

**Air National Guard  
F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II  
Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft Executive Summary**



**January 2024**

*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft – January 2024*

---

This volume contains the printed Executive Summary of the Air National Guard (ANG) F-15EX Eagle II and F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). To obtain a full copy of the Draft EIS, you can download it at <https://angf15ex-f35a-eis.com>.

For questions or more information, contact:

Mr. Will Strickland

NGB/A4AM

3501 Fetchet Avenue

Joint Base Andrews, MD 2076205157

(240) 612-7042

Email: [NGB.A4.A4A.NEPA.COMMENTS.org@us.af.mil](mailto:NGB.A4.A4A.NEPA.COMMENTS.org@us.af.mil)

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... ES-1**

Airfield Operations ..... ES-7

Construction and Modification of Facilities ..... ES-7

Personnel..... ES-8

Training Airspace and Range Operations ..... ES-8

Defensive Countermeasures and Ordnance Use ..... ES-10

Identification of the Preferred Alternative(s)..... ES-11

**FIGURES**

Figure ES-1 Existing F-15C/D ANG Fighter Wings Evaluated under the Proposed  
Action..... ES-2

**TABLES**

Table ES-1 Current and Estimated Proposed Annual Airfield Sorties by Aircraft Beddown  
Alternative..... ES-7

Table ES-2 Summary of Existing Airspace Units Currently Used by F-15C/D and  
Proposed for Use by F-15EX or F-35A Aircraft ..... ES-9



Table ES-3 Summary of Impacts ..... ES-12

This page intentionally left blank.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with the National Guard Bureau (NGB) and Department of Air Force (DAF) proposal to maintain the combat capability of the Air National Guard (ANG) fighter wings currently flying the F-15C/D aircraft. These aircraft have reached the end of their lifespan and will be phased out due to safety and maintenance concerns. These fighter wings (that are not already undergoing similar evaluation) include the 104th Fighter Wing (104 FW) at Westfield-Barnes Regional Airport (BAF) in Westfield, Massachusetts (MA); the 144th Fighter Wing (144 FW) at Fresno Yosemite International Airport (FAT) in Fresno, California (CA); and the 159th Fighter Wing (159 FW) at Naval Air Station (NAS) Joint Reserve Base (JRB) New Orleans, in Belle Chasse, Louisiana (LA) (Figure ES-1). The proposal is the beddown, operation, and associated infrastructure construction of one squadron of F-15EX Eagle II (F-15EX) aircraft at two of these fighter wings and one squadron of F-35A Lightning II (F-35A) aircraft at either the 104 FW or the 159 FW. These aircraft would replace the aging F-15C/D fighter aircraft at the selected wings. It is also conceivable that one or more of these fighter wings would retain the legacy F-15C/D aircraft for the foreseeable future and construction associated with that alternative would be implemented to support the current legacy aircraft. Under the No Action Alternative, each fighter wing would retain their F-15C/D aircraft, and no construction in support of the continuing mission would occur.

The DAF and NGB are the co-lead agencies for the Proposed Action and are responsible for the scope and content of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and United States (U.S.) Department of the Navy (DON) are cooperating agencies for this EIS. The FAA is serving as a cooperating agency because the scope of the Proposed Action and alternatives involve activities under its jurisdiction by law and for which it has special expertise. The DON was invited to be a cooperating agency because the Navy is the land-holding command at NAS JRB New Orleans, has a connected federal action subject to National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and has subject matter requirements and relevant expertise. The NGB, FAA, and DON coordinated from the outset and developed this document to meet each agency's distinct obligations under the NEPA of 1969 (42 United States Code [USC] 4321-4347) to support the decision-making of all three agencies.



**Figure ES-1 Existing F-15C/D ANG Fighter Wings Evaluated under the Proposed Action**



In accordance with NEPA of 1969 (42 USC 4321-4347), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) *Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA* (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500–1508), and 32 CFR Part 989 et seq., *Environmental Impact Analysis Process* (EIAP); FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*; and 32 CFR Part 775, *Policies and Responsibilities for Implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act Within the Department of the Navy*, the NGB has prepared this Draft EIS. The DAF and NGB use a systematic, interdisciplinary approach to consider the potential consequences to the quality of the human environment and important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage that may result from implementation of this action.

The DAF and NGB have released this Draft EIS to the public and agencies for review and comment. A Notice of Availability was published in the Federal Register, newspaper advertisements were published, press releases were announced, flyers were posted, and letters accompanied the direct mailing of this Draft EIS document. This Draft EIS has been posted on a publicly accessible website at [www.ANGF15EX-F35A-EIS.com](http://www.ANGF15EX-F35A-EIS.com). Copies of this Draft EIS document were also sent to local document repositories.

The Draft EIS public comment period must be a minimum of 45 days beginning on the Notice of Availability publication date. All substantive comments received prior to the close of the public comment period will be considered during preparation of the Final EIS. The DAF and NGB respond to substantive comments on a Draft EIS in the Final EIS, consistent with 40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1503.4. Substantive comments are regarded as those comments that challenge the analysis, methodologies, or information in the Draft EIS as being factually inaccurate or analytically inadequate; identify impacts not analyzed or identify reasonable alternatives or feasible mitigations not considered by the agency; or offer specific information that may have a bearing on the decision such as differences in interpretations of significance, scientific data, or technical conclusions. Non-substantive comments, which do not require a DAF or NGB response, are generally considered those comments that express a conclusion, an opinion, or a vote for or against the proposal itself, or some aspect of it; state a position for or against a particular alternative; or otherwise state a personal preference or opinion.

## **PURPOSE AND NEED**

The federal mission of these ANG units is to support the DAF by maintaining well-trained, well-equipped units available for prompt mobilization during wartime and to provide assistance during national emergencies. To meet these requirements, the NGB must operate combat and support aircraft and train personnel for the job, according to the training requirements established by Air Combat Command through its Ready Aircrew Program (RAP). In order to do so, the NGB must

acquire and train with the current DAF aircraft, including the F-15EX and F-35A. The purpose of the Proposed Action is to maintain combat capability and mission readiness for NGB's 104 FW in Westfield-Barnes, MA; 144 FW in Fresno, CA; and 159 FW in New Orleans, LA. Beddown and operation of the F-15EX and F-35A to replace the aging F-15C/D fleet at the 104 FW, 144 FW (F-15EX only), and 159 FW would enable this goal. These beddown actions and associated training would ensure availability of combat-ready pilots in the most advanced fighter aircraft in the world.

Since the Proposed Action involves construction of infrastructure necessary to support the F-15EX and F-35A basing at two candidate civil airport locations, the airport owner/operator would need to request approval from the FAA for certain changes to their Airport Layout Plans (ALPs). Thus, FAA's federal action is the approval of the respective civilian ALP. The purpose and need of the FAA's action is to ensure the components of the Proposed Action subject to FAA approval do not derogate aviation safety and meet FAA airport design standards at BAF and FAT. The DON's federal action is approval of the Proposed Action occurring at NAS JRB New Orleans. The purpose and need of the DON's action is to support NGB in maintaining the combat capability and mission readiness of the ANG's 159 FW while ensuring the components of the Proposed Action do not impede ongoing mission requirements at NAS JRB New Orleans.

The F-15C/D fleet is reaching the end of its service life. The DAF determines the service life of a fleet based on capability and structural integrity of the aircraft constrained by economic reality. Theoretically, with unlimited funding, it would be possible to fly an aircraft forever, but eventually it is more cost- and capability-effective to replace older aircraft with newer aircraft. The DAF has decided it is not optimal to retain the F-15C/D aircraft beyond fiscal year (FY) 2026 and has already begun to retire aircraft that are reaching the end of their service life.

The F-15C/D aircraft currently based at these three NGB fighter wings face increased maintenance issues due to the age of the aircraft that limit flying ability and can present pilot and public safety hazards. The fighter aircraft need to be replaced due to attrition, decreasing service life, and because new F-15C/D aircraft are no longer being manufactured. The F-15EX and F-35A are solutions to the F-15C/D that maintains capacity to conduct the mission and adds capability to the DAF while preserving the Air Superiority and Homeland Defense missions. The F-15EX and F-35A aircraft offer next generation technologies that will ensure the U.S. military remains ahead of current and evolving threats.

#### **ALTERNATIVE IDENTIFICATION PROCESS METHODOLOGY**

Identification and analysis of alternatives is one of the core elements of the EIAP under NEPA and the DAF's implementing regulations. The Secretary of the Air Force may expressly eliminate



alternatives from detailed analysis based on reasonable selection standards (32 CFR 989.8[c]). Based on extensive analysis by the NGB and DAF operations communities, a study was conducted to determine the specific requirements for beddowns of the F-15EX and F-35A aircraft and to identify potential military installations where these beddowns could occur. Following this study, the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force approved selection criteria for beddown.

