3

#### *DRAFT* FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FNSI) ARMY RESERVE CENTER AT DOBBINS AIR RESERVE BASE

4 Pursuant to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations for implementing the 5 procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA: 40 Code of Federal 6 Regulations [CFR] 1500-1508) and Air Force Regulation 32 CFR Part 989, the United States Army 7 Reserve (USAR) 81st Readiness Division (RD) and United States Air Force (USAF) have prepared 8 an Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate the potential environmental consequences 9 associated with the proposed construction and operation of a 600-member Army Reserve Center 10 (ARC) in the vicinity of the Atlanta Metropolitan Area. This EA is incorporated by reference into 11 this Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI).

#### 12 PURPOSE AND NEED

The **purpose** of the Proposed Action is to provide adequate facilities for a 600-member unit currently utilizing an insufficient ARC located within the Atlanta Metropolitan Area. The new ARC, within Dobbins Air Reserve Base (ARB), would include training facilities, a Vehicle Maintenance Shop (VMS), and an Unheated Storage building (USB) and be capable of meeting facility requirements of the meeting facility requirements of the USAR Design Guide, as well as AT/FP requirements and physical security measures.

19

20 The need for the USAR, 81st RD, is a new facility for the 600-member unit to support the USAR's

- 21 mission to provide trained and ready units and individuals to mobilize and deploy in support of the
- 22 national military strategy. The new facility must be located within the Atlanta Metropolitan Area
- to replace the existing East Point ARC. The Proposed Action would provide a modern facility and training areas that are properly sized and designed for the intended use, collocate similar staff
- 25 functions, and ensure land use is consistent with installation planning guidelines. More
- specifically, the Proposed Action is needed to (1) ensure the effective training and mission
- 27 readiness of units, (2) ensure the safety of unit personnel and equipment, (3) improve degraded
- 28 maintenance support and unit accessibility to requisite equipment, and (4) allow units to stand
- ready to assist with regional, state and local crisis management and emergency/ disaster response,
- and (5) reduce the negative financial, recruiting, and morale effects of poor facility conditions,
- 31 overcrowding, and overutilization on USAR personnel and equipment.

#### 32 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

The Proposed Action would provide for a 600-member ARC to support the USAR mission and function within the Atlanta Metropolitan Area. The ARC would include training facilities, a VMS, and a USB and be capable of meeting facility requirements of the USAR Design Guide, as well as AT/FP requirements and physical security measures. Supporting facilities include land clearing,

- 37 paving, concrete aprons, vehicle wash rack/platform(s), fencing, general site improvements, and
- 38 utility connections. The proposed ARC would be authorized for up to 206 permanent staff and
- 39 1,202 Guard or Reserve staff with three monthly drill weekends. The proposed ARC would meet
- 40 applicable installation architectural standards, local building codes, Americans with Disabilities
- 41 Act (ADA), and fire code requirements. Facilities would have sustainable principles, including
- life-cycle cost-effective practices that would be integrated into the project's design, development,
   and construction per the Energy Policy Act and other applicable laws and Executive Orders. Other
- and construction per the Energy Policy Act and other applicable laws and Executive Orders. Other
   locations for the ARC were considered and determined not to meet the need and purpose of the
- 45 Proposed Action. Therefore, the only practicable alternative is the Proposed Action.

- 1 CEQ regulations recommend consideration of the No Action Alternative. Under the No Action
- 2 Alternative, the USAR unit would continue to operate in a substandard facility.

#### 3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- 4 This EA comprehensively evaluates the existing conditions and environmental consequences of
- 5 implementing the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative in compliance with NEPA as
- 6 implemented by the CEQ and USAF regulations. The analysis focused on the following resource
- 7 areas: geology and soils, water resources, air quality, noise, cultural resources, biological
- 8 resources, socioeconomic resources, safety, and occupational health, hazardous materials and 9 hazardous waste, traffic and transportation, recreation, and utilities. The EA concluded that the
- 9 hazardous waste, traffic and transportation, recreation, and utilities. The EA concluded that the
   10 Proposed Action would not significantly affect any resource categories. The EA also concluded
- 11 that no significant adverse cumulative impact would result from activities associated with the
- 12 Proposed Action when considered with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects.

#### 13 PUBLIC NOTICE

- 14 A notice, in both English and Spanish, was published on July 26 and July 27 in the Marietta Daily
- 15 Journal and the Atlanta Journal-Constitution, inviting the public to review and comment on the
- 16 Draft EA. Comments received during the 30-day review periods will be addressed in the Final EA.

#### 17 FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

- 18 Based upon my review of the facts and analyses contained in the EA, which is hereby incorporated
- 19 by reference, I conclude that the Proposed Action would not have a significant impact on the
- 20 natural or human environment. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required for this
- action. This analysis fulfills the requirements of the NEPA, CEQ regulations, and 32 CFR Part989.
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26 MIKE KLUG, GS-14, DAF

Date:\_\_\_\_\_

- 27 Acting Chief, Civil Engineer Division
- 28
- 29 Attachments:
- 30 1. Draft EA Army Reserve Center at Dobbins Air Reserve Base, Cobb County, Georgia

# **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

#### FOR THE

# ARMY RESERVE CENTER AT DOBBINS AIR RESERVE BASE

Cobb County, Georgia

**July 2024** 



Prepared For:

United States Army Reserve, 81<sup>st</sup> Readiness Division 81 Wildcat Way, Fort Jackson, South Carolina 29207

and

Department of the Army Louisville District, Corps of Engineers 600 Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Place, Louisville, Kentucky 40202



Prepared By:

Pond & Company-Tetra Tech Joint Venture 3500 Parkway Lane, Suite 500, Peachtree Corners, Georgia 30092 This Page Was Intentionally Left Blank.

# 1 Executive Summary

- 2 This Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared for the United States Army Reserve (USAR)
- 3 81st Readiness Division (RD) and United States Air Force (USAF). The EA evaluates the potential
- 4 environmental consequences associated with the construction and operation of an 600-member
- 5 unit Army Reserve Center (ARC) to support the USAR's mission to provide trained and ready 6 units and individuals to mobilize and deploy in support of the national military strategy, at Dobbins
- 7 Air Force Base (ARB) in Cobb County, Marietta, Georgia. The evaluation was conducted in
- 8 accordance with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA; 42 United
- 9 States Code [USC] 4321 et seq.), the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ)
- 10 Regulations Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations
- 11 [CFR] §§ 1500–1508), the USAF Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP; 32 CFR § 989),
- 12 Protection of Historic Properties (36 CFR § 800), and the National Preservation Programs (54 USC
- 13 Subtitle III Division A).

# 14 **Purpose and Need**

15 The **purpose** of the Proposed Action is to provide adequate facilities for an 600-member unit 16 currently utilizing an insufficient ARC located within the Atlanta Metropolitan Area.

- 17 The **need** for the USAR, 81st RD, is a new facility for the 600-member unit to support the USAR's
- 18 mission to provide trained and ready units and individuals to mobilize and deploy in support of the
- 19 national military strategy. The new facility must be located within the Atlanta Metropolitan Area
- 20 to replace the existing East Point ARC.

# 21 **Proposed Action**

22 The Proposed Action would provide for an 600-member ARC to support the USAR mission and 23 function within the Atlanta Metropolitan Area. The ARC would include training facilities, a 24 Vehicle Maintenance Shop (VMS), and an Unheated Storage building (USB) and be capable of 25 meeting facility requirements of the USAR Design Guide, as well as Antiterrorism/Force 26 Protection (AT/FP) requirements and physical security measures. Supporting facilities include 27 land clearing, paving, concrete aprons, vehicle wash rack/platform(s), fencing, general site 28 improvements, and utility connections. The proposed ARC would be authorized for up to 206 29 permanent staff and 1,202 Guard or Reserve staff with three monthly drill weekends. The proposed 30 ARC would meet applicable installation architectural standards, local building codes, Americans 31 with Disabilities Act (ADA), and fire code requirements. Facilities would have sustainable 32 principles, including life-cycle cost-effective practices that would be integrated into the project's 33 design, development, and construction per the Energy Policy Act and other applicable laws and 34 Executive Orders (EOs).

# **1** No Action Alternative

- 2 CEQ regulations recommend consideration of the No Action Alternative. Under the No Action
- 3 Alternative, the USAR would continue to operate in a substandard facility. The No Action
- 4 Alternative is carried forward for further analysis in the EA to provide a baseline against which
- 5 the effects of the Proposed Action can be assessed.

# 6 Summary of the Environmental Effects

7 This EA contains a comprehensive evaluation of the existing conditions and environmental 8 consequences of implementing the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative in compliance 9 with NEPA as implemented by the CEQ and USAF regulations. The analysis focused on the 10 following resource areas: geology and soils, water resources, air quality, noise, cultural resources, 11 biological resources, socioeconomic resources, safety, and occupational health, hazardous 12 materials and hazardous waste, traffic and transportation, recreation, and utilities. The EA 13 concluded that the Proposed Action would not significantly affect any resource categories. The 14 EA also concluded that no significant adverse cumulative impact would result from activities

- 15 associated with the Proposed Action when considered with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable
- 16 future projects.

# 17 Public and Stakeholder Involvement

- 18 NEPA ensures that environmental information is made available to the public during the decision-
- 19 making process and prior to actions being taken. The premise of NEPA is that the quality of federal
- 20 decisions will be enhanced if proponents provide information on their actions to state and local
- 21 governments, tribal governments, and the public and involve these entities in the planning process
- 22 per the requirements of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 (42 USC § 4231[a]) and
- 23 EO 12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs.

# 24 Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI)

- Based on the information and analysis presented in the EA and on review of the public and agency comments submitted during the 30-day public comment period, the analysis concludes that the
- 27 environmental impacts of the construction and operation of the ARC at Dobbins ARB are not
- 28 significant, that preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is unnecessary, and that a FNSI
- 29 is appropriate.
- 30

	Proposed Action		No Action Alternative	
Phase of Proposed Action (C = Construction; O = Operation)	С	0	N/A	
<b>Resource Category</b>	+ = Beneficial Effect, = Insignificant Adverse Effect, Ø = No Effect			
Geology and Soils			Ø	
Water Resources			Ø	
Air Quality			Ø	
Cultural Resources	Ø	Ø	Ø	
Biological Resources		Ø	Ø	
Socioeconomic Resources	+	+	Ø	
Safety and Occupational Health	Ø	+		
Hazardous Materials			Ø	
Traffic and Transportation			Ø	
Recreation	Ø	Ø	Ø	
Utilities			Ø	

# 1 Summary of Potential Environmental and Socioeconomic Consequences.

This Page Was Intentionally Left Blank.

#### **TABLE OF CONTENTS** 1 2 Introduction.....1 1 3 1.1 4 1.2 5 1.3 6 1.4 7 1.4.1 8 1.4.2 9 1.4.3 10 1.5 1.5.1 11 12 1.5.2 1 A ation of - A Itornati

13	2	Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives	/
14	2.1	Proposed Action	7
15	2.2	Alternatives	7
16	2.2.1	Construction and Operation of a New ARC at Dobbins ARB (Preferred	Action
17		Alternative)	8
18	2.2.2	No Action Alternative	8
19	2.2.3	Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Consideration	9
20	3	Affected Environment and Consequences	13
21	3.1	Resources Eliminated from Detailed Analysis	13
22	3.2	Resources Considered in Detail	16
23	3.2.1	Geology and Soils	16
24	3.2.2	Water Resources	18
25	3.2.3	Air Quality	20
26	3.2.4	Noise	25
27	3.2.5	Cultural Resources	28
28	3.2.6	Biological Resources	29
29	3.2.7	Socioeconomic Resources	34
30	3.2.8	Safety and Occupational Health	35
31	3.2.9	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste	36
32	3.2.10	Traffic and Transportation	39
33	3.2.11	Recreation	40
34	3.2.12	Utilities	41
35	4	Finding and Conclusions	43
36	4.1	Findings	43
37	4.1.1	Mitigation Measures	43
38	4.1.2	Cumulative Impact Analysis	44
39	4.1.3	Consequences of No Action Alternative	46
40	4.2	Conclusions	46
41	5	References	47
42	6	List of Preparers	49

# 2 **Tables**

3	Table 3-1. Soil Types within the Proposed Action Area	17
4	Table 3-2. Ambient Air Quality Standards within Proposed Action Area	21
5	Table 3-3. Estimated Emissions of Criteria Pollutants from the Preferred Action Alt	ernative.
6		
7	Table 3-4. Noise Levels of Construction Equipment at 50 and 1,800 feet.	
8	Table 4-1. Summary of Potential Environmental and Socioeconomic Consequences	
9	Table 4-2. Summary of Proposed Measures to Avoid or Minimize Impacts	
10	Table 4-3. Summary of Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions.	
11	Table 6-1. List of Preparers.	

