval Commander changes since our Mou and Resolution was completed. I have recommended both items be updated To our Chairman and Vice Chairman, Randall Jack. I have interviewed other elders, community people ans staff who have comments I have permission to share.</p>	<p>On May 16, 2013, notice of intent correspondence were mailed to the Honorable Lorren Samnaripa, Chairman of the Walker River Paiute Tribe. Additionally, letters of availability and notification of public meeting were mailed to the tribes on January 23, 2015. As described at the beginning of this Appendix, additional regional outreach occurred, including newspaper publications, postcard mailers, news releases, and Public Service Announcements, all of which indicated the date, time, and location of the public meeting. We appreciate the inclusion of an updated contact for the Tribal Chairman in your Draft EIS comment.</p> <p>As a result of your comment, the Navy sent letters to the federally recognized Tribes in the region (which was followed up with confirmation of receipt) which continued consultation in regard to the subject Undertaking in accordance with 36 CFR 800, regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 (16 USC 470f), as amended. Additionally, the Navy offered the opportunity to meet face-to-face with each tribe to discuss the Undertaking in early June 2015. The Walker River Paiute Tribe was the only tribe that accepted the Navy's invitation for a meeting. The meeting was held June 1, 2015, and additional communications have occurred since the meeting. The Navy has initiated Government-to-Government contact to express its desire to pursue a Memorandum of Agreement with the Tribe to enhance communications and foster a long-term working relationship with the Tribe on items of mutual interest.</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
Oceguera - 2	<p>Corey Tom, Tribal Air Quality Tech, shares my concern for the Ozone Levels. Mr. Tom stated he believes Fallon was approaching the National Standard and EPA lowered the standard. "What impact will the increased flights have on the new standard?" He believes it would push Fallon over the National Standard. Walker River Tribe should be monitoring the Ozone Levels but presently is not. We would like the opportunity to have a plan to get this program to us? What are the plans for the monitoring of the Ozone levels?</p>	<p>The process for changing the emissions standards is an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) process and occurs independently of Naval readiness activities. In 2008, the EPA significantly strengthened its national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for ground-level ozone, the primary component of smog. The Air Quality Trend Report 2000–2010 (Nevada Division of Environmental Protection 2011) indicated that for ground-level ozone, the ambient concentrations of O<sub>3</sub> have remained steady and below the current 2008 national ambient air quality standards. Section 3.2 (Air Quality) of the EIS analyses the historical and anticipated levels of ozone and concluded that there would be small increase relative to baseline Nevada emissions. Measurable changes in air quality would be expected locally, but the attainment status in the Northwest Nevada Intrastate Air Quality Control Region and Nevada Intrastate Air Quality Control Region would not be affected.</p> <p>With regards to air quality monitoring in the region, the Nevada Air Pollution Control Program operates a network of monitoring stations across Nevada's 15 rural counties. The monitors conform to all U.S. Environmental Protection Agency siting criteria and are situated to measure air quality in both rural and urbanized portions of Nevada's 15 rural counties: Carson City, Churchill, Douglas, Elko, Esmeralda, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, Lincoln, Lyon, Mineral, Nye, Pershing, Storey, and White Pine.</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
Oceguera - 3	<p>We are a small community but involved with the impact of our affairs to protect future environmental concerns, culture, safety issues and other potential opportunities to identify the disturbed areas already contaminated. Thousands of acres of land is contaminated and vegetation has not been addressed which was due to UXO contamination. This should also be a consideration in the project plan or the tribe can bring forth further negotiations in an updated MOU. Please note the following from draft: 3.3.3.1.1 Potential Release of Contaminants; 3.4.1.1.1 Sound Characteristics; 3.7.1.3 Approach to Analysis. We would be very interested in the analysis of the potential for adverse human health or environmental effects to Walker River Tribe and other tribal reservations. The future consultations with Walker River so we may be involved in the decision making process is appreciated. What data is available for the historical suffering from environmental health risks and hazards. our tribal government remains our constant despite our lack of resources and remote surroundings. I would ask our concerns be addressed in the process of developing the final report for approval. We do support the protection and the continued training of our military personnel. Prior to increased bombings happen, I encourage bringing tribes to the current status of MOU's and Tribal Resolutions. Thank you for this opportunity to voice my comments. I look forward to hearing from you in regards to the response for the final report. Respectfully submitted Cynthia Oceguera</p>	<p>The issue of inadvertent release of munitions on the Walker River Paiute Reservation became apparent in February 1989. The Navy implemented operational changes in November 1989 to reduce or eliminate subsequent off-range munitions, including reorienting strafing/bomb run-in lines and increasing surveillance of all drops. These operational changes have been effective based on NAWDC Range Office data, which show no incidents of off-range munitions at B-19 from 2001 through present (September 2015).</p> <p>In addition to the operational changes, the Navy conducted UXO survey and clearance on affected portions of the Reservation in 1989–1990 and 1998–1999. The Walker River Paiute Tribe and Navy have considered several alternatives to bring closure to the issue, but have not yet reached a final resolution. Resolution of the off-range munitions issue is will continue to be addressed with the Walker River Paiute Tribe and is not considered further in this EIS.</p> <p>In accordance with Executive Order 13175, <i>Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments</i>, DoD policies, the National Historic Preservation Act, and Navy instructions, the Navy engaged in Tribal consultations following release of the FRTC Draft EIS. Additional consultation efforts were initiated in spring 2015, which included follow-up communications with the Walker River Paiute Tribe, an in-person meeting with the Tribe on June 1, 2015, and additional communications following the meeting. The Navy has initiated Government-to-Government contact to express its desire to pursue a Memorandum of Agreement to enhance communications and foster a long-term working relationship with the Tribe on items of mutual interest.</p>