In general, the DAF uses the strategic basing process outlined in Department of the Air Force Instruction (DAFI) 10-503 (2023) to identify potential locations to beddown missions. The process begins by determining an enterprise definition from which potential installations could be identified. This enterprise of installations is then evaluated using objective criteria to screen the top alternative installations. Site surveys are then conducted at each alternative location to determine if the installation could reasonably support the mission in question. The Strategic Basing Group oversees the process and reports findings directly to the Secretary of the Air Force and Chief of Staff of the Air Force. This process was mandated by the Secretary of the Air Force to ensure basing decisions were made using a standardized, repeatable, transparent process. These F-15EX and F-35A basing decisions followed this general basing process. The following planning conventions were followed:

1. Identify the number of F-15EX aircraft scheduled to be delivered between 2027 and 2028 and F-35A scheduled to be delivered in 2026. This time period corresponded to the Department of Defense 2020–2024 Future Years Defense Program, which is the program and financial plan approved by the Secretary of Defense and provides a basis for DAF planning. Planning beyond this time period is speculative due to the uncertainty of funding availability.
2. Identify the number of F-15EX and F-35A aircraft to be allocated to operations based on then-current national strategic considerations.
3. Determine the enterprise definition, from which the number of potential locations capable of supporting one squadron of at least 21 F-15EX Primary Aerospace Vehicle Authorized (PAA) or at least 21 F-35A PAA can be identified. The PAA are those assigned to meet the primary aircraft authorization and reflect the number of aircraft flown by a unit in performance of its mission.
4. Recognize additional factors of Plans and Guidance and Global Posture, which include strategic considerations but do not provide meaningful distinction among installations for ANG training within the U.S. and its territories.
5. Determine if the candidate beddown locations can accommodate the new construction associated with the F-15EX or F-35A beddowns within the necessary timeframe in order to maintain operational readiness.

Consideration of the planning conventions above led to an initial screening of all alternative locations against the following standards:

1. a unit that currently supports an F-15C/D fighter aircraft mission,
2. units that are not formal training units, and
3. the installation has to be located in the contiguous U.S. (Continental U.S.).

The Proposed Action was limited to ANG units that are currently assigned the F-15C/D since the DAF has determined that it is not optimal to retain the F-15C/D aircraft beyond FY 2026 and has already begun to retire aircraft that are reaching the end of their service life. The DAF needs to replace F-15C/D aircraft with new fighter aircraft. The only two active fighter procurement programs in the DAF are the F-15EX and the F-35A. Application of these standards resulted in three fighter wings being considered for the Proposed Action: the 104 FW (F-15EX or F-35A), the 144 FW (F-15EX only), and the 159 FW (F-15EX or F-35A).

#### **PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES**

The Proposed Action is the beddown, operation, and associated infrastructure construction of one squadron of F-15EX aircraft at two of these fighter wings and one squadron of F-35A aircraft at either the 104 FW or the 159 FW. These aircraft would replace the aging F-15C/D fighter aircraft at the selected wings. Should the DAF decide to not base either the F-15EX or the F-35A at one or more of the three wings that currently fly the F-15C/D aircraft (104 FW, 144 FW, 159 FW), it would be imperative to continue to support their mission with the required construction, infrastructure, and maintenance activities necessary to continue their mission into the foreseeable future, however long that may be with the F-15C/D aircraft. The facility and infrastructure construction required for continuing the legacy F-15C/D mission is also evaluated in this EIS for the three fighter wings and is referred to as the “F-15C/D Legacy Aircraft Alternative” in this EIS.

The Proposed Action also includes additional personnel needed to operate and maintain the F-15EX or F-35A, and construction of new and/or modification of existing facilities on the installations supporting the beddowns. Pilots operating the aircraft would conduct training from the installation and in existing Special Use Airspace (SUA) associated with each proposed location. No new SUA or reconfiguration of existing SUA is proposed to support the beddowns for any of these fighter wings; however, there would likely be an increase in operations within the SUA.

The beddown process would occur in phases associated with the manufacture and delivery of F-15EX or F-35A aircraft. Delivery of the first aircraft to an installation would be expected to be in FY 2027–28 for the F-15EX, and as early as 2026 for the F-35A; and the last aircraft delivery

is scheduled to be completed within 6–12 months following initial aircraft arrival, at which time the full complement of 21 PAA (plus 2 Backup Aerospace Vehicle Authorized [BAA] and 1 Attrition Reserve [AR]) F-15EX aircraft or 21 PAA (plus 2 BAAs) F-35A aircraft would be based at the selected fighter wing installations.

To provide the training needed to ensure combat readiness, F-15EX and F-35A aircrews would conduct operations in two types of areas: (1) an airfield associated with an installation, and (2) training ranges and SUA. Additionally, pilots flying the F-15EX and F-35A would use ground-based flight simulators extensively. Simulator training includes all facets of flight operations and comprehensive emergency procedures.

### **Airfield Operations**

The annual flying program for both the F-15EX and the F-35A is 250 hours per aircraft. Though each aircraft may not achieve the full amount of annual flying hours, this analysis will evaluate the full 250 hours per aircraft. Thus, with 21 PAA proposed for either the F-15EX or the F-35A, the total flying hour program at any of these fighter wing installations would be 5,250 hours annually. The number of sorties conducted at each installation would vary depending on the average sortie duration for each fighter wing installation (Table ES-1), which depends upon each installation’s proximity to their training airspace.

**Table ES-1 Current and Estimated Proposed Annual Airfield Sorties by Aircraft Beddown Alternative**

<i>ANG Unit and Airfield</i>	<i>Existing Average Sortie Duration (hours)</i>	<i>Total Current F-15C/D Aircraft Sorties</i>	<i>Proposed F-15EX Sorties</i>	<i>Proposed F-35A Sorties</i>
104 FW, a tenant at BAF	1.65	1,900	3,182	3,182
144 FW, a tenant at FAT	1.60	1,811	3,281	N/A
159 FW, a tenant at NAS JRB New Orleans	1.37	1,850	3,832	3,832

*Legend:* 104 FW = 104th Fighter Wing; 144 FW = 144th Fighter Wing; 159 FW = 159th Fighter Wing; ANG = Air National Guard; BAF = Westfield-Barnes Regional Airport; FAT = Fresno Yosemite International Airport; JRB = Joint Reserve Base; N/A = not applicable; NAS = Naval Air Station.

### **Construction and Modification of Facilities**

To accommodate the F-15EX, F-35A, or retention of the legacy F-15C/D aircraft, the fighter wing installations selected for these aircraft beddowns would require both new construction and modification of some existing facilities. All construction would be located within the airport or DON installation boundaries. Examples of some basic facility and infrastructure requirements include:

- Squadron operations/maintenance facilities
- Hangars
- Simulator facilities
- Installation communications infrastructure
- Electrical system upgrades
- Other installation support facilities, such as an engine repair shop and aircraft parking aprons, which vary from installation to installation

While each fighter wing installation currently offers many of the necessary facilities for the proposed beddowns, none of them provide all of the required infrastructure and facilities to support the new aircraft. At each fighter wing location (BAF, FAT, and NAS JRB New Orleans), construction of new facilities and/or modification of existing facilities would be necessary, although the nature and magnitude of these efforts would differ among these locations. Much of the proposed construction and modifications would occur before the first new aircraft would arrive at the selected fighter wing installations but may continue after the first aircraft arrives. The duration of construction is dependent upon the complexity and breadth of development needed to support the beddowns. Construction projects that would support the legacy aircraft if any of these fighter wings were not selected for the F-15EX or the F-35A aircraft are also analyzed within this EIS.

### **Personnel**

The total number of ANG personnel at each fighter wing location would increase by approximately 80–100 people depending on the particular aircraft beddown alternative. For the F-15EX, it is estimated there would be an increase of 36 officers (including 21 combat system officers [CSOs]) and 65 enlisted persons. For the F-35A, it is estimated there would be an increase of 15 officers and 65 enlisted persons. The addition in personnel is, in part, to accommodate the increase in aircraft (from 18 to 21 PAA). Additionally, for the F-15EX, there is an accommodation for the CSO (in the second seat of the aircraft). If a fighter wing does not receive one of these new aircraft, then the number of personnel would not change from current conditions.

### **Training Airspace and Range Operations**

To fulfill the multiple roles currently performed by the F-15C/D aircraft they would be replacing, the F-15EX and/or F-35A pilots must conduct training exercises in the respective aircraft per the appropriate RAP to ensure combat readiness. All flight operations would take place in existing training airspace. No additions or alterations of training airspace are associated with the Proposed Action; however, there could be an increase in utilization of the SUA.