# 12 Figures

- 13 **Figure 1-1.** Soldier Home Location Map
- 14 **Figure 1-2.** Project Vicinity Map
- 15 **Figure 1-3.** Project Location Map
- 16 **Figure 3-1.** Floodplains Map

# 17 Appendices

- 18 Appendix A. Coordination Letters and Responses
- 19 Appendix B. Notice of Availability
- 20 Appendix C. Air Quality Emissions Calculations and Record of Conformity Analysis
- 21 Appendix D. USEPS EJScreen

# 1 Acronyms and Abbreviations

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act		
AFFF	Aqueous Film-Forming Foam		
AFRC	Air Force Reserve Command		
a.m.	Ante Meridiem		
APE	Area of Potential Effects		
AQCR	Air Quality Control Region		
AR	Army Regulation		
ARB	Air Reserve Base		
AT/FP	Antiterrorism/Force Protection		
ARC	Army Reserve Center		
B.A.	Bachelor of Arts		
bgs	below ground surface		
BMPs	Best Management Practices		
B.S.	Bachelor of Science		
CAA	Clean Air Act		
CE	Civil Engineering		
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality		
CEV	Civil Engineering Environmental Flight		
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations		
CO	Carbon Monoxide		
$CO_2$	Carbon Dioxide		
CO <sub>2</sub> e	Carbon Dioxide Equivalent		
dB	Decibel		
dBA	A-Weighted Sound Pressure Level		
DNL	Day-Night Average Sound Level		
DoD	Department of Defense		
DoDI	Department of Defense Instruction		
DOT	Department of Transportation		
EA	Environmental Assessment		
EIAP	Environmental Impact Analysis Process		
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement		
EISA	Energy Independence Security Act		
EO	Executive Order		
ESA	Endangered Species Act		
°F	Degrees Fahrenheit		
FNSI	Finding of No Significant Impact		
FYDP	Fiscal Year Development Plan		
GAEPD	Georgia Environmental Protection Division		
GHGs	Greenhouse Gasses		

I-	Interstate-
IICEP	Interagency and Intergovernmental Coordination for Environmental Planning
LID	Low-Impact Development
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MEP	Military Equipment Park
MPA	Master of Public Administration
M.S.	Master of Science
MSG	Mission Support Group
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NRCS	Natural Resource Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NSR	New Source Review
NO <sub>2</sub>	Nitrogen Dioxide
O <sub>3</sub>	Ozone
Pb	Lead
PFOS	Perfluoroctane Sulfonate
p.m.	Post Meridiem
$PM_{10}$	particulate matter less than or equal to 10 micrometers in diameter
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 micrometers in diameter
POV	Privately Owned Vehicles
RD	Readiness Division
sf	Square Feet
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
$SO_2$	Sulfur Dioxide
sy	Square Yards
tpy	Tons per Year
UFC	Unified Facilities Criteria
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USAF	United States Air Force
USAR	United States Army Reserve
USC	United States Code
USCB	United States Census Bureau
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	United State Fish and Wildlife Service
USB	Unheated Storage Buildings
VMS	Vehicle Maintenance Shop
VOCs	Volatile Organic Compounds
WOTUS	Waters of the United States

# 1 **1 Introduction**

2 The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), on behalf of the United States Army Reserve

3 (USAR) 81st Readiness Division (RD), prepared this Environmental Assessment (EA) for the

proposed construction and operation of an Army Reserve Center (ARC) in the Atlanta Metropolitan
Area. The EA complies with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 ([NEPA], 42 United

6 States Code [USC] 4321, et. seq.), the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) *Regulations for* 

7 Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR], Parts

8 1500-1508), 32 CFR Part 989, 32 CFR Part 651, Environmental Analysis of Army Actions (Army

9 Regulation [AR] 200-2), and Air Force Instruction 32-1015, Integrated Installation Planning, which

10 also integrates the environmental impact analysis process (EIAP).

# 11 1.1 Background

12 The USAR, 81st RD, operates a 600-member East Point ARC located on 5.8 acres in East Point, Georgia, within the Atlanta Metropolitan Area, where a majority of the soldiers reside (see Figure 13 1-1). The East Point ARC complex was constructed in 1959 and is 22 years past its 40-year designed 14 15 life. The East Point ARC is currently considered to be in poor condition and is not configured to 16 support mission needs properly. The current ARC complex is 17,700 square feet (sf), undersized and 17 over-utilized. The utilization of the current ARC Administrative/Training facility alone was 125% 18 in 2017. The current ARC also does not meet the minimum standoff distance and, therefore, is not 19 in compliance with Antiterrorism/ Force Protection (AT/FP) requirements. The Military Equipment 20 Park (MEP) and Private Owned Vehicle (POV) parking lot are also inadequate and pose a health and 21 safety issue. The East Point ARC is land-locked within a residential area with no room for expansion, 22 as no adjacent land is available for purchase or lease. Excessive sustainment, maintenance, and repair 23 costs are currently incurred to maintain the functions of the existing East Point ARC. During 2018 -24 2019 alone, the East Point ARC had 151 maintenance and repair-related customer support requests. 25 These limitations negatively impact the unit's capability to maintain readiness, train, conduct 26 maintenance operations, and store equipment. The outdated infrastructure and major electrical 27 shortfalls negatively impact the unit's highly technical mission and recruiting and retention objectives. Therefore, the USAR, 81<sup>st</sup> RD is seeking to provide for an 600-member ARC within the 28 Atlanta Metropolitan Area in order to replace the function of the East Point ARC<sup>1</sup>. The proposed 29 ARC would include training facilities, a Vehicle Maintenance Shop (VMS), and an Unheated Storage 30 31 Building (USB) that meet the facility requirements of the USAR Design Guide, USAR Facilities, 32 dated October 20, 2023, as well as AT/FP requirements and physical security measures.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Information cited here was collected from DD Form 1391, dated March 02, 2022, and East Point/ Dobbins ARB Area Development Plan Future Fiscal Year Development Plan (FYDP).

#### 1 **1.2 Purpose and Need**

2 The **purpose** of the Proposed Action is to provide adequate facilities for an 600-member unit

- currently utilizing an insufficient ARC located within the Atlanta Metropolitan Area. The new ARC,
  within Dobbins Air Reserve Base (ARB) would include training facilities, VMS, and USB and be
- 5 capable of meeting facility requirements of the meeting facility requirements of the USAR Design
- 6 Guide, as well as AT/FP requirements and physical security measures.

7 The need for the USAR, 81st RD, is a new facility for the 600-member unit to support the USAR's 8 mission to provide trained and ready units and individuals to mobilize and deploy in support of the 9 national military strategy. The new facility must be located within the Atlanta Metropolitan Area to 10 replace the existing East Point ARC. The Proposed Action would provide a modern facility and 11 training areas that are properly sized and designed for the intended use, collocate similar staff 12 functions, and ensure land use is consistent with installation planning guidelines. More specifically, 13 the Proposed Action is needed to (1) ensure the effective training and mission readiness of units, (2) 14 ensure the safety of unit personnel and equipment, (3) improve degraded maintenance support and 15 unit accessibility to requisite equipment, and (4) allow units to stand ready to assist with regional, 16 state and local crisis management and emergency/ disaster response, and (5) reduce the negative 17 financial, recruiting, and morale effects of poor facility conditions, overcrowding, and overutilization 18 on USAR personnel and equipment. More information pertaining to the degraded maintenance 19 support and negative financial consequences associated with the current ARC is included in Section 20 1.1.

# 21 **1.3 Relevant Plans, Laws, and Regulations**

Accomplishing the stated Purpose and Need requires consideration of numerous factors, including mission requirements, regulatory requirements, and environmental considerations. In addressing environmental considerations, the USACE and Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) were guided by relevant statutes (and their implementing regulations) and Executive Orders (EOs) that establish standards and provide guidance on environmental and natural resources management and planning.

- The proposed action would require compliance with the federal regulations and EOs, including, but not necessarily limited to, the following:
- 29 NEPA
- 30 32 CFR 989 (Air Force NEPA implementing regulations)
- Noise Control Act
- 32 Clean Air Act (CAA)
- Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA), Section 438
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and its associated hazardous and solid waste
   amendments
- Comprehensive, Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Act, as amended by
   Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know-Act; release or threatened release of
   a hazardous substance

1 • Federal Air Quality Conformity Applicability 2 Clean Water Act • 3 • Endangered Species Act (ESA) 4 • The Sikes Act 5 • Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) 6 • National Historic Preservation Act 7 • Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act 8 • Water Resource Development Act 9 • Safe Drinking Water Act 10 • Intergovernmental Cooperation Act 11 • EO 11990, Protection of Wetlands 12 • EO 11988, Floodplain Management, as amended by EO 13690, Establishing a Federal Flood 13 Risk Management Standard and a Process for Further Soliciting and Considering 14 Stakeholder Input 15 • EO 11593, Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment 16 EO 12416, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs ٠ 17 • EO 12866, *Regulatory Planning and Review* 18 • EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations 19 20 • EO 12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs 21 EO 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks • 22 • EO 13132, Federalism 23 • EO 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Government 24 • EO 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, 25 Distribution, or Use 26 • EO 13859, Maintaining American Leadership in Artificial Intelligence 27 • EO 14094, Modernizing Regulatory Review 28 • EO 14096, Revitalizing our Nation's Commitment to Environmental Justice for All 29 Air Force Manual 32-7003, Environmental Conservation • 30 Department of Defense Instruction 2000.16, Department of Defense (DoD) Antiterrorism • 31 Standards 1.4 Summary of Key Environmental Compliance Requirements 32 **1.4.1** National Environmental Policy Act 33 34 NEPA (42 USC Sections 4321-4347) is a federal statute requiring the identification and analysis of 35 potential environmental impacts associated with proposed federal actions before those actions are 36 taken. The intent of NEPA is to help decision-makers make well-informed decisions based on 37 understanding the potential environmental consequences and take actions to protect, restore, or 38 enhance the environment. NEPA established the CEQ, which was charged with developing and

implementing regulations and ensuring federal agency compliance with NEPA. The CEQ regulations mandate that all federal agencies use a prescribed structured approach to environmental impact analyses. This approach also requires federal agencies to use an interdisciplinary and systematic approach in their decision-making process. The process evaluates potential environmental consequences associated with a Proposed Action and considers alternative courses of action.

6 The process for implementing NEPA is codified in Title 40 CFR, Parts 1500-1508, Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the NEPA. The CEQ regulations specify that an EA must 7 8 be prepared to provide evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare a Finding of No 9 Significant Impact (FNSI), where appropriate, or whether the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is necessary. The EA can aid in an agency's compliance with NEPA when 10 an EIS is unnecessary or facilitate the preparation of an EIS when one is required. Air Force Policy 11 Directive 32-70, Environmental Quality, states that the United States Air Force (USAF) will comply 12 13 with applicable federal, state, and local environmental laws and regulations, including NEPA. USAF's implementing regulation for NEPA is its amended EIAP, 32 CFR Part 989. 14

15 The USAR, in accordance with AR 200-1, 40 CFR 1500-1508, and 32 CFR 651, must comply with

16 NEPA requirements for analyzing the environmental consequences of proposed asset management

17 actions and generating documentation that describes environmental impacts, if any. 32 CFR 651 sets

18 forth the Army's policies and responsibilities for implementing NEPA compliance.

The USAR, in accordance with EO 14096 and EO 12898, must identify and address disproportionate and adverse impacts on minority populations and/or low-income populations to the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law. The USAR, in accordance with EO 13175, will not promulgate any regulation that has tribal implications, which imposes substantial direct compliance costs on Indian tribal governments, and that is not required by statute unless the regulation meets the conditions described in Section 5 of EO 13175. Per EO 13045, the USAR must identify and assess environmental health and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children.

26

# **1.4.2** Integration of Other Environmental Statutes and Regulations

To comply with NEPA, the planning and decision-making process for actions proposed by federal 27 agencies involves a study of other relevant environmental statutes and regulations. The NEPA 28 29 process, however, does not replace procedural or substantive requirements of other environmental 30 statutes and regulations. It addresses them collectively in the form of an EA or EIS, which enables 31 the decision-maker to have a comprehensive view of major environmental issues and requirements 32 associated with a Proposed Action. According to CEQ regulations, the requirements of NEPA can 33 be integrated "with other planning and environmental review procedures required by law or by 34 agency practice so that all such procedures run concurrently rather than consecutively" (40 CFR 35 part 1500.2 [c]), which enables the decision maker to have a comprehensive view of major 36 environmental issues and requirements associated with a Proposed Action.