Table F.3-4 contains comments from private individuals received during the public comment period and the Navy's response. Responses to these comments were prepared and reviewed for scientific and technical accuracy and completeness. Comments appear as they were submitted and have not been altered with the exception that expletives, addresses, and phone numbers have been removed, as necessary.

**Table F.3-4: Responses to Comments from Private Individuals**

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
<p>Adell Panning Private Individual (online)</p>	<p>My biggest concern with all of this is the fact that in short reading of this HUGE document it looks as if you are increasing the amount of flying over our town. We have had structural damage to our home due to the sonic booms caused by this training as well as the over all shock when they hit. It has for years caused our animals to become upset. I know for a fact that there have been numerous complaints put in on this. I am all for training and support you completely on that fact but with all of the unpopulated areas in this state I simply do not understand why you need to fly over any populated area for this training. My next concern is this document itself. Do you really think that the general public will be able to understand all that is in here? I am far from undereducated and 10 pages into it I was ready to be finished. I don't feel that you have explained the true impact that this can cause in terms that the general public of this area will understand. Lastly, why is the public meeting only being held in Fallon? Is there going to be a public meeting in Crescent Valley?</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the NEPA process. Under the Proposed Action, the number of flight activities will increase compared to the No Action Alternative. The Navy recognizes its proximity to surrounding communities and has attempted to structure its training activities to achieve operational readiness while minimizing any potential impact to the surrounding area. In light of this proximity, the Navy has developed management practices and operating procedures for activities that may cause an impact to the environment or surrounding area and has presented these in the EIS (Section 3.4.1.2 [Regulatory Framework and Management Practices]). With regards to noise complaints, the Navy's Public Affairs Officer at NAS can be contacted for noise complaints and operational suggestions at 702-426-2880. The decision to conduct a single meeting in Fallon, NV, during the public comment period was partially a result of minimal public contribution during the scoping period (only four comments were submitted at the scoping meetings, none negative). For most regional issues, local political and volunteer communication in the area is electronic, therefore it was determined that NEPA outreach and public involvement requirements could be met with a single public meeting combined with public notification efforts via newspaper, website, postcard mailers, fliers, and news releases.</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
<p>Jean Public Private Individual (online)</p>	<p>oppose this project at fallon because of the contamination and pollution that the us military brings to every site they have ever had in this country. then the military doesnt tell its employees of the toxicity and they die of cancer. no more land should be given to the ilitary in america. use what you previously had, that is enough. you are full of greed to destroy nature. we dont want that. wild horses need to live in nevada. the blm is killing them all. selling them to slaughterers etc and forcing them to live in horrific brutal conditions in corrals. you are causing this. ugly as sin i say</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the NEPA process. The purpose of the NEPA process is to insure that environmental information is available to public officials and citizens before decisions are made and before actions are taken. This Draft and Final EIS analyzes the potential environmental effects of the proposed action. Detailed analysis is provided on Soils (Section 3.1), Air Quality (Section 3.2), Public Health and Safety (Section 3.10), and Biological Resources (Section 3.5).</p>
<p>Frank Whitman (mail)</p>	<p>Sage Grouse ..... The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will decide Sept 15th of this year whether to list the bird as endangered. I don't see any thing in your document acknowledging this potential.</p>	<p>Since the publication of the Draft EIS, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service has determined that the Bi-State population of greater sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>) does not require the protection of the ESA (80 FR 22827) and has removed the Bi-State greater sage-grouse from the list of candidate species. Further, an unprecedented, landscape-scale conservation effort across the western United States has significantly reduced threats to the greater sage-grouse across 90 percent of the species' breeding habitat and enabled the USFWS to conclude that the greater sage grouse does not warrant protection under ESA (Docket Number FWS-R6-ES-2015-0146). This collaborative, science-based greater sage-grouse strategy is the largest land conservation effort in U.S. history.</p> <p>While the Draft EIS did not mention an anticipated date of decision for the greater sage grouse, it presented its current status as a Candidate species as well as mentioned that the Bi-State Distinct Population Segment (DPS) is proposed to be listed as threatened under the ESA, with a special rule in addition to the proposed listing. Additionally, at the time of the DEIS publication, there had yet to be a determination for critical habitat for the sage grouse under ESA.</p>