Most training occurs within SUA (including Warning Areas, Restricted Areas, and military operations areas [MOAs]) associated with Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace (ATCAAs). Because Warning Areas are offshore (and therefore remote from populations), there are often fewer restrictions on the activities there (such as for supersonic flight). Under this Proposed Action, there are no proposed changes to any SUA. Any new aircraft would use the same training airspace that the current F-15C/D aircraft use (Table ES-2).

**Table ES-2 Summary of Existing Airspace Units Currently Used by F-15C/D and Proposed for Use by F-15EX or F-35A Aircraft**

<i>Airspace Unit</i>	
<b>104 FW, Massachusetts (BAF)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adirondack MOA Complex</li> <li>• Carthage MOA Complex</li> <li>• Chugs MOA</li> <li>• Condor MOA Complex</li> <li>• Cranberry MOA</li> <li>• Laser ATCAA Complex</li> <li>• Lowville MOA</li> <li>• Lightning ATCAA Complex</li> <li>• Scotty ATCAA Complex</li> <li>• Tupper MOA Complex</li> <li>• Yankee MOA Complex</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R-5201</li> <li>• R-5202 Complex</li> <li>• W-105 Complex</li> </ul>
<b>144 FW, California (FAT) (F-15EX only)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bakersfield MOA</li> <li>• Barstow MOA</li> <li>• Bishop MOA</li> <li>• Buckhorn MOA</li> <li>• Foothill MOA Complex</li> <li>• Hunter MOA Complex</li> <li>• Isabella MOA</li> <li>• Lemoore MOA Complex</li> <li>• Owens MOA</li> <li>• Panamint MOA</li> <li>• Porterville MOA</li> <li>• Roberts MOA</li> <li>• Saline MOA</li> <li>• Shoshone MOA</li> <li>• Silver North MOA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R-2502 Complex</li> <li>• R-2504 Complex</li> <li>• R-2505</li> <li>• R-2506</li> <li>• R-2508 Complex</li> <li>• R-2513</li> <li>• R-2515</li> <li>• R-2524</li> <li>• W-283 Complex</li> <li>• W-285 Complex</li> <li>• W-532 Complex</li> </ul>
<b>159 FW, Louisiana (NAS JRB New Orleans)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Claiborne MOA Complex</li> <li>• Snake MOA Complex</li> <li>• Warrior MOA Complex</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R-3801 Complex</li> <li>• R-3803 Complex</li> <li>• R-3804 Complex</li> <li>• W-59 Complex</li> <li>• W-148 Complex</li> <li>• W-155 Complex</li> <li>• W-453 Complex</li> </ul>

*Legend:* 104 FW = 104th Fighter Wing; 144 FW = 144th Fighter Wing; 159 FW = 159th Fighter Wing; ATCAA = Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace; BAF = Westfield-Barnes Regional Airport; FAT = Fresno Yosemite International Airport; MOA = Military Operations Area; NAS = Naval Air Station; JRB = Joint Reserve Base; R- = Restricted Area; W- = Warning Area.

In general, F-15EX and F-35A pilots at each fighter wing installation would operate in FAA-approved MOAs, ATCAAs, Restricted Areas, and Warning Areas. Air-to-ground training would also include ordnance delivery, which would occur in existing Restricted Areas over the approved ranges. Should either the F-15EX or the F-35A be beddown at these alternative fighter wing installations, ranges proposed for use include:

- Adirondack Range Complex, New York (104 FW)
- Restricted Area (R-) 2508 Range Complex, CA (144 FW for F-15EX only.)
- Fort Polk Range, LA (159 FW)

### **Defensive Countermeasures and Ordnance Use**

Chaff and flares are the principal defensive countermeasures dispensed by military aircraft to evade attack by enemy air defense systems. Fighter pilots must train to employ defensive countermeasures, even for the F-35A, which possesses stealth features that substantially reduce its detectability. Chaff and flare deployment in authorized airspace associated with the alternatives is governed by AFI 11-214, Change 1 and local supplements based on safety and environmental considerations and limitations. This instruction establishes procedures governing the use of chaff and flares over ranges, other federally controlled lands, and nongovernment-owned or -controlled areas. The DAF has set standard minimum-release altitudes (AFI 11-214, Change 1, 2021) for flares over government-owned and -controlled lands. These standards, which vary from 300 to 900 feet above ground level (AGL) depending on the flare type, are designed to allow the flares to burn out completely at least 100 feet above the ground. Over nongovernment-controlled lands, flare release is restricted to a minimum of 2,000 feet AGL and above for all aircraft (and would be the same for F-15EX and F-35A aircraft). More restrictive altitude limits are followed for specific airspace units in response to local considerations, including wildfire threat levels. Flares can be dispensed in the offshore Warning Areas without altitude restrictions. The use of chaff requires approval from the FAA to ensure that it does not interfere with radar or communications used to direct air traffic. Use and limitations within SUA are defined in each unit's letter of agreement with the Air Route Traffic Control Center responsible for controlling the airspace. The allocation and use of defensive countermeasures is not expected to change from current usage with either the F-15EX or the F-35A. They would be used for Aerospace Control Alert (ACA) missions and would also be used in training. Each of the three units would continue to receive the same allocation of chaff and flares that they currently receive. They would be used at the same rates in the same places, subject to the same restrictions that exist now.

Air-to-air ordnance is used to destroy other aircraft and includes air-to-air missiles (AIM-120 and AIM-9) and the cannon. The F-15C/D and F-15EX have 20-millimeter (mm) cannon systems, and the F-35A cannon is 25mm. Air-to-ground ordnance is used for ground-based targets. There are

many types of air-to-ground ordnance, to include free-fall bombs (“dumb” bombs), and a variety of laser-guided (such as Paveway), global positioning system (GPS)-guided weapons (such as the Joint Direct Attack Munition family, Joint Standoff Weapon, and inertial guidance weapons such as Wind Correct Munitions Dispenser). Some munition types have multiple guidance options (such as Small Diameter Bomb).

The F-15C/D does not carry any air-to-ground ordnance since it does not have an air-to-ground mission. In support of air-to-air training missions, the F-15C/D carries training missiles and instrument pods (which help record the aircraft’s position for training purposes). These training aids do not release from the aircraft.

Legacy F-15C/D aircraft are also used in ACA missions supporting U.S. National Security. For these missions, the alert aircraft are loaded with live air-to-air missiles, and the cannon is loaded with 20mm gun rounds. For ANG locations where the fighter squadron is located on a civil airport, there are strict regulations about the storage, loading, flying, and unloading of these items.

In locations where the ANG beddown would be located on civilian airfields (BAF and FAT), the ANG squadrons would deploy to other locations to train with live air-to-ground ordnance. For the proposed location where the new beddown would be on a military airfield (NAS JRB New Orleans), the squadron would be able to store, load, and fly with air-to-ground ordnance similar to the other squadrons currently located at that location. Local regulations on safety for storage, handling, and use of ordnance would all remain as they are now.

### **Identification of the Preferred Alternative(s)**

Based on an evaluation of operational parameters, on April 18, 2023, the Secretary of the Air Force announced preferred alternatives for the 10th F-35A and 2nd and 3rd F-15EX Eagle II Operational Beddowns: the 104 FW was identified as the preferred location to host the next F-35A squadron and the 144 FW and 159 FW were identified as the preferred locations to host the F-15EX squadrons. According to the announcement, the new squadrons would consist of 18 F-35A PAA at the 104 FW at BAF and 18 F-15EX PAA each at both the 159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans and 144 FW at FAT. The Secretary of the Air Force makes the final basing decision for the F-35A location after the requisite environmental analysis (this EIS) is complete. The final decisions for the F-15EX locations and the signing of the Record of Decision are delegated to lower levels.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES**

Comparing and differentiating among alternatives are a fundamental premise of NEPA. For the basing alternatives and scenarios identified for this Proposed Action, summaries and comparisons of consequences are presented in Table ES-3.