37

25

# 1.4.3 Interagency Coordination and Public Involvement

2 NEPA ensures that environmental information is made available to the public during the decision-3 making process and before final agency actions are taken. The premise of NEPA is that the quality 4 of federal decisions will be enhanced if proponents provide information on their actions to state and 5 local governments, tribal governments, and the public and involve these entities in the planning process. The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act and EO 12372 require federal agencies to cooperate 6 7 with and consider state and local views in implementing a federal proposal. Through Interagency 8 and Intergovernmental Coordination for Environmental Planning (IICEP), the USAR has notified 9 relevant federal, state, and local agencies and allowed them sufficient time to communicate their 10 environmental concerns specific to the Proposed Action. This process facilitates interagency coordination and communication as required by CEQ, and EO 12372 was superseded by EO 12416, 11 and subsequently supplemented by EO 13132. A record of public involvement, agency coordination, 12 13 and Native American consultation is provided with this document. This record includes the distribution list and copies of all relevant correspondence, which can be found in Appendix A. 14

15 A notice of availability for the draft EA was published in the Marietta Daily Journal and 16 Atlanta Journal-Constitution as display ads in both Spanish and English. The notice was 17 posted in Spanish due to the high proportion of Spanish speakers near the Proposed Action 18 Area. The notice included a contact person for translation services if needed. Publication of the 19 notice of availability initiated a 30-day public review period. Copies of the draft EA were made 20 available at the Smyrna Public Library, 100 Village Green Circle, Smyrna, Georgia 30080. A 21 copy was also available online. The draft EA was also made available during the 30-day public 22 review period for federal, state, and local agencies and tribes. Comments to the draft were 23 accepted electronically and in writing.

# 24 **1.5** Interagency/Intergovernmental Coordination and Consultation

# 1.5.1 Interagency Coordination and Consultation

Scoping is an early and open process for developing the breadth of issues to be addressed in the EA and for identifying significant concerns related to a Proposed Action. Per the requirements of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act (42 USC § 4231(a)) and EO 12372, federal, state, and local agencies with jurisdiction that could be affected by the Proposed Action Alternative were notified during the development of this EA.

31 **1.5.2 Intergovernmental Consultations** 

EO 13175 directs Federal agencies to coordinate and consult with Native American tribal governments whose interests might be directly and substantially affected by activities on federally administered lands. Consistent with that EO, Department of Defense (DoD) Instruction (DoDI) 4710.02, *DoD Interactions with Federally-Recognized Tribes*, and Air Force Instruction 90-2002, *Air Force Interaction with Federally-Recognized Tribes*, Federally Recognized Tribes that are historically affiliated with Dobbins ARB's geographic region are invited to consult on all proposed undertakings that have a potential to affect properties of cultural, historical, or religious significance

- 1 to the Tribes. The tribal consultation process is distinct from NEPA consultation or the interagency
- 2 coordination process, and it requires separate notification of all relevant Tribes. The timelines for
- 3 tribal consultation are also distinct from those of other consultations. Per the requirements of the
- 4 Intergovernmental Cooperation Act (42 USC § 4231(a)) and EO 12372, Native American Tribes that
- 5 could be affected by the Proposed Action Alternative were notified during the development of this
- 6 EA. All relevant correspondence can be found in **Appendix A**.

# **2** Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives

2 The USAR proposes to construct and operate an 600-member ARC in the vicinity of the Atlanta Metropolitan Area to support the readiness of USAR Soldiers. ARC would include training facilities, 3 4 VMS, and USB and be capable of meeting facility requirements of the USAR Design Guide, as well as AT/FP requirements and physical security measures. The following sections provide a detailed 5 6 description of the Proposed Action and the alternatives considered to meet the Purpose and Need. 7 CEQ regulations require that all reasonable alternatives be evaluated under NEPA. Alternatives may 8 be eliminated from detailed analysis in a NEPA document based on being unfeasible and based on 9 operational constraints, technical constraints, or substantially greater environmental impacts relative to other alternatives under consideration. For this EA, the Proposed Action and a No Action 10 Alternative are analyzed. Figure 1-1 shows the general location of the Proposed Action Area, the 11 12 East Point ARC, and alternative sites no longer considered for evaluation.

# 13 **2.1 Proposed Action**

14 The Proposed Action is to provide for an 600-member ARC to support the USAR mission and 15 function within the Atlanta Metropolitan Area. The ARC would include training facilities, VMS, and 16 USB and be capable of meeting facility requirements of the USAR Design Guide, as well as AT/FP 17 requirements and physical security measures. Supporting facilities include land clearing, paving, concrete aprons, vehicle wash rack/platform(s), fencing, general site improvements, and utility 18 19 connections. The proposed ARC would be authorized for up to 206 permanent staff and 1,202 Guard 20 or Reserve staff with three monthly drill weekends. The proposed ARC would meet applicable 21 installation architectural standards, local building codes, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 22 and fire code requirements. Facilities would have sustainable principles, including life-cycle cost-23 effective practices that would be integrated into the project's design, development, and construction 24 per the Energy Policy Act and other applicable laws and EOs.

Per the DD Form 1391, suitable sites for the Proposed Action must meet the following screeningcriteria identified below:

- Be located within the Atlanta Metropolitan Area;
- Contain 20 acres or more of buildable land, or, if less than 20 acres, be configurable so as to accommodate the necessary facility components;
- Capable of meeting the USAR Design Guide, specialized space standards consistent with the
   unit training, recruiting, and retention objectives;
- Meets applicable DoD AT/FP criteria, consistent with UFC 4-010-01 DoD Minimum 8
   Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings.
- Meets the overall purpose and need and the project-specific purpose and need.

# 35

# 36 **2.2** Alternatives

Following the evaluation and dismissal of on-site alternatives at the East Point ARC location, off site alternatives at USAR facilities, and off-site alternatives at other DoD facilities, the USAR

- determined that construction and operation of a new ARC at Dobbins ARB was the only viable action 1
- 2 alternative capable of meeting the Purpose and Need of the Proposed Action and meet the screening
- criteria listed in Section 2.1. Alternatives considered and dismissed are discussed in Section 2.2.3. 3

# 2.2.1 Construction and Operation of a New ARC at Dobbins ARB (Preferred Action Alternative)

- 6 The Preferred Action Alternative, which would be located on the Dobbins ARB in Marietta, Georgia
- 7 (see Figure 1-3), includes two primary elements: (1) the construction of an ARC adequate to support
- the USAR mission in the Atlanta Metropolitan Area, and (2) the operation of the ARC by the 81st 8
- 9 RD. The following sections provide a detailed overview of these elements.

#### 10 Construction

- The Proposed Action would include the construction of an 600-member ARC, collocated VMS, and 11
- 12 USB, which would comply with the USAR Design Guide, on an approximately 11.62-acre site on
- 13 the Dobbins ARB. The East Point ARC was originally designed for commercial space, which limits
- 14 the ability to conduct effective training to complete the mission requirements.
- 15 The new ARC would consist of an 82,427 sf ARC training building, an 8,346 sf VMS, a 3,500 sf
- 16 USB, a 5,525 square yard (sy) MEP, a 6,405 sy POV parking lot, and one vehicle wash rack.
- 17 Construction to support these facilities includes land clearing, paving, concrete aprons, vehicle wash
- 18 platforms, fencing, general site improvements, and utility connections. Physical security and AT/FP
- 19 measures would be incorporated into the design, including maximum standoff distance from roads,
- 20 parking areas, and vehicle unloading areas. These measures would include the minimum site-specific
- 21 requirements that comply with the DoD AT Program (DoDI Number 2000.12) AR 525 13
- 22 Antiterrorism, and Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for 23 Buildings (UFC-4-010-01). In addition, ADA accessibility, cyber security measures and
- 24 sustainability measures would be provided at the site. The facilities would be designed for a
- 25 minimum life of 40 years in accordance with DoD UFC (UFC 1-200-02), including energy
- 26 efficiencies, building envelope, and integrated building system performance.

#### 27 **Operation**

- 28 The proposed 600-member training facility would be comprised of administrative, educational,
- 29 assembly, arms vault, weapons simulator, physical fitness, and storage area for 14 Army Reserve
- 30 Units. The VMS would be constructed to standards consisting of a drive-thru work bay (comprised
- 31 of six 16-foot by 32-foot work areas per bay), work bay safety aisle, equipment alcove, storage areas,
- 32 restrooms, maintenance administrative support, and Standard Automotive Tool Set trailer canopy.
- 33 The project would also provide vehicle wash rack/platform(s), concrete aprons, unit storage, MEP,
- 34 and POV parking.

#### 35 **2.2.2** No Action Alternative

While the No Action Alternative would not satisfy the Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action, 36 37

- 1 effects of the Proposed Action, as required in CEQ regulations (40 CFR Part 1502.14) and ARs (32
- 2 CFR Part 651). With the selection of the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Action would not be
- 3 implemented, and current operations would continue.

4 Under the No Action Alternative, the East Point ARC would continue to be used as-is. Assigned 5 USAR staff would continue to operate under the existing conditions with facilities that are 6 antiquated, undersized, overcapacity, and in poor condition. The site would continue to have 7 inadequate POV or MEP, and AT/FP compliance would remain unattainable as the front entrance 8 opens onto a public street. In addition, due to the antiquated electrical and data infrastructure, East 9 Point ARC cannot support the USAR's highly technical mission. The USAR would continue to pay 10 excessive sustainment, maintenance, and repair costs to operate the facility.

11

# 2.2.3 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Consideration

Alternatives that are eliminated from detailed study must be identified along with a brief discussion of the reasons for eliminating them. For the purposes of analysis, an alternative was considered "*unreasonable*" if it would not enable the USAR to meet the purpose of, and need for, the Proposed Action and satisfy the screening criteria. Additional information on eliminated alternatives is summarized in the following sections.

17

### 2.2.3.1 On-site Alternatives at the East Point ARC

18 The USAR evaluated multiple alternatives on the existing East Point ARC site to determine if the 19 Purpose and Need of the Proposed Action could be met using the existing facilities and property. 20 The USAR considered the following on-site alternatives:

- Renovation: Renovation of the existing facilities would not provide the objective functional
   sf specifications and the facility's authorized size. Additionally, the current condition of the
   existing facility is not conducive to installing AT/FP Standards and Army Reserve Design
   specialized space.
- Renovation/New Construction Mix: Due to the age of the building and its construction materials, renovation would require enhanced vertical construction replacement to meet AT/FP and Design Guide dated October 20, 2023 specialized space standards consistent with the objective. In addition, no facilities or land are available in the vicinity. The site is 5.8 acres, which is 14.2 acres short of the required acreage, with surrounding properties not available for purchase.
- Leasing: This alternative involves leasing commercially available properties designed to
   meet the current USAR Design Guide, specialized space. The commercial properties
   available are not typically constructed with AT/FP considerations and/or USAR Design
   Guide space requirements for a USAR Center Complex. The commercial building code
   utilized in the surrounding area is a mixture of several building functions not supported by
   administration-type leases.

1 Through evaluation of programming needs and site conditions, the USAR determined that on-site

2 alternatives at the existing East Point ARC location cannot satisfy the Purpose and Need of the

3 Proposed Action and are, therefore, non-viable. Renovating or expanding the ARC at the current

4 location would not meet the screening criteria described in **Section 2.1**.

### 2.2.3.2 Off-site Alternatives at USAR Facilities

6 The USAR evaluated other USAR facilities within the Atlanta Metropolitan Area (see Figure 1-2)

to determine if any existing USAR facilities could meet the Purpose and Need of the Proposed
 Action. The USAR considered Renovation, Renovation/New Construction, or New Construction

9 alternatives at the following facilities:

5

- Decatur ARC: Located in Decatur, Georgia, on approximately 11 acres of land. The site is six years away from passing its 40-year design life. However, utilization rates from 2019 show that utilization of additional USAR units is not possible. There is also no adjacent land available for purchase or lease in order to expand the facility footprint at this location.
- Forest Park ARC: Located in Forest Park, Georgia, on approximately 13 acres of land. This site was constructed in 1970 and is ten years past its 40-year designed life. The facility is considered to be in fair condition. Facility utilization rates for Administrative/Training was 148% in 2016. No adjacent land is also available for purchase or lease to expand the facility footprint to the necessary acreage to accommodate additional USAR units.
- Fort Gillem ARC: Located in Fort Gillem, Georgia. The ARC and associated enclave are considered to be in good condition. However, the facility utilization rates are very high. The utilization rates for the Administrative/Training facility alone were 184% in 2019. In addition, no adjacent land is available for purchase or lease to expand the facility footprint.

Through evaluation of programming needs and site conditions, the USAR determined that off-site alternatives at other existing USAR facilities within the Atlanta Metropolitan Area cannot satisfy the Purpose and Need of the Proposed Action and are, therefore, non-viable. The USAR noted that the existing facilities and properties are too small to accommodate the ARC mission; the existing facilities generally exceed programmed facility utilization rates, and additional adjacent land is generally unavailable for purchase or lease.

29 **2.2.3.3 Off-site Facilities at DOD Facilities** 

30 The USAR inquired about available facilities that could meet the Purpose and Need of the Proposed

Action at the 2019 Georgia State Facilities Board meeting<sup>2</sup>. Attendees of this board meeting included

representatives from the United States Air Force Reserve, USAR, Georgia Army National Guard,
 Georgia Air National Guard, United States Marine Corps Forces Reserve, Fort Stewart, and Fort

34 Gillem. No board members identified any available existing facilities with appropriate levels of space

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Information cited here was collected from the East Point/ Dobbins ARB Area Development Plan Future FYDP.