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
Whitman - 2	My concern is about sonic booms and leking/mating season. Some of the areas designated for super sonic training are in areas identified as critical sage grouse habitat. The Marines over to Sweetwater suspend flight operations during leking season. There must be some reason, and I don't see any reference to noise impacts on sage grouse in the document.	<p>The Draft EIS states that the response to sonic booms or other sudden disturbances is similar among many wildlife species— sudden and unfamiliar sounds usually act as an alarm and trigger a “fight or flight” startle reaction. The startling effect of a sonic boom can be stressful to an animal. This reaction to stress causes physiological changes in the neural and endocrine systems, including increased blood pressure and higher levels of available glucose and corticosteroids in the bloodstream. Continued disturbances and prolonged exposure to severe stress could deplete nutrients available to the animal. However, sonic booms are not expected to cause more than a temporary startle-response because the “pursuit” would not be present. Activities at the referenced marine training location are suspended during leking season as activities there consist of landing activities and equipment drops, which would represent a higher level of disturbance than aircraft overflights as marine training includes the physical presence of humans on the ground.</p> <p>Given the historical use of the airspace, and the persistence of aircraft operations and wildlife populations, wildlife within the Military Operations Areas are likely habituated to aircraft overflights and associated noise (e.g., sonic booms).</p> <p>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 on a regular basis. 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.</p>
Whitman - 3	Sonic Booms ..... You should install noise sensitivity sensor in the Austin canyon. It would be easy to then clarify how big a boom is	Sonic booms are a normal, though uncommon, part of essential Naval Aviation training activities at the Fallon Range

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
	<p>boom when the citizens call in and complain. Or when they want to file damage reports for broken windows. The timing of the sonic booms is also an issue. please no booms before 0900.</p> <p>Sincerely Frank Whitman</p>	<p>Training Complex. The range normally opens for operations at 7:30am. Realistic training requires large numbers of complexly integrated forces training in all conditions, day and night, and such high volume of complex training activities dictates schedules.</p> <p>The Navy strives to minimize the impact of aircraft noise on the public while still accomplishing its mission. Populated locations are designated as Noise Sensitive Areas and are to be avoided by a minimum of 3000 feet in accordance with FAA regulations and Navy doctrine. Supersonic activities in the areas of concern are restricted to altitudes greater than 30,000 feet.</p> <p>Additional noise monitoring systems are deemed unnecessary as the Navy monitors activities within the range with radar and telemetry systems.</p> <p>Noise complaints are taken through the hotline number (775) 426-2419. Reports are compared to schedules and telemetry to determine whether flight rules were violated and then handled by the Navy accordingly.</p>