**Table ES-3 Summary of Impacts**

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
<b>NOISE</b>			
F-15EX	<p>There would be 845 more acres off the airport property, 197 additional households, and 547 additional people that would be exposed to 65 dB DNL or greater. Six additional POIs would be exposed to 65 dB DNL. Thirty-five POIs would experience increases between 1 and 5 dB DNL. Under FAA standards, 10 POIs would experience significant increases while 304 households and 852 people would be affected. Five POIs, 621 households, and 1,811 people would experience a reportable increase in noise according to FAA criteria. Noise impacts in the vicinity of the airfield would be significant.</p> <p>Noise associated with the construction projects would be temporary and not significant.</p> <p>Fighter jet-generated noise would continue to dominate sound levels in the training airspace. <math>L_{dnmr}</math> and DNL would increase by up to 5 dB but remain in the 35–45 dB range, which is well below the 65 dB threshold considered for noise sensitive land uses and would not be significant within the SUA.</p>	<p>There would be 1,086 more acres off the airport property, 1,780 additional households, and 5,589 additional people that would be exposed to 65 dB CNEL or greater. Three additional POIs would be exposed to 65 dB CNEL. The CNEL at 2 POIs would decrease up to 2 dB, 4 POIs would not change, and 53 POIs would increase 1-6 dB. Under FAA standards, 7 POIs would experience significant increases while 1,924 households and 6,010 people would be affected. Six POIs, 5,063 households, and 14,977 people would experience a reportable increase in noise according to FAA criteria. Noise impacts in the vicinity of the airfield would be significant.</p> <p>Noise associated with the construction projects would be temporary and not significant.</p> <p>Fighter jet-generated noise would continue to dominate sound levels in the training airspace. <math>CNEL_{mr}</math> and CNEL would increase by up to 6 dB but remain in the 35–41 dB range, which is well below the 65 dB threshold considered for noise sensitive land uses and would not be significant within the SUA.</p>	<p>There would be 92 more acres off the airport property, though 136 fewer households, and 327 fewer people that would be exposed to 65 dB DNL or greater. The number of POIs exposed to 65 dB DNL would not change. The DNL at noise sensitive receptors would increase 1–4 dB at 29 POIs. Noise impacts in the vicinity of the airfield would not be significant.</p> <p>Noise associated with the construction projects would be temporary and not significant.</p> <p>Fighter jet-generated noise would continue to dominate sound levels in the training airspace. <math>L_{dnmr}</math> and DNL would increase by up to 6 dB but remain in the 35–46 dB range, which is well below the 65 dB threshold considered for noise sensitive land uses and would not be significant within the SUA.</p>



*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft – January 2024*

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
F-35A	<p>There would be 1,288 more acres off the airport property, 267 additional households, and 779 additional people that would be exposed to 65 dB DNL or greater. Four additional POIs would be exposed to 65 dB DNL. Thirty-one POIs would increase 1–7 dB DNL. Under FAA standards, 6 POIs would experience significant increases while 429 households and 1,212 people would be affected. Three POIs, 885 households, and 2,406 people would experience a reportable increase in noise according to FAA criteria. Noise impacts in the vicinity of the airfield would be significant.</p> <p>Noise associated with the construction projects would be temporary and not significant.</p> <p>Fighter jet-generated noise would continue to dominate sound levels in the training airspace. <math>L_{dnmr}</math> and DNL would increase by up to 7 dB but remain in the 35–47 dB range, which is well below the 65 dB threshold considered for noise sensitive land uses and would not be significant within the SUA.</p>	N/A	<p>There would be 1,127 more acres off the airport property, 508 additional households, and 1,320 additional people that would be exposed to 65 dB DNL or greater. The DNL at noise sensitive receptors would increase 1–4 dB at 41 POIs. Due to the increase of households and population exposed to greater than 65 dB DNL noise contours, impacts resulting from the F-35A beddown at NAS JRB New Orleans would be significant.</p> <p>Noise associated with the construction projects would be temporary and not be significant.</p> <p>Fighter jet-generated noise would continue to dominate sound levels in the training airspace. <math>L_{dnmr}</math> and DNL would increase by up to 8 dB but remain in the 35–48 dB range, which is well below the 65 dB threshold considered for noise sensitive land uses and would not be significant within the SUA.</p>
F-15C/D	<p>Impacts from aircraft noise would be the same as under the existing conditions/No Action Alternative and would not be significant. Impacts associated with construction would be temporary and less than significant.</p>	<p>Impacts from aircraft noise would be the same as under the existing conditions/No Action Alternative and would not be significant. Impacts associated with construction would be temporary and less than significant.</p>	<p>Impacts from aircraft noise would be the same as under the existing conditions/No Action Alternative and would not be significant. Impacts associated with construction would be temporary and less than significant.</p>
No Action	<p>There would be no change in aircraft, and no construction would occur. There would be no significant impacts.</p>	<p>There would be no change in aircraft, and no construction would occur. There would be no significant impacts.</p>	<p>There would be no change in aircraft, and no construction would occur. There would be no significant impacts.</p>

*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft – January 2024*

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
<b>AIRSPACE</b>			
F-15EX	The replacement of the F-15C with the F-15EX would not require changes in local airspace. Over time, the replacement of the F-15C aircraft at the installation could result in a 6.7 percent increase in total airfield operations at BAF. This increase in airfield operations would have a minimal effect on the local air traffic environment. Close coordination of scheduling and use of SUA would ensure safe air operations within the controlled airspace and SUA. Impacts would not be significant.	The replacement of the F-15C with the F-15EX would not require changes in local airspace. Over time, the replacement of the F-15C aircraft at the installation could result in a 3.6 percent increase in total airfield operations at FAT. This increase in airfield operations would have a minimal effect on the local air traffic environment. Close coordination of scheduling and use of SUA would ensure safe air operations within the controlled airspace and SUA. Impacts would not be significant.	The replacement of the F-15C/D with the F-15EX would not require changes in local airspace. Over time, the replacement of the F-15C/D aircraft at the installation could result in a 19.8 percent increase in total airfield operations at NAS JRB New Orleans. This increase in airfield operations would have a minimal effect on the local air traffic environment. Close coordination of scheduling and use of SUA would ensure safe air operations within the controlled airspace and SUA. Impacts would not be significant.
F-35A	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX and would not be significant.	N/A	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX and would not be significant.
F-15C/D	There would be no change in operations within the SUA or controlled airspace from the existing conditions/No Action Alternative. Impacts would not be significant.	There would be no change in operations within the SUA or controlled airspace from the existing conditions/No Action Alternative. Impacts would not be significant.	There would be no change in operations within the SUA or controlled airspace from the existing conditions/No Action Alternative. Impacts would not be significant.
No Action	Impacts would be as described for the F-15C/D and would not be significant.	Impacts would be as described for the F-15C/D and would not be significant.	Impacts would be as described for the F-15C/D and would not be significant.
<b>AIR QUALITY/CLIMATE CHANGE</b>			
F-15EX	The net change in emissions would not exceed the General Conformity thresholds for VOCs or NO <sub>x</sub> and would not exceed the comparative indicator thresholds for the remaining criteria pollutants. Impacts would not be significant.	The net change in emissions at either of the two locational scenarios would not exceed the <i>de minimis</i> thresholds for any criteria pollutant. As a result, the emissions are presumed to conform, as defined in 40 CFR 93.153(g), and no further action under the General Conformity Rule is required.	The net change in emissions resulting from implementation of the F-15EX Alternative would not exceed the NAAQS comparative indicator thresholds for any criteria pollutant. Long-term operational emissions associated with the aircraft activity and additional personnel commutes would increase over the existing conditions/No Action Alternative but would remain below the comparative indicator threshold for all criteria pollutants. Impacts would not be significant.

*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft – January 2024*

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
F-35A	The net change in emissions would not exceed the General Conformity thresholds for VOCs or NO <sub>x</sub> and would not exceed the comparative indicator thresholds for the remaining criteria pollutants. Impacts would not be significant.	N/A	The net change in emissions resulting from implementation of the F-35A Alternative would not exceed the comparative indicator thresholds for any criteria pollutant. Long-term operational emissions associated with the aircraft activity and additional personnel commutes would decrease when compared to the existing conditions/No Action Alternative for VOCs and CO, and all other criteria pollutants would increase over the existing conditions/No Action Alternative but would remain below the comparative indicator thresholds. Impacts would not be significant.
F-15C/D	There would be no increase in operations at BAF, though construction for the F-15C would occur. Construction activities would not result in exceedance of the <i>de minimis</i> thresholds for VOCs or NO <sub>x</sub> and would not exceed the comparative indicator thresholds for the remaining criteria pollutants. Impacts would not be significant.	There would be no increase in aircraft operations at FAT, though construction for the F-15C would occur. Emissions would be below the <i>de minimis</i> and comparative thresholds for all criteria pollutants. Construction activities would not result in significant air quality impacts.	There would be no increase in operations at NAS JRB New Orleans, though construction for the F-15C/D would occur. Construction activities would not result in significant air quality impacts.
No Action	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on air quality.	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on air quality.	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on air quality.