- 1 availability. Dobbins ARB identified and offered approximately 20 acres of buildable land located
- 2 on Dobbins ARB in Marietta, Georgia. No other available properties were identified or offered. Due
- 3 to there being no demographic change around Dobbins ARB due to the Proposed Action, there would
- 4 be no impact on off-base communities beyond minor positive impacts. The Proposed Action would
- 5 not include cumulative impacts.

This Page Was Intentionally Left Blank.

# 1 **3** Affected Environment and Consequences

This section describes the environmental resources and current conditions that may be affected by the Proposed Action and provides information to serve as a baseline from which to identify and evaluate potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts that could result from its implementation. Current conditions represent baseline conditions.

6 This chapter also describes the expected impacts for resource areas that may be affected by 7 implementing alternatives described in Chapter 2. The criteria for evaluating potential environmental 8 effects are measured in terms of context and intensity (40 CFR § 1508.27). Context is the potentially 9 affected environment, while intensity is the degree of the effects. The specific criteria for evaluating 10 the potential environmental effects of each alternative are explained under each resource category 11 throughout the following sections. Throughout this EA, impact assessment and determination of 12 impacts consider the following aspects:

- 13 • Nature of impact: 14 • Direct: Impacts occurring at the same time and place as the action and ending upon 15 completion of the action. 16 • Indirect: Impacts occurring at a later time or farther away (off-site) from the action but which are still reasonably foreseeable. 17 Duration of the impact: 18 • • Short-term: Occurring only during a finite period of time (e.g., less than one year). 19 20 • Long-term: Occurring over an indefinite period of time; persistent; chronic. Magnitude of the impact: 21 22 • No Impact: The action would not cause a change. • Negligible: The lowest level of detection; discountable; hardly noticeable. 23 24 • Minor: Slight but detectable. • Moderate: Readily apparent. 25 • Major: Severely adverse or exceptionally beneficial. 26 27 Type of impact: ٠ 28 • Beneficial: A positive or favorable consequence. • Adverse: A negative or deleterious consequence. 29 Significance of the impact: 30 ٠ 31 o Less than Significant: Having a magnitude of No Impact, Negligible, Minor, or 32 Moderate. 33 • Significant: Having a magnitude of Major. **3.1 Resources Eliminated from Detailed Analysis** 34 Per CEQ regulations (40 CFR § 1501.7(s) (3)), federal agencies may focus their NEPA analysis on 35 36 those resource areas that could be affected and omit discussions of resource areas that would not be 37
- affected by a Proposed Action. The following resource areas have been reviewed and determined not
   to warrant further consideration because there would be no or negligible potential for effects from

implementing the Preferred Action Alternative. Therefore, these resource areas are not discussed 1

2 further in the EA.

3

### **3.1.1** Land Use

4 Dobbins ARB encompasses approximately 1,660 acres between the cities of Smyrna and Marietta, 5 approximately 20 miles northwest of downtown Atlanta (Dobbins ARB, 2018). The Preferred Action 6 Alternative would be consistent with the adjoining land use and the surroundings; therefore, this

- 7 resource is excluded from further discussion.
- 8 **3.1.2** Groundwater

9 Groundwater under Dobbins ARB consists of a surficial water table and bedrock aquifers; however, 10 the bedrock aquifers beneath Dobbins ARB are generally unproductive and contain a high concentration of minerals. The aquifer beneath Dobbins ARB is unconfined and characterized by 11 12 three geologic strata: residual soils, underlying fractured bedrock, and competent bedrock. The 13 residual soils and underlying fractured bedrock provide the dominant pathway for groundwater flow. 14 Groundwater in the northern Piedmont Physiographic Province occurs predominantly in joints and 15 fractures in the bedrock and the pore spaces overlying the bedrock or flows in the openings in the 16 exposed rock. Depth to groundwater varies in the northern portion of Dobbins ARB from approximately 12 feet below ground surface (bgs) on the eastern portion of Dobbins to 60 feet bgs 17 18 on the west side of the Dobbins ARB. Based on a geotechnical investigation, groundwater at the 19 Proposed Action Area ranges from approximately 31 to 38 feet bgs (Terracon on Behalf of Pond &

20 Company, 2024).

21 Two monitoring wells, located in the northern-central portion of the Proposed Action Area, were 22 observed during the site visit for the May 2024 Environmental Baseline Survey (Pond & Company-23 Tetra Tech Joint Venture, 2024a). Installed in the early 2000s during an off-site investigation, the 24 monitoring wells were most recently sampled on March 26, 2004, and June 03, 2004. The 25 investigations indicated non-detectable levels of tested constituents, including volatile organic compounds (VOCs), except for an instance of chloroform in one well, which was greater than the 26 27 detection limit but less than the reporting limit. All findings were below detection limits during the subsequent sampling event (June 03, 2004), including chloroform. These monitoring wells would be 28 29 capped and abandoned before the construction of the Preferred Action Alternative.

- 30 The construction of the new facilities would not require excavation to the groundwater depth or use
- of groundwater. The depth of ground disturbance would vary between 10 and 15 feet bgs. The 31
- 32 Preferred Action Alternative would have no impact on groundwater; therefore, this resource does not
- 33 warrant further consideration and is excluded from further discussion.
- 34 **3.1.3 Floodplains**

35 EOs 11988 and 13690 require federal undertakings to avoid floodplains whenever possible and minimize harm if locating in a floodplain is unavoidable. 36

1 A floodplain is located in the southeastern area of the Proposed Action Area. This floodplain consists

2 of Zone A – 1% Annual Flood Hazard located in Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood

3 Insurance Rate Maps Flood Panel 13067C0117G eff. 12/16/2008 (see Figure 3-1). The Proposed

4 Action would avoid any development within the flood zone to minimize flood risk on-site. The

5 Preferred Action Alternative would have no impact on floodplains. Therefore, this resource does not 6 warrant further consideration and is excluded from further discussion.

# 7 **3.1.4** Environmental Justice and Protection of Children

8 EO 13045 states that each Federal agency "(*a*) shall make it a high priority to identify and assess 9 environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children; and (b) shall 10 ensure that its policies, programs, activities, and standards address disproportionate risks to 11 children that result from environmental health risks or safety risks."

EO 14096 was issued in April 2023 to advance environmental justice and address disparities in environmental impacts on communities, building on EO 12898. The EO emphasizes the need for clean air, water, and a healthy environment for everyone, highlighting the importance of justice, liberty, and equality. It calls for implementing and enforcing environmental and civil rights laws, pollution prevention, climate change mitigation, and cleanup of legacy pollution. The order aims to support culturally vibrant, sustainable communities with equitable housing, energy, and transportation access.

Dobbins ARB does not offer on-base housing; therefore, low-income populations, minority 19 20 populations, or dependent children under the age of 18 are not present at Dobbins ARB. While there are communities with a high proportion of minority and/or low-income populations within a 1-mile 21 22 radius of Dobbins ARB compared to reference communities (United States Environmental Protection Agency [USEPA], 2024a), the Preferred Action Alternative would not impact off-base communities. 23 24 No disproportionate effects on environmental justice communities or the environmental health and 25 safety of children would result from the implementation of the Preferred Action Alternative; 26 therefore, these resources are dismissed from further discussion. The USEPA environmental justice 27 screening tool (EJScreen) was utilized for this information (Appendix D).

28

# 3.1.5 Demographics and Housing

29 The Proposed Action does not include changes to the number of staff employed by the USAR; there 30 is currently no on-base housing at Dobbins ARB. The USAR surveyed soldiers and concluded that 31 43% of soldiers live within 50 miles of the East Point ARC located at 2323 Dauphine Street, East 32 Point, Georgia 30344 (see Figure 1-1). The Proposed Action Area, located in Marietta, Georgia, is 33 approximately 20 miles from the East Point ARC. Due to the relatively minimal change in site 34 location, there would be minimal impact on the housing needs for USAR soldiers upon completion 35 of the Preferred Action Alternative. A change in demographics and housing is not anticipated. 36 Therefore, these resources do not warrant further consideration and are excluded from further 37 discussion.

# 2 **3.1.6** Aesthetic and Visual Resources

The Preferred Action Alternative would have insignificant impacts on aesthetics and visual resources and would not result in any obvious modifications to the existing aesthetic and visual landscape at Dobbins ARB. The visual appearance of the proposed facilities would be consistent with the developed areas in the vicinity of the Proposed Action Area. Therefore, these resources do not warrant further consideration and are excluded from further discussion.

### 8 **3.1.7** Airspace

9 Implementing the Preferred Action Alternative would not result in additional aircraft, aircraft 10 operations, or changes in airspace use at Dobbins ARB. As a result, there would be no impact on 11 airspace, and this resource is excluded from further discussion.

#### 12 **3.2 Resources Considered in Detail**

Detailed analysis has been conducted on the following resource areas to document the potentialimpacts from the Proposed Action.

### 15 **3.2.1 Geology and Soils**

For this analysis, the geology resource category relates to the subterranean structure and composition of the earth including rocks, minerals, and the processes by which they are formed or changed. Soil refers to the unconsolidated mineral or organic material on the immediate surface of the earth that serves as a natural medium for the growth of plants.

#### 20

#### 3.2.1.1 Affected Environment

#### 21 Geology

22 Dobbins ARB is located within the Central Uplands district of the Piedmont physiographic province (United States Geological Survey, 1997). The topography of Dobbins ARB is gently rolling and 23 gradually slopes downward to the southeast. Ground surface elevation at Dobbins ARB ranges from 24 approximately 1,100 feet above sea level in the northwest corner of Dobbins ARB to 950 feet above 25 26 mean sea level in the southwest corner (Parsons, 1995). The Proposed Action Area exhibits 27 significant topographic relief, sloping downhill toward the stream that passes through the southeastern portion of the Proposed Action Area. The elevation of the Proposed Action Area ranges 28 from approximately 1,040 feet to 950 feet above the mean sea level. 29

Bedrock underlying Dobbins ARB consists of the New Georgia Group, which is overlain by the
 Sandy Springs Group (AFCEC, 2018). The New Georgia Group is comprised of amphibolite,

32 hornblende gneiss, and magnetite quartz, with minor schists. Overlying the New Georgia Group, the

33 Sandy Springs Group consists of the Powers Ferry Formation (interbedded gneisses, schists, and

34 amphibolites), the Chattahoochee Palisades Quartzite, and the Factory Shoals Formation

35 (interbedded metagreywacke and kyanite quartz schist) (Parsons, 1995).

#### 1 <u>Soil</u>

- 2 Soil types present within the Proposed Action Area are described in **Table 3-1**. Soil overlying the
- 3 bedrock is present in thickness between 0 feet (outcroppings present) to over 100 feet bgs across
- 4 Dobbins ARB and was derived in-place from the weathering of underlying metamorphic and igneous
- 5 rocks (Parsons, 1995). All soil groups are considered moderately well drained to well drained. All
- 6 soils are non-hydric.
- 7 **Table 3-1.** Soil Types within the Proposed Action Area.

Soil Type(s)		Percent of the Proposed Action Area
Appling sandy clay loam, 6 to 10 percent slopes	1.5	11.6%
Cecil sandy loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes	2.4	18.7%
Cecil sandy loam, 6 to 10 percent slopes		34.2%
Gwinnett clay loam, 6 to 10 percent slopes		6.1%
Madison and Pacolet soils, 15 to 25 percent slopes		9.1%
Pacolet sandy loam, 10 to 15 percent slopes		16.0%
Toccoa sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	0.5	4.2%

Source: Natural Resource Conservation Service, 2024

#### 8 **3.2.1.2** Environmental Consequences

- 9 For the purposes of this evaluation, the area of potential impacts is defined as the boundary of the
- 10 Proposed Action Area and immediately adjacent areas.

#### 11 **3.2.1.2.1** Preferred Action Alternative

#### 12 Construction

- Construction of the Preferred Action Alternative would result in direct, long-term, moderate, adverse impacts to soils within the Proposed Action Area due to mass grading, compaction from heavy equipment, and construction of impervious surfaces. Alteration of native soil and topography would
- 16 occur on approximately 10.3 acres. Impacts on soils are considered less than significant in the overall
- 17 context of Dobbins ARB. Construction of the Preferred Action Alternative would have no impact on
- 18 geology because excavation would not occur at a depth or scale that would affect geologic resources.
- 19 The construction contractor would be required to develop and implement effective sedimentation
- 20 and erosion control procedures and best management practices (BMPs) to be used during
- 21 construction to minimize erosion of surrounding soils due to soil/ground disturbance in accordance
- 22 with the Georgia Erosion and Sedimentation Control Act. See Section 3.2.2 for additional
- 23 information on erosion related to stormwater management.

#### 24 **Operation**

- 25 Operation of the Preferred Action Alternative would have no impacts on geology or soils because no
- 26 activities with the potential to affect these resources would occur. A discussion of surface water and
- 27 stormwater considerations can be found in **Section 3.2.2**.

- 1 **3.2.1.2.2** No Action Alternative
- No new construction would occur under the No Action Alternative, and existing conditions would
   continue. Therefore, there would be no impacts on geology or soils.

#### 4 **3.2.2 Water Resources**

- 5 Water resources include surface water, wetlands, and stormwater. Hydrology concerns water
- 6 distribution through evapotranspiration, atmospheric transport, precipitation, surface runoff and
- 7 flow, and subsurface flow.

#### 8 **3.2.2.1** Affected Environment

#### 9 <u>Surface Waters</u>

- 10 Dobbins ARB is located within the Upper Chattahoochee watershed. A Waters of the United States
- 11 (WOTUS) delineation was conducted on October 30, 2023 (Pond & Company-Tetra Tech Joint
- 12 Venture, 2024b). There is one perennial stream, which is located within the southeastern portion of
- 13 the Proposed Action Area (see Figure 3-1). This stream drains into Rottenwood Creek,
- 14 approximately 2,270 feet northwest of the Proposed Action Area. Rottenwood Creek is listed on the
- 15 Georgia Environmental Protection Division's (GAEPD's) 303(d) list of impaired streams. It is noted
- 16 as not supporting its designated fishing use due to impacted fish and macroinvertebrate communities
- 17 associated with urban runoff. A Total Maximum Daily Load has been established for fecal coliform.
- 18 The perennial stream located within the Proposed Action Area is subject to regulation under Section
- 19 404 of the Clean Water Act, and any discharge of fill material would require permitting through the
- 20 USACE Savannah District. Under the Official Code of Georgia, Title 12, the stream is considered a
- 21 Buffered State Water by the GAEPD and is subject to a 25-foot vegetated buffer requirement.
- 22 Disturbance within the 25-foot vegetated buffer would require a variance from the GAEPD. Under
- the Official Code of Cobb County, Part I, Chapter 50, Article 3, the stream is also subject to a 50-
- foot vegetative buffer and a 25-foot impervious setback to be established from the edge of the 50-
- 25 foot buffer. Disturbance within the 50-foot buffer or impervious setback would require a variance
- 26 from Cobb County.

# 27 <u>Wetlands</u>

- A WOTUS delineation was conducted on October 30, 2023, and no wetlands were identified within
- 29 the Proposed Action Area. The determination that there are no wetlands within the project boundaries
- 30 was made by the Pond & Tetra Tech Joint Venture Ecologists in March 2024. This determination
- 31 coincides with an Aquatic Resource Delineation Report that was approved by USACE in January
- 32 2023.

# 33 <u>Stormwater</u>

- 34 As the Proposed Action Area is presently undeveloped, the existing stormwater infrastructure is
- 35 minimal. It consists of a roadside swale that is concrete-lined in portions and gravel-lined in portions
- 36 along Lake Circle and a grassy roadside swale along South Cobb Drive, which was observed during

1 the site visit conducted on October 30, 2023. The swales convey off-site stormwater toward the

- 2 perennial stream located in the southeastern portion of the Proposed Action Area.
- 3

#### 3.2.2.2 Environmental Consequences

4 Effects on water resources would be insignificant unless the Proposed Action would (1) reduce water

- 5 availability or supply, (2) exceed the safe annual yield of water supplies, (3) adversely affect water
- 6 quality, (4) threaten or damage hydrology, or (5) violate local, state, or federal water resources laws
- 7 or regulations. For the purposes of this evaluation, the area of potential impacts is defined as the
- 8 boundary of the Proposed Action Area and immediately adjacent areas.

# 9 **3.2.2.2.1** Preferred Action Alternative

# 10 **Construction**

- 11 Construction of the Preferred Action Alternative would have no impact on surface waters or
- 12 wetlands. Wetlands are absent within the Proposed Action Area, and the proposed site design would
- 13 provide a 100-foot undisturbed buffer from the perennial stream. There would be no disturbance
- 14 within the perennial stream, the 25-foot buffer, 50-foot buffer, or 25-foot impervious setback.

15 Construction of the Preferred Action Alternative would have a direct, short-term, negligible, adverse

- 16 impact on stormwater due to the potential for erosion and sedimentation during construction. Impacts
- 17 on stormwater are considered less than significant due to the required erosion and sedimentation
- 18 controls that would be implemented during construction. The project design would include an
- 19 Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan, which would comply with all applicable local,
- state, and federal regulations. Appropriate BMPs would be (e.g., schedules, stabilization measures,
   structural practices, sediment basins, etc.) designed, installed, and maintained in accordance with
- 22 State of Georgia requirements. The construction contractor would be required to submit a Notice of
- 23 Intent for permit coverage under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit
- 24 GAR100001 for Stand Alone Construction Projects to discharge stormwater associated with
- 25 construction activity; submittal of a land disturbance application to Cobb County Stormwater
- 26 Department; obtaining a dig permit from the 94th Civil Engineer Squadron to identify underground
- 27 utilities, and submission of a Notice of Termination to Cobb County Stormwater Department
- following completion of work when site conditions meet the definition of "*final stabilization*." All
- 29 permit applications would be submitted to the 94th Civil Engineering Squadron for review prior to
- 30 final submittal to governing authorities.
- 31 Federal development projects must comply with the stormwater design requirements of the EISA 32 (Title 42, USC, Section 17094). Specific concerns regarding EISA compliance on AFBs are 33 addressed in Stormwater Compliance for Air Force Bases (Krishnan et al., 2011). The EISA requires 34 that federal facility projects over 5,000 gross square feet must "maintain or restore, to the maximum 35 extent technically feasible, the predevelopment hydrology of the property with regard to the 36 temperature, rate, volume, and duration of flow." DoD policy on implementing Section 438 of the 37 EISA states that new facilities or expanded facilities with a new footprint greater than 5,000 gross square feet of horizontal hard surfaces (such as building areas and pavements) must comply with the 38

- 1 EISA requirements using low-impact development (LID) techniques to achieve an overall design
- 2 objective of maintaining predevelopment hydrology and preventing any net increase in stormwater
- 3 runoff to the maximum extent technically feasible. The maximum extent technically feasible
- 4 criterion requires full employment of accepted and reasonable stormwater retention and reuse
- 5 technologies (e.g., bio-retention areas, permeable pavements, cisterns/recycling, and green roofs),
  6 subject to site and applicable regulatory constraints. The Preferred Action Alternative would comply
- 7 with the EISA requirements through the use of LID techniques to maintain predevelopment
- 8 hydrology, and prevent any net increase in stormwater runoff to the maximum extent technically
- 9 feasible. Subject to site and applicable regulatory constraints, acceptable, and reasonable stormwater
- 10 retention and reuse technologies would be used. The stormwater runoff would be properly managed
- 11 to avoid adversely impacting the water quality of off-site surface waters.

#### 12 **Operation**

13 Operation of the Preferred Action Alternative would have no impact on surface waters or wetlands.

- 14 Operation of the Preferred Action Alternative would have a direct, short-term, negligible, adverse
- 15 impact on stormwater due to the long-term addition of impervious surfaces. The Preferred Action
- 16 Alternative would include post-development stormwater controls and LID techniques that comply
- with EISA requirements (as noted above) as well as local, state, and federal requirements.
  Specifically, the Preferred Action Alternative would include the installation of two separate
- 19 stormwater facilities with forebays, infiltration basins, and detention pond treatment trains. All
- 20 stormwater from the facility would be treated prior to discharge. The proposed facility would
- 21 maintain predevelopment hydrology and avoid a net increase in stormwater runoff to the maximum
- 22 extent technically feasible.
- 23

# 3.2.2.2.2 No Action Alternative

No new construction would occur under the No Action Alternative, and existing conditions wouldcontinue. Therefore, there would be no impacts on water resources.

# 26 **3.2.3** Air Quality

Air pollution is the presence in the outdoor atmosphere of one or more contaminants (e.g., dust, 27 fumes, gas, mist, odor, smoke, or vapor) in quantities and of characteristics and duration such as to 28 29 be injurious to human, plant, or animal life or to property, or to interfere unreasonably with the 30 comfortable enjoyment of life and property. Air quality as a resource incorporates several 31 components that describe the overall air pollution levels within a region, sources of air emissions, 32 and regulations governing air emissions. The following paragraphs discuss the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), local ambient air quality, General Conformity, Greenhouse Gas 33 34 emissions, and federal and state regulatory requirements.

#### 35 Air Quality Standard

- The CAA (42 U.S.C. § 7401–7671q), as amended, gives USEPA the responsibility to establish the
- 37 primary and secondary NAAQS (40 CFR § 50) that set acceptable concentration levels for six criteria
- 38 pollutants. These standards represent the maximum allowable ambient concentrations for ground-

1 level ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), respirable

- 2 particulate matter (including particulate matter equal to or less than 10 microns in aerodynamic
- 3 diameter  $[PM_{10}]$  and particulate matter equal to or less than 2.5 microns in aerodynamic diameter
- 4  $[PM_{2.5}]$ ), and lead (Pb). Ground-level  $O_3$  is created through the reactions of VOCs and nitrogen
- 5 oxides in the presence of sunlight. Short-term standards (i.e., periods generally less than 24 hours)
- 6 have been established for pollutants contributing to acute health effects, while long-term standards
- 7 (i.e., quarterly or annual averages) have been established for pollutants contributing to chronic health
- 8 effects. Each state has the authority to adopt standards stricter than those established under the federal
  9 program; however, the State of Georgia follows the federal standards for all pollutants that would be
- 10 emitted under this Proposed Action. **Table 3-2** presents the USEPA NAAQS for federally listed
- 11 criteria pollutants.

Pollutant	Averaging Time	Primary Standard	Secondary Standard	Cobb County Attainment Status
CO	8-hour	9 ppm	None	Attainment
CO	1-hour	35 ppm	None	Attainment
Pb	Rolling 3-Month Average	0.15 μg/m <sup>3</sup>	Same as Primary	Attainment
NO.	Annual	53 ppb	Same as Primary	Attainment
NO <sub>2</sub>	1-hour	100 ppb	None	Attainment
<b>PM</b> <sub>10</sub>	24-hour	$150 \ \mu g/m^3$	Same as Primary	Attainment
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Annual	9.0 μg/m <sup>3</sup>	15.0 μg/m <sup>3</sup>	Maintenance
	24-hour	$35 \ \mu g/m^3$	Same as Primary	Maintenance
03	8-hour	0.070 ppm	Same as Primary	Maintenance
SO <sub>2</sub>	3-hour	75 ppb	0.5 ppm	Attainment

12 **Table 3-2.** Ambient Air Quality Standards within Proposed Action Area.

Source: EPA, 2024b

Note: This table is intended to provide a listing of designations and classifications for current, active NAAQS. While NAAQS, which have been revoked by the USEPA, does not appear in this table, some anti-backsliding obligations may continue to apply for revoked standards.  $\mu g/m3 = microgram(s)$  per cubic meter

ppm = part(s) per million, by volume

#### 13 Attainment Versus Nonattainment

The USEPA classifies the air quality in an air quality control region (AQCR), or in subareas of an 14 15 AQCR (e.g. counties), according to whether the concentrations of criteria pollutants in ambient air exceed the NAAQS. Areas within each AQCR are, therefore, designated as either attainment, 16 17 nonattainment, maintenance, or unclassified for each of the six criteria pollutants. Attainment means that the air quality within an area is better than the NAAQS; nonattainment indicates that criteria 18 pollutant levels exceed NAAQS; maintenance indicates that an area was previously designated 19 20 nonattainment but is now attaining; and an unclassified air quality designation by USEPA means that there is not enough information to appropriately classify an area, so the area is considered attainment. 21 22 In accordance with the CAA, each state or commonwealth must develop a State Implementation

- 1 Plan, which is a compilation of regulations, strategies, schedules, and enforcement actions designed
- 2 to move the state or commonwealth into compliance with all NAAQS.

#### 3 General Conformity

4 The General Conformity Rule (40 CFR Part 93) applies to federal actions in nonattainment or 5 maintenance areas. The emissions thresholds above which trigger requirements for a conformity 6 analysis are called *de minimis* levels. *De minimis* emission levels (in tons per year [tpy]) vary by pollutant and depend on the severity of the nonattainment status for the air quality management area 7 8 in question. Actions subject to the Transportation Conformity Rule or below de minimis thresholds 9 are exempt from the rule. The General Conformity rule requires that a subject federal action meet the requirements of a State Implementation Plan or Federal Implementation Plan. More specifically, 10 CAA conformity is ensured when a federal action does not cause a new violation of the NAAQS; 11 contribute to an increase in the frequency or severity of violations of NAAQS; or delay the timely 12 13 attainment of any NAAQS, interim progress milestones, or other milestones toward achieving compliance with the NAAQS. 14

15 Under the USEPA New Source Review (NSR) program, stationary sources of air pollution are

16 required to have permits before construction of the source begins. Approval of the NSR Prevention

- 17 of Significant Deterioration permit would be required if the proposed action were either a new source,
- 18 with the potential to emit 250 tons or more per year of an attainment pollutant, or an existing major
- 19 source of emissions, making a major modification in an attainment area and resulting in a net
- 20 emissions increase above specified levels. Nonattainment NSR approval would be required if the
- 21 proposed project were a new stationary source or major source of emissions, making a major
- 22 modification in a nonattainment area with the potential to emit nonattainment pollutants in excess of
- the NSR thresholds.