*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft – January 2024*

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
<b>SOCIOECONOMICS/ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE/CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND SAFETY</b>			
F-15EX	Construction projects would lead to minor beneficial impacts on the local economy and employment. A substantial portion of the workforce could be supplied by the local construction industry, so impacts from non-local construction workers moving into the area would be minimal. Under the F-15EX Alternative, impacts on minority or low-income populations would not be disproportionate. However, there would be a higher percentage of children under the age of 18 and elderly within the projected noise contours than compared to the reference counties, and therefore, applying DoD criteria, they would be disproportionately impacted.	Construction projects would lead to minor beneficial impacts on the local economy and employment. A substantial portion of the workforce could be supplied by the local construction industry or from within commuting distance, so impacts from non-local construction workers moving into the area would be minimal. Under the F-15EX Alternative, there would be a higher percentage of minority and low-income populations affected than the reference community, thus applying criteria, impacts on minority and low-income populations would be disproportionate. There would be a higher percentage of children under the age of 18 impacted than the reference community, and therefore, applying DoD criteria, they would be considered disproportionate, while impacts on the elderly population would not be disproportionate.	Construction projects would lead to minor beneficial impacts on the local economy and employment. A substantial portion of the workforce could be supplied by the local construction industry, so impacts from non-local construction workers moving into the area would be minimal. Under the F-15EX Alternative, impacts on minority populations would not be disproportionate, whereas impacts on low-income populations would be slightly higher than the three-Parish reference group. The percent of children under 18 years of age and the elderly that would be affected by the F-15EX noise contours would both be below the three-Parish reference group.
F-35A	Under the F-35A Alternative, impacts on minority or low-income populations would not be disproportionate. However, there would be a higher percentage of children under the age of 18 and elderly within the projected noise contours than compared to the reference counties, and therefore, applying DoD criteria, they would be disproportionately impacted.	N/A	Under the F-35A Alternative, the percent of minority, low-income, children under the age of 18, and the elderly would all be below the three-Parish reference populations, and therefore would not be disproportionate.

*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft – January 2024*

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
F-15C/D	There would be no increase in operations at BAF, though construction for the F-15C would occur. Construction activities would not result in significant socioeconomic or environmental justice impacts.	As with the F-15EX Alternative, construction projects would lead to minor beneficial impacts on the local economy and employment. Impacts on minority and low-income populations would not be disproportionate. Similarly, impacts on children under the age of 18 or the elderly population would not be disproportionate.	There would be no increase in operations at NAS JRB New Orleans, though construction for the F-15C/D would occur. Construction activities would not result in significant socioeconomic or environmental justice impacts.
No Action	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. Minor economic benefits from construction activities would not be realized. Impacts on socioeconomics would not be significant and impacts on environmental justice, children’s health and safety, and elderly would not be disproportionate.	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. Minor economic benefits from construction activities would not be realized. Impacts on socioeconomics would not be significant and impacts on environmental justice, children’s health and safety, and elderly would not be disproportionate.	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. Minor economic benefits from construction activities would not be realized. Impacts on socioeconomics would not be significant and impacts on environmental justice, children’s health and safety, and elderly would not be disproportionate.

*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
 Environmental Impact Statement  
 Draft – January 2024*

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
<b>LAND USE/NOISE COMPATIBLE LAND USE</b>			
F-15EX	<p>There would be 845 more acres off the airport property that would be exposed to DNL 65 dB or greater. Residential land use acreage would increase by 287 acres within the 65–70 dB DNL and 23 acres within the 70–75 dB DNL. Impacts on residential land uses would be considered significant.</p> <p>Construction projects would introduce short-term noise increases that would not generate noise levels to affect or change land use compatibilities.</p>	<p>There would be 1,086 more acres off the airport property that would be exposed to CNEL 65 dB or greater. Residential land use acreage would increase 262 acres within the 65–70 dB CNEL noise contours, and 15 within the 70–75 dB CNEL noise contours.</p> <p>Irwin O. Addicott Elementary School/Scandinavian Middle School would be additionally exposed to 3 acres within 70–75 dB CNEL.</p> <p>There would be an additional 260 acres of industrial land uses within the 65–70 dB CNEL noise contours, 51 acres within the 70–75 dB CNEL contours, 7 acres within the 75–80 dB CNEL.</p> <p>Construction projects would introduce short-term noise increases that would not generate noise levels to affect or change land use compatibilities.</p> <p>Impacts on residential land uses, public land uses as they relate to school facilities, industrial land uses, and recreational land uses as they relate to the Fresno Airways Golf Course would be considered significant.</p>	<p>There would be 92 more acres off the airport property that would be exposed to DNL 65 dB or greater. Residential land use acreage would decrease 59 acres within the 65–70 dB DNL. No significant impacts on residential land uses would occur.</p> <p>Construction projects would introduce short-term noise increases that would not generate noise levels to affect or change land use compatibilities.</p>

*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft – January 2024*

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
F-35A	<p>There would be 1,288 more acres off the airport property that would be exposed to DNL 65 dB or greater. Residential land use acreage would increase by 449 acres within the 65–70 dB DNL, 109 acres within the 70–75 dB DNL, and 2 acres within the 75–80 dB DNL. Impacts on residential land uses would be considered significant. Under the F-35A, significant impacts would also occur to recreational land uses associated with the North Road Recreational Area where 6 acres would be newly exposed to 75–80 dB DNL noise contours.</p> <p>Construction projects would introduce short-term noise increases that would not generate noise levels to affect or change land use compatibilities.</p>	N/A	<p>There would be 1,127 more acres off the airport property that would be exposed to DNL 65 dB or greater. An additional 252 acres of residential land use would be within the 65–70 dB DNL and 8 acres within the 70–75 dB DNL. Impacts on residential land uses would be considered significant. Construction projects would introduce short-term noise increases that would not generate noise levels to affect or change land use compatibilities.</p>
F-15C/D	<p>There would be no increase in operations at BAF, though construction for the F-15C would occur. Construction activities would not result in significant land use impacts.</p>	<p>There would be no increase in operations at FAT, though construction for the F-15C would occur. Construction activities would not result in significant land use impacts.</p>	<p>There would be no increase in operations at NAS JRB New Orleans, though construction for the F-15C/D would occur. Construction activities would not result in significant land use impacts.</p>
No Action	<p>No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on land use.</p>	<p>No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on land use.</p>	<p>No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on land use.</p>

*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft – January 2024*

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
<b>DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT, SECTION 4(f)</b>			
F-15EX	<p>Construction and operations associated with the F-15EX beddown would not have appreciable effects to proposed Section 4(f) resources, including historic sites. No permanent incorporation of land, direct use, or temporary occupancy of Section 4(f) resources would occur as no construction would occur near or within the boundaries of the Section 4(f) resources. Impacts would not be significant.</p> <p>Per Public Law 105–85 (Division A, Title X, Section 1079, November 18, 1997), no military flight operation (including military training flight), or designation of airspace for such an operation, may be treated as a transportation program or project for purposes of Section 303 of Title 49, USC. Therefore, there would be no impacts to these resources under 4(f) and any 4(f) impacts related to the Proposed Action would not be considered significant. See Section CA3.1, <i>Noise</i>, for a detailed discussion on noise impacts.</p> <p>There are no incompatible land uses under this alternative. Indirect impacts on Section 4(f) resources related to noise impacts from operations would not be considered significant.</p>	<p>Construction and operations associated with the F-15EX would not have appreciable effects to proposed Section 4(f) under either of the locational scenarios at FAT.</p> <p>Per Public Law 105–85 (Division A, Title X, Section 1079, November 18, 1997), no military flight operation (including military training flight), or designation of airspace for such an operation, may be treated as a transportation program or project for purposes of Section 303 of Title 49, USC. Therefore, there would be no impacts to these resources under 4(f) and any 4(f) impacts related to the Proposed Action would not be considered significant. See Section CA3.1, <i>Noise</i>, for a detailed discussion on noise impacts.</p>	<p>FAA has jurisdiction by law relating to the DAF/NGB Proposed Action where there is a military use of a civil airport location. Given that NAS JRB New Orleans is not a civilian airfield, it was not analyzed for impacts related to Section 4(f) resources.</p>
F-35A		N/A	<p>FAA has jurisdiction by law relating to the DAF/NGB Proposed Action where there is a military use of a civil airport location. Given that NAS JRB New Orleans is not a civilian airfield, it was not analyzed for impacts related to Section 4(f) resources.</p>



*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft – January 2024*

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
F-15C/D	There would be no increase in operations at BAF, though construction for the F-15C would occur. Construction activities would not result in significant Section 4(f) impacts.	There would be no increase in operations at FAT, though construction for the F-15C would occur at the existing cantonment area. There would be no significant impacts on Section 4(f) resources.	FAA has jurisdiction by law relating to the DAF/NGB Proposed Action where there is a military use of a civil airport location. Given that NAS JRB New Orleans is not a civilian airfield, it was not analyzed for impacts related to Section 4(f) resources.
No Action	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on Section 4(f) properties.	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on Section 4(f) properties.	FAA has jurisdiction by law relating to the DAF/NGB Proposed Action where there is a military use of a civil airport location. Given that NAS JRB New Orleans is not a civilian airfield, it was not analyzed for impacts related to Section 4(f) resources.