#### 24 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

- Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are gaseous compounds that trap heat in the atmosphere. These compounds are emitted from natural processes as well as human activities. The most common GHGs emitted from human activities include carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane, and nitrous oxide. GHGs are produced by burning fossil fuels and through industrial and biological processes. Scientific evidence indicates a trend of increasing global temperature over the past century due to increased GHGs in the atmosphere. Human activity has contributed to the increase in GHG concentrations. The climate change associated with this global warming is predicted to produce negative environmental,
- 32 economic, and social consequences across the globe.
- 33 As of the date of this EA, guidance for the analysis of GHGs with respect to NEPA documents is in
- 34 flux. Draft guidance from CEQ issued in 2019 was rescinded on February 19, 2021. The final
- 35 guidance from 2016 is currently under review. As such, there is no specific guidance on whether to
- 36 include a specific emissions amount or threshold that should be used in determining significance;
- 37 instead, it leaves that determination up to the document preparers. Previous draft CEQ guidance
- 38 recommended that agencies consider 27,563 tons (25,000 metric tons) of carbon dioxide equivalent

- 1 (CO<sub>2</sub>e) emissions annually as a reference point below which a quantitative analysis of GHG is not
- 2 recommended unless it is easily accomplished based on available tools and data. That previous
- 3 guidance will be used for this analysis.
- EO 13990<sup>3</sup>, *Protecting Public Health and the Environment and Restoring Science to Tackle the Climate Crisis*, tasks agencies to capture the costs of GHG emissions to include the "*social cost of carbon*", "*social cost of nitrous oxide*", and the "*social cost of methane*" associated with increases in GHG emissions and their impact on climate pollution. The climate change associated with global warming is predicted to produce negative economic and social consequences in many parts of the
- 9 globe.
- 10 The January 9, 2023, NEPA Guidance on the Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and
- 11 Climate Change, issued by CEQ, provides interim guidelines to federal agencies on how to integrate
- 12 climate change and GHG emissions considerations into their NEPA reviews. This guidance aligns
- 13 with EO 13990, aiming to protect public health and the environment and restore scientific integrity
- 14 in tackling the climate crisis.
- 15 Global climate change refers to any significant, long-term fluctuations in temperature, precipitation,
- 16 wind, sea level, and other elements of Earth's climate system brought about because of changes in
- 17 the atmosphere as well as interactions between the atmosphere and various other geologic, chemical,
- 18 biological, and geographic factors within the Earth system. Ways in which the Earth's climate system
- 19 may be influenced by changes in the concentration of various gases in the atmosphere have been
- 20 discussed worldwide. Of particular interest, GHGs are gases<sup>4</sup> (e.g., CO<sub>2</sub>). GHG emissions occur from
- 21 natural processes and human activities. Scientific evidence indicates a trend of increasing global
- 22 temperature over the past century because of increased GHG emissions from human activities.
- 23 EO 14008, Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad, outlines policies to reduce GHG
- emissions and bolster resilience to the impacts of climate change. The EO directs CEQ to review,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> EO 13990 directed CEQ to update its *Final Guidance for Federal Departments and Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in National Environmental Policy Act Reviews.* CEQ's final guidance on GHG and climate change had been revoked by EO 13783 *Promoting Energy Independence and Economic Growth* and CEQ prepared new guidance, *Draft National Environmental Policy Act Guidance on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions* which subsequently has been rescinded by EO 13990.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>The principal GHGs are water vapor, CO<sub>2</sub>, methane, NO, and fluorinated gases. Although water vapor is the largest contributor to the Earth's greenhouse effect, it does not control the Earth's temperature because it is condensable, i.e., the maximum amount of water vapor is regulated by the atmosphere's temperature through evaporation and condensation. Without an increase in the remaining non-condensable GHGs, the amount of water vapor would remain constant, i.e., barring other changed conditions. Importantly, atmospheric water vapor generally cannot be attributed to human activities. In contrast, CO<sub>2</sub> is largely emitted through human activities. It is the most important GHG and accounts for about 80 percent of United States GHG emissions. CO<sub>2</sub> enters the atmosphere through the burning of fossil fuels, solid waste, trees and wood products, and certain chemical reactions. Plants remove it from the atmosphere naturally as part of the biological carbon cycle.

- 1 revise, and update its 2016 final guidance entitled "Final Guidance for Federal Departments and
- 2 Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in
- 3 National Environmental Policy Act Reviews." The CEQ guidance requires agencies within the DoD
- 4 to quantify GHG emissions in NEPA assessments and review federal actions in the context of future
- 5 climate scenarios and resiliency.
- 6 **3.2.3.1 Affected Environment**
- Cobb County is in maintenance for current PM<sub>2.5</sub> and O<sub>3</sub> NAAQS (Table 3-2). Cobb County is in
  attainment with all other current NAAQS.

#### 9 <u>Climate Conditions and Trends</u>

- 10 For Atlanta, Georgia, which is the closest major city to Dobbins ARB, the average high temperature
- 11 is 90.1 °F in July, which is the warmest month; Average low temperature is 35.6 °F in January, which
- 12 is the coldest month; Atlanta has an average annual precipitation of 50.43 inches. The wettest month
- 13 of the year is July, with an average rainfall of 4.75 inches.
- 14 Annual average temperatures are projected to rise by as much as approximately 7°F by 2050 and
- 15 13°F by 2100. Overall, rising temperatures will lead to more intense heat waves but decreased cold
- 16 wave intensity. Since 2000, Georgia has generally experienced below-average precipitation,
- 17 including one of the worst droughts in Georgia's history in 2007. While precipitation projections are
- 18 inconclusive, droughts are expected to become more intense because of increased evaporation rates
- 19 from higher temperatures (Frankson et al., 2017).

# 20 **3.2.3.2 Environmental Consequences**

- This analysis relies on the significance thresholds for criteria pollutants described within the USAF's Air Quality EIAP Guide Volume II (USAF, 2020) to determine the significance of impacts to the air quality resource. Since Cobb County is currently in maintenance status for two NAAQS pollutants, emissions exceeding the *de minimis* thresholds of the General Conformity Rule would be considered significant while emissions below these thresholds would be considered insignificant. For GHG, this
- 26 analysis relies on previous CEQ guidance of 27,563 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions on an annual basis as a
- 27 threshold of significance.

# 28 **3.2.3.2.1** Preferred Action Alternative

# 29 <u>Construction</u>

30 Construction of the Preferred Action Alternative would result in direct, short-term, minor, adverse 31 impacts on air quality associated with the operation of construction equipment, generating exhaust 32 emissions, dust, and mobile source emissions from vehicular traffic. Impacts on air quality are 33 considered less than significant since they fall below the significance thresholds established in 34 Section 3.2.3.2 (Table 3-3; Appendix C). The estimation of construction and operational emissions 35 was conducted using the USAF's Air Conformity Applicability Model, with BMPs planned to mitigate potential impacts, such as controlling dust and maintaining equipment to reduce exhaust 36 37 emissions.
	l
	I
1	

2	Table 3-3. Estimated	Emissions of	Criteria Pollutar	nts from the Prez	ferred Action A	lternative.
---	----------------------	--------------	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-------------

Emission Source	Emissions for 2025 (tpy)								
Emission Source	VOCs	CO	NO <sub>2</sub>	SO <sub>2</sub>	<b>PM</b> <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Pb	CO <sub>2e</sub>	
Total Construction Emissions	0.42	4.24	3.39	0.01	12.09	0.12	0.00	796.22	
Annual Operation Emissions	0.353	4.797	0.478	0.003	0.030	0.029	0.00	867.45	
<i>de minimis</i> levels (tpy)	100	100	100	100	100	100	25	27,563	
Threshold Exceeded for Any Activity?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	

3 Source: Record of Conformity Analysis (Appendix C)

### 4 **Operation**

5 Operation of the Preferred Action Alternative would have indirect, long-term, negligible, adverse

6 impacts on air quality. Impacts on air quality are considered less than significant since they fall below

7 the significance thresholds established in Section 3.2.3.2 (Table 3-3; Appendix C). In addition,

8 climate change is not expected to influence future operations or exacerbate impacts associated with

9 the Preferred Action Alternative, as Dobbins ARB is not situated in a coastal region or along a tidally

10 influenced river reach, thus remaining unaffected by sea level rise associated with climate change.

11 Therefore, although the impacts would be long-term due to the ongoing operation associated with

12 the Proposed Action, the impacts on air quality would be negligible.

### 13 **3.2.3.2.2** No Action Alternative

14 Implementation of the No Action Alternative would not change current conditions at Dobbins ARB

15 and would not impact air quality.

### 16 **3.2.4** Noise

20

Noise is defined as unwanted or annoying sound that interferes with or disrupts normal human activities such as sleep, conversation, or student learning. Noise measurements are normally considered when determining noise impacts and include the following:

- Decibel (dB): A measurement of the sound pressure level.
- A-weighted sound pressure level (dBA): The sound pressure level is adjusted by an A-weighting filter. The filter places greater emphasis on frequencies within the sensitive range of the human ear by de-emphasizing the very low and very high-frequency components. Typically, human hearing is best approximated by using a dBA scale (USEPA, 1974).

- 1 2
- Day-night average sound level (DNL): Total accumulation of sound energy but spread out uniformly over a 24-hour period.

The decibel scale is logarithmic instead of arithmetic. When sound pressure doubles, the sound 3 4 pressure level, as expressed by dBA, increases by 3. Most humans do not perceive this increase in 5 sound until there is an increase of 10 dBA (USEPA, 1974). Sound pressure decreases with distance 6 from the source. There is a reduction of 6 dBA for every doubling of distance from the noise source. 7 However, other factors, including ground type, atmospheric conditions, and shielding by vegetation 8 and structures further affect the amount of decrease in sound over distance (United States Department 9 of Transportation [US DOT], 2011). The Federal Aviation Administration and the United States 10 Department of Housing and Urban Development criteria specify that noise levels in noise-sensitive 11 land use areas are normally considered unacceptable if they exceed a DNL of 65 dBA.

12 **3.2.4.1** Affected Environment

13 Noise sources at Dobbins ARB include aircraft operations and maintenance, the Explosive Ordnance

14 Disposal Range, shop activities, traffic, and occasional construction (AFRC, 2011; AFRC, 2020).

15 The 2011 DNL noise zones for Dobbins ARB, which are framed by noise contours, extend along the

16 runway centerline to the east and west and follow the same general path as the flight paths.

17 The Proposed Action Area is outside the 2011 DNL noise zones (AFRC, 2011). The closest zone is

18 the 65 to 69 dBA DNL zone located approximately 300 feet south of the Proposed Action Area;

19 therefore, existing sound levels at the Proposed Action Area are assumed to be below 65 dBA. The

20 nearest sensitive noise receptor to the Proposed Action Area is a military campground called Dobbins

ARB Recreation Area, subsequently referred to as FamCamp, which is approximately 1,813 feet

southwest of the Proposed Action Area. Other noise-sensitive locations, including the Atlanta

23 Marietta Recreational Vehicle Park and Life University's student housing, are more than 2,600 feet

- 24 from the Proposed Action area.
- 25 **3.2.4.2** Environmental Consequences

26 Effects on noise resources would be considered insignificant unless the Proposed Action would (1)

27 result in physical damage to the auditory senses of individuals, (2) violate noise regulations, policy,

or laws, or (3) result in a major and long-term increase in the level of noise experienced at a sensitive

29 receptor. For the purposes of this evaluation, the area of potential impacts is defined as the boundary

30 of the Proposed Action Area and immediately adjacent areas.

# 31 **3.2.4.2.1** Preferred Action Alternative

# 32 <u>Construction</u>

33 The Preferred Action Alternative would result in direct, short-term, minor, adverse noise impacts

34 from construction activities. During construction, noise would typically be above background levels,

35 except during aircraft flyovers. Heavy equipment, such as bulldozers, graders, backhoes, excavators,

36 dump trucks, pavers, jackhammers, and cement trucks, would generate noise that could affect onsite

37 workers. Construction equipment typically emits noise between 75-dBA to 89-dBA at a distance of

- 1 50 feet (see **Table 3-4**). If multiple pieces of construction equipment operate simultaneously, then
- 2 the noise would be increased due to the additional equipment. Therefore, noise from the construction
- 3 site could be up to 94 dBA at 50 feet with several large pieces of equipment operating at the same
- 4 time. Construction workers would use hearing protection and follow Occupational Safety and Health
- 5 Administration standards and procedures to protect themselves from construction noise.
- 6 **Table 3-4.** Noise Levels of Construction Equipment at 50 and 1,800 feet.

Equipment	Noise Level at 50 Feet	Noise Level at 1,800 Feet (dBA)					
Equipment	(dBA)	(distance to FamCamp)					
	Earthmovers						
Front Loaders	79	48					
Backhoes	78	47					
Dozers	82	51					
Tractors	84	53					
Graders	85	54					
Pavers	77	46					
Trucks	75	44					
	Materials Handling						
Concrete Mixers	79	48					
Concrete Pump	81	50					
Crane	81	50					
	Stationary						
Pumps	81	50					
Generator	81	50					
Compressors	78	47					
Impact							
Jack Hammers	89	58					
Pneumatic Tools	85	54					
	Other						
Vibrators	87	56					

Source: USDOT, 2006

7 Non-construction staff would have limited exposure to construction-related noise. Construction noise

8 may be audible for non-construction staff during travel, such as driving by the construction site or

9 walking between buildings or to POVs. For personnel stationed outdoors near construction areas, the

10 hearing risk would be analyzed, and personnel would be provided with hearing protection if 11 warranted by the exposure noise levels. Construction activities would be confined to daytime hours,

12 further minimizing potential disturbances to sensitive residential areas at the most critical times (8

13 post meridiem [p.m.] to 7 ante meridiem [a.m.]).

- 1 The nearest sensitive noise receptor (FamCamp), located approximately 1,813 feet southwest of the
- 2 Proposed Action Area, would likely experience construction noise levels at or below 65 dBA, which
- 3 is similar to noise levels of a normal conversation. FamCamp is located within the 65-79 dBA DNL
- 4 zone (AFRC, 2011). Other potential noise receptors (e.g., Atlanta Marietta Recreational Vehicle Park
- 5 and Life University's student housing) located off-base and farther away would not be anticipated to
- 6 experience any perceivable increase in noise from construction activities.

### 7 **Operation**

8 The operation of the Preferred Action Alternative would have no impact on the noise environment, 9 as it would be compatible with adjacent land use resulting in a negligible change in noise levels. The 10 operation of the Preferred Action would not result in any actions that would increase the area's

11 existing noise level beyond a negligible level.

# 12 **3.2.4.2.2** No Action Alternative

13 No new construction would occur under the No Action Alternative, and existing conditions would

14 continue. Therefore, there would be no impact on noise resources.

# 15 **3.2.5 Cultural Resources**

The cultural resource category consists of important historical, and cultural aspects of our national 16 heritage. These cultural resources include those listed in the National Register of Historic Places 17 (NRHP) or determined by the Georgia State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to be eligible for 18 19 listing in the NRHP. Structures greater than fifty (50) years of age located within the area of potential 20 effects (APE) should be included in a survey of properties or assumed to be potentially eligible for 21 listing in the NRHP. For the purposes of this cultural resource evaluation, the direct APE is 22 considered to be the boundary of the Proposed Action Area. A visual APE is considered the Proposed 23 Action's viewshed (defined as a 0.25-mile buffer around the Proposed Action Area, in this case).

24

# 3.2.5.1 Affected Environment

25 Early coordination was conducted with Georgia SHPO to determine the potential for historical 26 resources to occur within the Proposed Action Area (Appendix A). A Phase I cultural resource 27 survey (TerraXplorations on behalf of Pond & Company, 2024) was conducted between October 31 28 and November 01, 2023, in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. 29 The investigation led to the discovery of one newly recorded cultural archaeological site. Upon 30 review, it was determined that the site is ineligible for inclusion in the NRHP due to a lack of potential 31 for further research. The Phase I also identified five historic resources within the visual APE. Each 32 of the five resources lacks the historical significance necessary for listing in the NRHP. The Georgia 33 SHPO concurred with these finding on May 09, 2024 (Appendix A).

- 34 **3.2.5.2** Environmental Consequences
- Effects on cultural resources would be insignificant unless the Proposed Action were to affect an NRHP-eligible or listed property, causing degradation to the characteristics that qualify it for listing
- for the NRHP, such as the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or

- 1 association. In addition, the loss of a Native American sacred or ceremonial site or resource without
- 2 necessary consultation with the affected tribes would be considered significant. For the purposes of
- 3 this evaluation, the area of potential impacts is defined as the boundary of the Proposed Action Area
- 4 and the visual APE.

# 5 **3.2.5.2.1** Preferred Action Alternative

# 6 <u>Construction</u>

- 7 Per consultation with Georgia SHPO, no archaeological or historic resources occur within the direct
- 8 or visual APE that are listed in or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP (Appendix A). Therefore, the
- 9 construction of the Preferred Action Alternative would have no impact on cultural resources.
- 10 Should any unanticipated discoveries of archaeological resources or cultural items subject to the
- 11 provision of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act occur during construction,
- 12 work would be halted at the discovery site, the Dobbins ARB Installation Cultural Resources
- 13 Manager would be contacted, and all appropriate measures would be implemented to avoid
- 14 disturbance. Dobbins ARB would immediately inform SHPO and Tribal partners of the discovery
- 15 and invite them to consult on the procedures to minimize adverse effects and/or render disposition
- 16 of Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act cultural items.

# 17 **Operation**

- 18 Operation of the Preferred Action Alternative would have no impact on cultural resources.
- 19 **3.2.5.2.2** No Action Alternative
- 20 No new construction would occur under the No Action Alternative, and existing conditions would 21 continue. Therefore, there would be no impact on cultural resources.

# 22 **3.2.6 Biological Resources**

Biological resources include native or naturalized plants and animals and the habitats in which they occur. These include vegetation, wildlife, and threatened, endangered, or sensitive species in a given area. Biological resources are integral to ecosystem integrity. The existence and preservation of biological resources are intrinsically valuable to society for aesthetic, recreational, and socioeconomic purposes.

# 28 **3.2.6.1** Affected Environment

# 29 <u>Vegetation</u>

- The Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan for Dobbins ARB identifies the vegetation
   within the Proposed Action Areas as Piedmont Loblolly Pine Oak Forest and Interior Southern Red
- 32 Oak White Forest (Dobbins ARB, 2023). During a site visit (October 30, 2023), biologists observed
- 33 a mix of oak (Quercus sp.), red maple (Acer rubrum), sweetgum (Liquidambar styraciflua), and
- 34 loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*), as well as multiple species of shrubs and herbs which are common to
- 35 this region of Georgia (Pond & Company-Tetra Tech Joint Venture, 2024b).

### 1 <u>Wildlife</u>

- 2 The wildlife habitat available on Dobbins ARB is limited due to urban fragmentation, which limits
- 3 the type and density of wildlife inhabiting the installation (Dobbins ARB, 2023). The wildlife within
- 4 the Proposed Action Area is typical of upland deciduous forest habitats within Georgia and includes
- 5 common mammal, avian, reptile, and amphibian species.

### 6 Special-status Species

7 Special-status species include those listed as threatened or endangered, proposed for listing, or 8 candidate for listing under the ESA; species listed as endangered, threatened, or a species of special 9 concern by the State of Georgia; and species protected by other applicable regulations (e.g., the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, MBTA, etc.). Fish and wildlife surveys were conducted at Dobbins 10 ARB in 1993, 2007, and 2022 (Dobbins ARB, 2023), and a general ecology survey was conducted 11 for the Proposed Action Area in 2023 (Pond & Company-Tetra Tech Joint Venture, 2024b). 12 13 According to the Natural Resource Survey Report (Pond & Company-Tetra Tech Joint Venture, 2024b), the only special-status species confirmed as occurring on Dobbins ARB are the gray bat 14 (Myotis grisescens), northern long-eared bat (Myotis septentrionalis), tricolored bat (Perimyotis 15 16 subflavus), and pink ladyslipper (Cypripedium acaule). No special-status species were directly 17 observed on the Proposed Action Area during the general ecology field survey in 2023 (Pond & Company-Tetra Tech Joint Venture, 2024b); however, suitable habitat is present for Chattahoochee 18 19 crayfish (Cambarus howardi), monarch butterfly (Danaus plexippus), northern long-eared bat, 20 tricolored bat, gray bat, and pink ladyslipper. Early coordination was conducted with the United 21 States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and Georgia Department of Natural Resources to 22 determine special-status species with the potential to occur on the Proposed Action Area (Appendix 23 A), and these species are identified in Table 3-5. In addition to the species listed in Table 3-5, the 24 Proposed Action Area provides habitat for multiple migratory bird species, which are protected under 25 the MBTA.

Common	Scientific	Protection Status		Potential to Occur at the Proposed Action Area	Recommended Biological
Ivanie	Name	Federal	State	r roposed Action Area	Determination
Avians					
Bald Eagle	Haliaeetus leucocepha lus	BGEPA		Marginal habitat on Dobbins ARB. Foraging and roosting habitats are not present in the Proposed Action Area.	No Take
Whooping Crane	Grus americana	EPNE		None.	No Effect
	Invertebrates				

26 **Table 3-5.** Special-status species.

Common	Scientific	Protection Status		Potential to Occur at the	Recommended Biological
Iname	Iname	Federal	State	Proposed Action Area	Determination
Chattahoochee Crayfish	Cambarus howardi		Т	Documented occurrence 2.2 miles away in Rottenwood Creek. Potential habitat present in the perennial stream.	N/A
Delicate Spike	Elliptio arctata		E Historic occurrence in the Chattahoochee River. Believed extirpated from Cobb County.		N/A
Monarch Butterfly	Danaus plexippus	C May occur. Requires nectar- producing plants for foraging. Suitable habitat is present in the Proposed Action Area.		N/A	
Mammals					
Northern Long-eared Bat <sup>1</sup>	Myotis septentiona lis	T/PE		Observed acoustically in the July 2022 Bat Survey at Dobbins ARB. Suitable roost/forage habitat is present in the Proposed Action Area.	MANLAA
Tricolored Bat <sup>1</sup>	Perimyotis subflavus	PE Observed acoustically in the July 2022 Bat Survey at Dobbins ARB. Suitable roost/forage habitat is present in the Proposed Action Area.		N/A	
Gray Bat <sup>2</sup>	Myotis grisescens	E	EObserved acoustically in the July 2022 Bat Survey a Dobbins ARB. Suitable forage habitat is present in the Proposed Action Area.		MANLAA
Plants					
Michaux's Sumac	Rhus michauxii	Е		None. Requires dry, open, rocky, or sandy forests over mafic bedrock, ridgetops, and river bluffs. Suitable habitat is not present in the Proposed Action Area.	No Effect

Common Name	Scientific Name	Protect Statu	tion Is	Potential to Occur at the Proposed Action Area	Recommended Biological
ivanic	ivanic	Federal	State	Toposed Action Area	Determination
Pink Ladyslipper	Cypripediu m acaule		U	Known to occur on Dobbins ARB, but not in the Proposed Action Area. Suitable habitat is present in the Proposed Action Area.	N/A
White Fringeless Orchid	Platanther a integrilabia	Т		None. Requires wet, flat, boggy areas in acidic muck or sand. Associated with Georgia Piedmont sandstones. Suitable habitat is not present in the Proposed Action Area.	No Effect

Information on federally protected species was obtained from the USFWS (Appendix A).

Information on State-protected species was obtained from the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (Appendix A). State-protected species with a documented occurrence within three miles of the Proposed Action Area are presented.

- <sup>1</sup>Northern long-eared bat and tricolored bat do not appear on the list of federally protected species provided by the USFWS (**Appendix A**). However, Cobb County is located within the known range of the northern long-eared bat and the tricolored bat (USFWS, 2024), and these species are included in the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (Dobbins ARB, 2023).
- <sup>2</sup>Gray bat does not appear on the list of federally protected species provided by the USFWS (**Appendix A**), and Cobb County is not considered to be within the range of this species (USFWS, 2023). However, it is included in the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (Dobbins ARB, 2023).

BGEPA = Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act

C = Candidate for listing under the ESA

E = Endangered

T= Threatened

EPNE = Experimental Population, Non-Essential

N/A = Not Applicable.

PE = Proposed Endangered

U = Unusual

1

MANLAA = May Affect Not Likely to Adversely Affect

### 3.2.6.2 Environmental Consequences

2 Effects on biological resources would be considered insignificant unless the Proposed Action would 3 jeopardize the continued existence of a special-status species, violate applicable laws for the

4 protection of biological resources, or have major impacts on regional populations for flora or fauna.

5 For the purposes of this evaluation, the area of potential impacts is defined as the boundary of the

6 Proposed Action Area and immediately adjacent areas.

### 7 **3.2.6.2.1** Preferred Action Alternative

### 8 <u>Construction</u>

9 Construction of the Preferred Action Alternative would have direct, short-term, minor adverse 10 impacts on vegetation, wildlife, and special-status species associated with site clearing and

- development. Clearing would occur on approximately 10.3 acres. These impacts are considered less
   than significant in the overall context of Dobbins ARB.
- 2 than significant in the overall context of Dobbins ARB.
- 3 During the construction of the Preferred Action Alternative, the land would be cleared within the
- 4 limits of disturbance. Conversion of forested land to development would result in habitat loss. During
- 5 land clearing and grading, all vegetation would be removed within the limits of disturbance. Mobile
- 6 wildlife would be expected to leave the area to avoid harm; however, immobile species or slow-
- 7 moving species may suffer mortality. Incidental loss of wildlife during construction would not
- 8 seriously affect regional wildlife populations.
- 9 No special-status species have been directly observed in the Proposed Action Area; however, suitable
- 10 habitat is present for Chattahoochee crayfish, monarch butterfly, northern long-eared bat, tricolored
- 11 bat, gray bat, and pink ladyslipper. Suitable habitat for the Chattahoochee crayfish may be present
- 12 within the perennial stream; however, the Preferred Action Alternative would not impact the stream.
- 13 The monarch butterfly is currently a candidate for protection under the ESA; therefore, there are
- 14 currently no protections afforded to this species, and a biological determination under the ESA is not
- 15 warranted. The pink ladyslipper has been documented on Dobbins ARB, and suitable habitat is
- 16 present in the Proposed Action Area; however, this species has not been identified in the Proposed
- 17 Action Area during previous surveys (Dobbins ARB, 2023). Since the pink ladyslipper is a state-
- 18 protected species, a biological determination under the ESA is not warranted.