*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft – January 2024*

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
<b>WATER RESOURCES/FLOODPLAINS/WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS</b>			
F-15EX	Construction activities would result in up to 148,000 SF of new impervious surfaces. Site-specific SWPPPs would be prepared for each construction project to ensure that runoff would be contained on-site. Predevelopment hydrology would be maintained through compliance with LID and Section 438 of the EISA. BMPs would continue to be implemented to minimize impacts on both surface water and groundwater. None of the proposed construction or modification projects are located within the 100-year floodplain. Impacts on water resources would not be significant.	Proposed construction activities would result in up to 231,300 SF for Locational Scenario 1, and 670,900 SF for Locational Scenario 2 of new impervious surfaces. Site-specific SWPPPs would be prepared for each construction project to ensure that runoff would be contained on-site. Predevelopment hydrology would be maintained through compliance with LID and Section 438 of the EISA. BMPs would continue to be implemented to minimize impacts on both surface water and groundwater. None of the proposed construction or modification projects are located within the 100-year floodplain. Impacts on water resources would not be significant.	Construction activities would result in up to 85,300 SF of new impervious surfaces. Site-specific SWPPPs would be prepared for each construction project to ensure that runoff would be contained on-site. Predevelopment hydrology would be maintained through compliance with LID and Section 438 of the EISA. BMPs would continue to be implemented to minimize impacts on both surface water and groundwater. Several of the proposed construction and modification projects are located within the 100-year floodplain; however, none are located in an active floodway. EO 11988 requires that agencies evaluate the potential effects of actions within a floodplain and to avoid floodplains unless the agency determines there is no practicable alternative. Since the proposed projects would involve construction in a floodplain, a Finding of No Practicable Alternative would be required. Therefore, in compliance of EO 11988 and with preparation of a Finding of No Practicable Alternative, impacts on water resources would not be significant.
F-35A	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX, though new impervious surface would be 136,600 SF. Impacts on water resources would not be significant.	N/A	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX, though new impervious surface would be 100,800 SF. Impacts on water resources would not be significant.
F-15C/D	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX, though new impervious surface would be 128,400 SF. Impacts on water resources would not be significant.	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX, though new impervious surface would be up to 104,700 SF for Locational Scenario 1; Locational Scenario 2 is not an option for this alternative. Impacts on water resources would not be significant.	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX, though new impervious surface would be 62,500 SF. Impacts on water resources would not be significant.

*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft – January 2024*

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
No Action	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on water resources.	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on water resources.	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on water resources.
<b>GEOLOGICAL RESOURCES/SOILS/FARMLANDS</b>			
F-15EX	Construction activities would result in up to 218,100 SF of ground disturbance. Construction and modification activities would be in compliance with the Construction General Permit. Site-specific SWPPPs would be prepared for each construction project to ensure that runoff would be contained on-site. Construction and modification activities would only occur on soils designated by the NRCS as farmland of statewide importance. However, there would be no conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses as the land within the BAF boundary has been previously disturbed and is not currently being used as farmland. Impacts on geological resources would not be significant.	Construction activities would result in up to 1,148,600 SF for Locational Scenario 1, and 1,588,200 SF for Locational Scenario 2 of ground disturbance. Construction and modification activities would be in compliance with the Construction General Permit. Site-specific SWPPPs would be prepared for each construction project to ensure that runoff would be contained on-site. Construction and modification activities would only occur on soils designated by the NRCS as Prime Farmland if irrigated. However, there would be no conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses as the land within FAT boundaries has been previously disturbed and is not currently being used as farmland. Impacts on geological, soils, and farmland resources would not be significant.	Construction activities would result in up to 218,800 SF of ground disturbance. Construction and modification activities would be in compliance with the Construction General Permit. Site-specific SWPPPs would be prepared for each construction project to ensure that runoff would be contained on-site. Impacts on geological resources would not be significant.
F-35A	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX, though ground disturbance would be 203,800 SF. Impacts on geological resources would not be significant.	N/A	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX, though ground disturbance would be 151,500 SF. Impacts on geological resources would not be significant.
F-15C/D	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX, though ground disturbance would be 173,900 SF. Impacts on geological resources would not be significant.	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX, though ground disturbance would be 1,062,000 SF for Locational Scenario 1; Locational Scenario 2 is not an option for this alternative. Impacts on geological resources would not be significant.	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX, though ground disturbance would be 81,700 SF. Impacts on geological resources would not be significant.
No Action	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on geological resources.	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on geological resources.	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on geological resources.

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>			
F-15EX	<p>There are no known archaeological sites within any of the proposed construction footprints. In the event of an inadvertent discovery during ground-disturbing operations, work would cease, and procedures would be implemented to manage the site prior to continuation of work. No buildings associated with the proposed construction have been determined to be eligible for the NRHP. There are no historic properties within 1/2 mile of BAF and are beyond the 65 dB DNL therefore, analysis under the category Off-Installation is not carried forward. No traditional cultural properties have been identified at the 104 FW installation. Government-to-government consultation with associated Tribal Nations is ongoing and will continue throughout the EIAP. Historic properties are present on the lands beneath the SUA.</p>	<p>There are no known archaeological sites within any of the proposed construction footprints at the 144 FW installation at FAT. In the event of an inadvertent discovery during ground-disturbing operations, work would cease, and procedures would be implemented to manage the site prior to continuation of work. Building 2606, built in 1966, has not been evaluated for NRHP eligibility. However, modifications for Building 2606 would be confined to the interior of the building, which would not affect the building’s potential significance or integrity. One structure has been evaluated for the NRHP, the Gould Canal, and six structures have not been evaluated within the 65 dB and greater noise contours surrounding the airfield. These structures are managed as NRHP eligible, and there would be no adverse effect per 36 CFR Section 800.5(b). The proposed action would not be anticipated to effect eligibility.</p> <p>No traditional cultural properties have been identified at the 144 FW installation at FAT. Government-to-government consultation with associated Tribal Nations is ongoing and will continue throughout the EIAP.</p>	<p>There are no known archaeological sites within any of the proposed construction footprints. In the event of an inadvertent discovery during ground-disturbing operations, work would cease, and procedures would be implemented to manage the site prior to continuation of work. No buildings associated with the proposed construction have been determined to be eligible for the NRHP. There are no historic properties within 1/2 mile of NAS JRB New Orleans and are beyond the 65 dB DNL therefore, analysis under the category Off-Installation is not carried forward. No traditional cultural properties have been identified at the 159 FW installation. Government-to-government consultation with associated Tribal Nations is ongoing and will continue throughout the EIAP. Historic properties are present on the lands beneath the SUA. Use of the SUA would increase but would be similar in nature to ongoing operations.</p>

*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft – January 2024*

<b>Resource and Alternative</b>	<b>104 FW at BAF</b>	<b>144 FW at FAT</b>	<b>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</b>
F-15EX (continued)	Use of the SUA under the Proposed Action would be similar to ongoing operations. Therefore, beddown of the F-15EX would not result in significant impacts to cultural resources. Implementation of the F-15EX Alternative at the 104 FW installation would result in no historic properties affected per 36 CFR Section 800.4(d)(1). Known historic properties are present within the APE under the airspace; however, there would be no adverse effect per 36 CFR Section 800.5(b).	Historic properties are present on the lands beneath the SUA. Use of the SUA under the Proposed Action would be similar to ongoing operations. Therefore, implementation of the F-15EX Alternative at the 144 FW installation would result in no adverse effect per 36 CFR Section 800.5(b). Known historic properties are present within the APE under the airspace; however, there would be no adverse effect per 36 CFR Section 800.5(b).  Overall, implementation of F-15EX beddown at FAT would not result in significant impacts on cultural resources.	Implementation of the F-15EX Alternative at the 159 FW installation would result in no historic properties affected per 36 CFR Section 800.4(d)(1). Known historic properties are present within the APE under the airspace; however, there would be no adverse effect per 36 CFR Section 800.5(b).  Overall, implementation of F-15EX beddown at FAT would not result in significant impacts on cultural resources.
F-35A	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX and would not be significant. Therefore, implementation of the F-35A Alternative at the 104 FW installation would result in no historic properties affected per 36 CFR Section 800.4(d)(1). Known historic properties are present within the APE under the airspace; however, there would be no adverse effect per 36 CFR Section 800.5(b).	N/A	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX and would not be significant. Therefore, implementation of the F-35A Alternative at the 159 FW installation would result in no historic properties affected per 36 CFR Section 800.4(d)(1). Known historic properties are present within the APE under the airspace; however, there would be no adverse effect per 36 CFR Section 800.5(b).
F-15C/D	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX though no change in operations at BAF or in the SUA would occur. Therefore, implementation of the F-15C/D Alternative at the 104 FW installation would result in no historic properties affected per 36 CFR Section 800.4(d)(1). Known historic properties are present within the APE under the airspace; however, there would be no adverse effect per 36 CFR Section 800.5(b).	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX though no change in operations at FAT or in the SUA would occur. Therefore, implementation of the F-15C/D Alternative at the 144 FW installation would likely result in no adverse effect per 36 CFR Section 800.5(b). Known historic properties are present within the APE under the airspace; however, there would be no adverse effect per 36 CFR Section 800.5(b).	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX though no change in operations at NAS JRB New Orleans or in the SUA would occur. Therefore, implementation of the F-15C/D Alternative at the 159 FW installation would result in no historic properties affected per 36 CFR Section 800.4(d)(1). Known historic properties are present within the APE under the airspace; however, there would be no adverse effect per 36 CFR Section 800.5(b).

*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft – January 2024*

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
No Action	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on cultural resources. Therefore, implementation of the No Action Alternative at the 104 FW installation would result in no historic properties affected per 36 CFR Section 800.4(d)(1). Known historic properties are present within the APE under the airspace; however, there would be no adverse effect per 36 CFR Section 800.5(b).	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on cultural resources. Therefore, implementation of the No Action Alternative at the 144 FW installation would result in no historic properties affected per 36 CFR Section 800.4(d)(1). Known historic properties are present within the APE under the airspace; however, there would be no adverse effect per 36 CFR Section 800.5(b).	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on cultural resources. Therefore, implementation of the No Action Alternative at the 159 FW installation would result in no historic properties affected per 36 CFR Section 800.4(d)(1). Known historic properties are present within the APE under the airspace; however, there would be no adverse effect per 36 CFR Section 800.5(b).
<b>SAFETY</b>			
F-15EX	<p>Fire and crash response would continue to be conducted by the 104 FW’s fire department. Construction activities would not pose any unusual concerns, and standard construction safety procedures would be implemented. No construction would occur within RPZs and there would be no new airfield obstructions created by construction or modification projects. QD arcs would not change from the existing conditions/No Action Alternative. While there are some planned constructions that would take place within QD arcs, all DAF regulations would be met to ensure proper protocols and distances are met. All new construction projects would implement AT/FP requirements.</p> <p>The 104 FW BASH plan and WHMP are used to mitigate and reduce the chances of a wildlife strike from occurring. There would be no significant impacts on safety.</p>	<p>Fire and crash response would continue to be conducted by the 144 FW’s fire department. Construction activities would not pose any unusual concerns, and standard construction safety procedures would be implemented. QD arcs would not change from the existing conditions/No Action Alternative. While there are some planned construction projects that would take place within QD arcs, all DAF regulations would be met to ensure proper protocols and distances are met. All new construction projects would implement AT/FP requirements.</p> <p>The 144 FW BASH plan and WHMP are used to mitigate and reduce the chances of a wildlife strike from occurring. There would be no significant impacts on safety.</p>	<p>Fire and crash response would continue to be conducted by the 159 FW’s fire department. Construction activities would not pose any unusual concerns, and standard construction safety procedures would be implemented. QD arcs would not change from the existing conditions/No Action Alternative. While there are some planned construction projects that would take place within QD arcs, all DAF regulations would be met to ensure proper protocols and distances are met. All new construction projects would implement AT/FP requirements. The 159 FW BASH plan would continue to be followed to mitigate and reduce the chances of a BASH event from occurring. There would be no significant impacts on safety.</p>
F-35A	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX and would not be significant.	N/A	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX and would not be significant.

*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft – January 2024*

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
F-15C/D	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX though no change in operations at BAF or in the SUA would occur. Maintenance issues for the F-15C would continue to impair operational readiness. There would be no significant impacts on safety.	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX though no change in operations at FAT or in the SUA would occur. Maintenance issues for the F-15C would continue to impair operational readiness. There would be no significant impacts on safety.	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX though no change in operations at NAS JRB New Orleans or in the SUA would occur. Maintenance issues for the F-15C/D would continue to impair operational readiness. There would be no significant impacts on safety.
No Action	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on safety. Maintenance issues for the F-15C would continue to impair operational readiness. There would be no significant impacts on safety.	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on safety. Maintenance issues for the F-15C would continue to impair operational readiness. There would be no significant impacts on safety.	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on safety. Maintenance issues for the F-15C/D would continue to impair operational readiness. There would be no significant impacts on safety.
<b>HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/WASTE</b>			
F-15EX	The types of hazardous materials needed for maintenance and operation of the F-15EX would be similar to those currently used for maintenance and operation of the F-15C fleet. Throughput of petroleum substances and hazardous waste streams would be expected to increase due to increased operations. Short-term increases in the quantity of fuel used during construction activities for this action would occur. Hazardous waste generation would continue to be managed in accordance with the installation’s HWMP and all applicable federal, state, and local regulations. The pollution prevention and waste minimization practices would continue to be managed in accordance with the HWMP. No changes to the installation’s Large Quantity Generator status would occur despite the increase in hazardous waste generation	The types of hazardous materials needed for maintenance and operation of the F-15EX would be similar to those currently used for maintenance and operation of the F-15C fleet. Throughput of petroleum substances and hazardous waste streams would be expected to increase due to increased operations. Short-term increases in the quantity of fuel used during construction activities for this action would occur. Hazardous waste generation would continue to be managed in accordance with the installation’s HWMP and all applicable federal, state, and local regulations. The pollution prevention and waste minimization practices would continue to be managed in accordance with the HWMP. No changes to the installation’s Small Quantity Generator status would occur despite the increase in hazardous waste generation from aircraft operations. Any projects proposed for	The types of hazardous materials needed for maintenance and operation of the F-15EX would be similar to those currently used for maintenance and operation of the F-15C/D fleet. Throughput of petroleum substances and hazardous waste streams would be expected to increase due to increased operations. Short-term increases in the quantity of fuel used during construction activities for this action would occur. Hazardous waste generation would continue to be managed in accordance with the installation’s HWMP and all applicable federal, state, and local regulations. The pollution prevention and waste minimization practices would continue to be managed in accordance with the HWMP. No changes to the installation’s Large Quantity Generator status would occur despite the increase

*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft – January 2024*

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
<p>F-15EX (continued)</p>	<p>from aircraft operations. Any projects proposed for modifications would be inspected for ACM and LBP according to established procedures prior to any renovation or demolition activities.</p> <p>If contaminated media (e.g., soil, groundwater) were encountered during the course of site preparation, work would cease until 104 FW Program Managers establish an appropriate course of action. The construction contractors would be responsible for ensuring their workers follow appropriate health and safety requirements including ensuring the field staff are OSHA Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response trained, if required. As such, there would be no significant impacts on hazardous materials, hazardous waste, toxic substances, or contaminated sites.</p>	<p>modifications would be inspected for ACM and LBP according to established procedures prior to any renovation or demolition activities. Both Locational Scenarios 1 and 2 involve Project 8 at Building 2606 which does include ACM and Project 12 at Building 157 where there is the potential for ACM.</p> <p>There are no active IRP sites that could potentially impact the proposed construction projects under the F-15EX beddown at Locational Scenarios 1 or 2. However, there is a TCE-contaminated groundwater plume associated with the OHF Area 1 (Formerly Used Defense Site) Remedial Investigation Site which overlaps with Project 5, Project 9.1, and Project 14. Projects 6, 11, and 16, would overlap with areas identified as being potential sources of PFAS (PRL 2 [Aircraft Parking Ramp]). Under Locational Scenario 2, there would be the same overlap with the OHF Area 1 TCE-contaminated groundwater plume and the proposed projects as with the Locational Scenario 1. Projects 6, 9.2, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20, however, would overlap with areas identified as being potential sources of PFAS (PRL 2 and Former Marine Corps Facility). If contaminated media (e.g., soil, groundwater) were encountered during the course of site preparation, work would cease until 144 FW Program Managers establish an appropriate course of action.</p>	<p>in hazardous waste generation from aircraft operations. Any projects proposed for modifications would be inspected for ACM and LBP according to established procedures prior to any renovation or demolition activities.</p> <p>If contaminated media (e.g., soil, groundwater) were encountered during the course of site preparation, work would cease until 159 FW Program Managers establish an appropriate course of action. The construction contractors would be responsible for ensuring their workers follow appropriate health and safety requirements including ensuring the field staff are OSHA Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response trained, if required. As such, there would be no significant impacts on hazardous materials, hazardous waste, toxic substances, or contaminated sites.</p>



*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft – January 2024*

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
F-15EX (continued)		The construction contractors would be responsible for ensuring their workers follow appropriate health and safety requirements including ensuring the field staff are OSHA Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response trained, if required. As such, there would be no significant impacts on hazardous materials, hazardous waste, toxic substances, or contaminated sites.	
F-35A	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX and would not be significant.	N/A	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX and would not be significant.
F-15C/D	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX though no increase in operations at BAF would occur. There would be no significant impacts on hazardous materials, hazardous waste, toxic substances, or contaminated sites.	Impacts would be as similar to those described for the F-15EX with the exception that the only projects that would be constructed with potential impacts from contaminated sites are Project 5 (overlaps the TCE-contaminated groundwater plume) and Project 6 (overlaps PRL 2). In addition, there would be no increase in operations at FAT. There would be no significant impacts on hazardous materials, hazardous waste, toxic substances, or contaminated sites.	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX though no increase in operations at NAS JRB New Orleans would occur. There would be no significant impacts on hazardous materials, hazardous waste, toxic substances, or contaminated sites.
No Action	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on hazardous materials, hazardous waste, toxic substances, or contaminated sites.	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on hazardous materials, hazardous waste, toxic substances, or contaminated sites.	No construction would occur, and no change in operations. There would be no impacts on hazardous materials, hazardous waste, toxic substances, or contaminated sites.

*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft – January 2024*

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES/COASTAL RESOURCES/WETLANDS</b>			
F-15EX	No impacts on sensitive vegetation would occur because no such species exist at the proposed construction sites for the 104 FW. Noise associated with construction activities and/or aircraft operations would be unlikely to affect wildlife or special status species because they are already likely habituated to disturbances from existing training and flight operations. Moreover, anticipated changes to use of the SUA would not impact biological resources. Impacts on biological resources would not be significant.	No effects to sensitive vegetation would occur because no such species exist at the proposed construction sites for the 144 FW. Noise associated with construction activities and/or aircraft operations would be unlikely to affect wildlife or special status species because they are already likely habituated to disturbances from existing training and flight operations. Moreover, anticipated changes to use of the SUA would not impact biological resources. Impacts on biological resources would not be significant.	No impacts on sensitive vegetation would occur because no such species exist at the proposed construction sites for the 159 FW. Noise associated with construction activities and/or aircraft operations would be unlikely to affect wildlife or special status species because they are already likely habituated to disturbances from existing training and flight operations. Moreover, anticipated changes to use of the SUA would not impact biological resources. The Navy has initiated informal section 7 consultation with USFWS on potentially occurring ESA-listed species. Impacts on biological resources would not be significant.
F-35A	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX and would not be significant.	N/A	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX and would not be significant.
F-15C/D	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX though no increase in operations at BAF would occur. Impacts on biological resources would not be significant.	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX though no increase in operations at FAT would occur. Impacts on biological resources would not be significant.	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX though no increase in operations at NAS JRB New Orleans would occur. Impacts on biological resources would not be significant.
No Action	No change in operations at BAF or in the SUA, and no construction at BAF would occur. There would be no impacts on biological resources.	No change in operations at FAT or in the SUA, and no construction at FAT would occur. There would be no impacts on biological resources.	No change in operations at NAS JRB New Orleans or in the SUA, and no construction would occur. There would be no impacts on biological resources.

*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft – January 2024*

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
<b>VISUAL IMPACTS</b>			
F-15EX	Construction and operations associated with the F-15EX beddown would not have appreciable effects to visual resources at the 104 FW installation, BAF, or the immediate surrounding community. The proposed facilities and associated infrastructure would remain consistent with the existing visual character of an airfield environment influenced by existing military, commercial, and civilian aircraft. The potential visual impact associated with aircraft operations transiting around or through BAF would not be significantly different from existing conditions/No Action Alternative. Basing the 21 F-15EX and associated construction and operations would not substantially increase off-airport light emissions or create visual effects. Impacts on visual resources would not be significant.	Construction and operations associated with the F-15EX beddown would not have appreciable effects to visual resources at the 144 FW installation, FAT, or the immediate surrounding community. The proposed facilities and associated infrastructure associated with both of the locational scenarios at FAT would remain consistent with the existing visual character of an airfield environment influenced by existing military, commercial, and civilian aircraft. The potential visual impact associated with aircraft operations transiting around or through FAT would not be significantly different from existing conditions/No Action Alternative. Basing of the 21 F-15EX to replace the existing 18 F-15C at the 144 FW and associated construction and operations at FAT would not substantially increase light emissions or create visual effects and therefore would be less than significant for all locational alternatives at FAT.	FAA has jurisdiction by law relating to the DAF/NGB Proposed Action where there is a military use of a civil airport location. Given that NAS JRB New Orleans is not a civilian airfield, it was not analyzed for impacts related to visual resources.
F-35A	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX and would not be significant.	N/A	FAA has jurisdiction by law relating to the DAF/NGB Proposed Action where there is a military use of a civil airport location. Given that NAS JRB New Orleans is not a civilian airfield, it was not analyzed for impacts related to visual resources.
F-15C/D	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX though no increase in operations at BAF would occur. Impacts on visual resources would not be significant.	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX though no increase in operations at FAT would occur. Impacts on visual resources would not be significant.	FAA has jurisdiction by law relating to the DAF/NGB Proposed Action where there is a military use of a civil airport location. Given that NAS JRB New Orleans is not a civilian airfield, it was not analyzed for impacts related to visual resources.

*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Draft – January 2024*

<b>Resource and Alternative</b>	<b>104 FW at BAF</b>	<b>144 FW at FAT</b>	<b>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</b>
No Action	No change in operations, and no construction at BAF would occur. There would be no impacts on visual resources.	No change in operations, and no construction at FAT would occur. There would be no impacts on visual resources.	FAA has jurisdiction by law relating to the DAF/NGB Proposed Action where there is a military use of a civil airport location. Given that NAS JRB New Orleans is not a civilian airfield, it was not analyzed for impacts related to visual resources.
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE/UTILITIES/NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY SUPPLY/TRANSPORTATION/PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION</b>			
F-15EX	There would be no substantial changes expected to potable water, wastewater systems, stormwater management, energy supply systems, solid waste management, or transportation routes as an increase in up to 101 personnel would not significantly impact regional natural resources, energy supply, or existing systems at the 104 FW installation. Impacts on infrastructure as a result of the F-15EX beddown would be slightly more intensive than the other alternatives as there would be 101 more personnel and a slightly larger construction footprint. This alternative would not have the potential to cause demand to exceed available or future supplies of applicable resources. Impacts on infrastructure would not be significant.	There would be no substantial changes expected to potable water, wastewater systems, stormwater management, energy supply systems, solid waste management, or transportation routes as an increase in up to 101 personnel at FAT would not significantly impact regional natural resources, energy supply, or existing systems at the 144 FW installation at FAT. While construction and operation associated with the F-15EX beddown would require the use of natural resources and energy supply, beddown of the F-15EX at either of the locational scenarios at FAT would not have the potential to cause demand to exceed available or future supplies of applicable resources. Impacts on infrastructure would not be significant.	There would be no substantial changes expected to potable water, wastewater systems, stormwater management, energy supply systems, solid waste management, or transportation routes as an increase in up to 101 personnel would not significantly impact regional natural resources or energy supply or existing systems at the 159 FW installation. Impacts on infrastructure as a result of the F-15EX beddown would be slightly more intensive than the other alternatives as there would be 101 more personnel and a slightly larger construction footprint. This alternative would not have the potential to cause demand to exceed available or future supplies of applicable resources. Impacts on infrastructure would not be significant.
F-35A	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX though 21 fewer additional personnel would be needed. Impacts on infrastructure would not be significant.	N/A	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX though 21 fewer additional personnel would be needed. Impacts on infrastructure would not be significant.
F-15C/D	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX though no new additional personnel would be required. Impacts on infrastructure would not be significant.	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX though no new additional personnel would be required. Impacts on infrastructure would not be significant.	Impacts would be as described for the F-15EX though no new additional personnel would be required. Impacts on infrastructure would not be significant.

*Air National Guard F-15EX Eagle II & F-35A Lightning II Operational Beddowns  
 Environmental Impact Statement  
 Draft – January 2024*

---

<i>Resource and Alternative</i>	<i>104 FW at BAF</i>	<i>144 FW at FAT</i>	<i>159 FW at NAS JRB New Orleans</i>
No Action	No change in operations, and no construction at BAF would occur. There would be no impacts on infrastructure.	No change in operations, and no construction at FAT would occur. There would be no impacts on infrastructure.	No change in operations, and no construction at NAS JRB New Orleans would occur. There would be no impacts on infrastructure.

This page intentionally left blank.