19 Suitable habitat (mature forest) for tricolored bats, northern long-eared bats, and gray bats is present 20 in the Proposed Action Area. Cobb County is located within the Year-Round Active Zone 1 for 21 tricolored bats and northern long-eared bats (USFWS, 2024), and tree clearing restrictions are 22 recommended from December 15 - February 15 and March 15 - July 15 to avoid potential take of these species. Pursuant to the 81st RD construction contract, the 81st RD would adhere to these 23 clearing restrictions (i.e., trees would not be cleared between December 15 – February 15 or March 24 25 15 – July 15) as a part of their mitigation measures. A biological determination of May Affect Not 26 Likely to Adversely Affect is appropriate for the northern long-eared bat and gray bat. The tricolored 27 bat is currently proposed to be listed as endangered under the ESA; therefore, there are currently no 28 protections afforded to this species, and a biological determination under the ESA is not warranted. However, the formal listing of the tricolored bat is presumed to be imminent and will likely occur in 29 2024. In the event that the tricolored bat becomes protected under the ESA prior to construction, then 30 a biological determination of May Affect Not Likely to Adversely Affect is recommended, provided 31 32 that the clearing restrictions described above are followed. In the event that implementation of the 33 Proposed Action Alternative is not able to comply with the tree clearing restrictions, then a biological 34 determination of May Affect Likely to Adversely Affect would be appropriate for the northern longeared bat, gray bat, and tricolored bat (assuming that ESA-listing has occurred) and formal 35 36 consultation with the USFWS would be required prior to the start of construction. Note that even 37 under May Affect Likely to Adversely Affect determinations for these bat species, the impact of the 38 Preferred Action Alternative would be less than significant.

- 1 The Proposed Action Area provides habitat for multiple species of birds afforded protection under
- 2 the MBTA. To avoid harm to these species, in compliance with the MBTA, ground-disturbing
- 3 construction activities would not occur between March 15 and September 30 to the extent practicable
- 4 to avoid impacts on nesting bird species. If construction must be scheduled when these birds are
- 5 nesting, then a site-specific survey for nesting migratory birds would be performed immediately prior
- 6 to construction by a qualified biologist. If nesting birds are found during the survey, appropriately
- 7 sized buffer areas would be established around the nests and construction would not occur in the
- 8 buffer areas until the birds have left the nest. Confirmation that all young have fledged would be
- 9 made by a qualified biologist.

### 10 **Operation**

11 The operation of the Preferred Action Alternative would result in no impacts on biological resources.

### 12 **3.2.6.2.2** No Action Alternative

- 13 No new construction would occur under the no Action Alternative, and existing conditions would
- 14 continue. Therefore, there would be no impacts on biological resources.
- 15 **3.2.7 Socioeconomic Resources**
- 16 Socioeconomic resources include population and population growth, income level, and general 17 aspects of the economy. Note that environmental justice, protection of children, demographics, and 18 housing were dismissed in **Section 3.1**.

# 19 **3.2.7.1** Affected Environment

- The socioeconomics analysis focused on the area encompassing the municipalities of Marietta and Smyrna, Georgia, and Cobb County. Between 2012 and 2021, Cobb County's population increased by 10.7 percent to 765,813 people. This growth trend extends to Marietta and Smyrna, which had population increases of 8.5 percent and 6.4 percent to 61,3187 and 55,863, respectively (United States Census Bureau [USCB], 2022).
- 25 The county's median household income of \$94,244 surpasses both the state average of \$72,355 and
- 26 Smyrna's median of \$92,258. Marietta's median household income (\$67,589) is slightly lower than 27 the state's median household income (USCB, 2022). Cobb County's unemployment rate is 2.6
- the state's median household income (USCB, 2022). Cobb County's unemployr
  percent, which is lower than the statewide level of 3.1 percent (USCB, 2023).

# 29 **3.2.7.2** Environmental Consequences

Effects on socioeconomic resources would be considered insignificant unless the Proposed Action would result in a major change to one of the resources evaluated. For the purposes of this evaluation, the area of potential impacts is defined as the boundary of Dobbins ARB and immediately adjacent municipalities.

# 34 **3.2.7.2.1** Preferred Action Alternative

35 <u>Construction</u>

- 1 Construction of the Preferred Action Alternative would have direct, short-term, minor beneficial
- 2 impacts on socioeconomic resources. Local labor and materials would likely be used for the
- 3 construction of the Preferred Action Alternative. No new permanent jobs or metro Atlanta area
- 4 residents would be associated with the construction of the Preferred Action Alternative.

### 5 **Operation**

- 6 The operation of the Preferred Action Alternative would have a direct, long-term, minor beneficial
- 7 impact on socioeconomic resources. Some service members in the 600-member unit would likely
- 8 utilize local businesses for activities such as dining and shopping. No new permanent jobs or metro
- 9 Atlanta area residents would be associated with the operations of the Preferred Action Alternative.
- 10 **3.2.7.2.2** No Action Alternative
- 11 No new construction would occur under the No Action Alternative, and existing conditions would
- 12 continue. Therefore, there would be no impact on socioeconomic resources.

# 13 **3.2.8 Safety and Occupational Health**

14 Safety and Occupational Health promote and maintain workers' physical, mental, and social well-

15 being by controlling risk to the highest degree and protecting the safety, health, and welfare of all

16 those engaged in work or employment.

# 17 **3.2.8.1** Affected Environment

The existing ARC in East Point, Georgia, lacks some health and safety standards, as referenced in Section 1.1. The East Point ARC currently fails AT/FP requirements, physical security standards, and cybersecurity standards. Inadequate MEP and POV parking are health and safety issues at the East Point ARC. No known health and safety concerns are currently associated with the Proposed Action Area.

23 **3.2.8.2** Environmental Consequences

Effects on the health and safety environment would be insignificant unless the Proposed Action (1) substantially increased risks associated with ground safety during construction, operations, or maintenance activities or (2) resulted in incompatible land use relating to safety criteria. For the purposes of this evaluation, the area of potential impacts is defined as the boundary of the Proposed Action Area and immediately adjacent areas.

# 29 **3.2.8.2.1** Preferred Action Alternative

# 30 <u>Construction</u>

The Proposed Action Area would have direct, short-term, minor, adverse impacts on worker safety and occupational health during construction. Implementing the Preferred Action Alternative would have no long-term impact on the availability, capabilities, or capacity of emergency services available on Dobbins ARB or neighboring communities. All construction contractors would be required to follow and implement Occupational Safety and Health Administration laws and 1 regulations, as well as applicable DoD, USAF, and AFRC regulations, to establish and maintain

2 safety procedures.

3 A temporary, secure perimeter fence would be installed around the construction area with a

- 4 construction access gate. During construction, signs would be placed on roadways to alert drivers to
- 5 changes in traffic patterns and trucks entering and exiting the road. The proposed facilities would
- 6 comply with DoD AT/FP, ADA, and fire protection requirements.

### 7 **Operation**

8 The operation of the Preferred Action Alternative would have direct, long-term, moderate, beneficial 9 impacts on health and safety for the USAR unit currently stationed at East Point ARC. Operation of 10 the Preferred Action Alternative would include the latest safety standards, taking into consideration 11 AT/FP and physical security measures such as having maximum standoff distances from roads, 12 parking areas, and vehicle unloading areas, as well as inherent safety features built into the new 13 facilities and equipment.

### 14 **3.2.8.2.2** No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be direct, long-term, moderate, adverse impacts on safety and occupational health for the USAR staff presently located at the East Point ARC. The current location's subpar safety and occupational health conditions would persist and increase over time.

# 19 **3.2.9 Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste**

20 Hazardous wastes are defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act in 42 USC 6903(5), as amended by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments. The act defines hazardous wastes as 21 22 solid waste, or combination of solid wastes, which because of its quantity, concentration, or physical, 23 chemical, or infectious characteristics may (A) cause, or significantly contribute to an increase in 24 mortality or an increase in serious irreversible, or incapacitating reversible, illness; or (B) pose a 25 substantial present or potential hazard to human health or the environment when improperly treated, 26 stored, transported, or disposed of, or otherwise managed. Hazardous materials are defined by the 27 United States General Services Administration as substances or chemicals that pose a health hazard, 28 a physical hazard, or harm to the environment (General Services Administration, 2024).

Special hazards are substances that may pose a risk to human health and are addressed separately from other hazardous substances. Examples include asbestos-containing material, polychlorinated biphenyls, and lead-based paint. The Toxic Substances Control Act (Title 15 USC 53) gives the USEPA authority to regulate these special hazards.

### 33 **3.2.9.1** Affected Environment

The operation of aircraft, vehicles, and equipment requires the use of various universal wastes (such as batteries and fluorescent and mercury-containing bulbs) and hazardous materials, including fuels, solvents, lubricants, and caustics. Common activities at Dobbins ARB that generate hazardous waste

- 1 include aircraft and vehicle maintenance. Dobbins ARB has one 90/180-day hazardous waste
- 2 accumulation site/central accumulation area at Building 748 for storing and staging hazardous waste
- 3 for offsite shipment. Dobbins ARB wastes are disposed of through a commercial disposal contractor,
- 4 Tri-State Government Services, Inc. (Dobbins ARB, 2020b).

5 The requirements for accumulation, collection, transportation, and disposal of hazardous wastes on

Dobbins ARB are identified in Dobbins ARB's Hazardous Waste Management Plan (Dobbins ARB,
2020b). The ARB maintains and operates as a small quantity generator for the whole year, but

- 8 occasionally there are periods when they operate as an episodic large quantity generator. The
- 9 generating organization and the 94th Mission Support Group/ Civil Engineering Environmental
- 10 Flight are responsible for managing hazardous wastes. The 94th Mission Support Group / Civil
- 11 Engineering Environmental Flight complies with all pertinent federal, state, USAF, and local
- 12 regulatory requirements.
- 13 The Dobbins ARB Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures Plan specifies procedures for

14 responding to releases, accidents, and spills involving petroleum products, including spill detection,

- 15 reporting, containment, cleanup, and disposal procedures (Dobbins ARB, 2020c).
- 16 An Environmental Baseline Survey documented the absence of hazardous materials or wastes in the
- 17 Proposed Action Area (Pond & Company-Tetra Tech Joint Venture, 2024a).

# 18 Per- and Polyfluorinated Alkyl Substances

Since the 1970s, the USAF has used aqueous film-forming foam (AFFF) firefighting agents toextinguish petroleum fires. AFFF has historically utilized the synthetic fluorinated chemicals

21 perfluorooctanoic acid, perfluoroctane sulfonate (PFOS), and/or perflurorobutane sulfonate

- 22 (AFCEC, 2018). These chemicals are persistent in the environment and can accumulate over time,
- and exposure to them can lead to adverse human health effects.
- 24 Dobbins ARB has historically used AFFF for firefighting and training purposes but has been actively
- 25 removing PFOS-based AFFF from its inventory. In its investigation, the Environmental Baseline
- 26 Survey found a database listing for a known or suspected PFAS site located just south of the Proposed
- 27 Action Area but determined that sites on this list do not necessarily reflect the source/s of PFAS
- 28 contamination and detections do not indicate level of risk or human exposure at the site (Pond &
- 29 Company-Tetra Tech Joint Venture, 2024a).

# 30 **Resource Conservation and Recovery Act**

- 31 Air Force Plant Number 6, located to the northwest of the Proposed Action Area, is one of nine
- 32 government-owned, contractor-operated manufacturing facilities maintained by the USAF. Air Force
- 33 Plant Number 6 began operations in 1942 as a military aircraft modification and production facility.
- 34 During its history, chemicals associated with facility operations were inadvertently released to the
- 35 environment. Currently there are two permanent monitoring wells within the Proposed Action Area.
- 36 These wells were originally constructed during an off-site investigation in the early 2000s, but are

not part of any current investigation or remediation effort. These wells are further described in 1

- Section 3.1.2. 2
- 3

### **3.2.9.2** Environmental Consequences

4 Effects associated with hazardous materials and wastes would be insignificant unless the Proposed 5 Action would (1) substantially increase the quantity or toxicity of hazardous substances, (2) 6 substantially increased risk to human health or the environment, or (3) generate solid waste in amounts that would appreciably decrease capacity or life span at receiving landfills. For the purposes of this 7 8 evaluation, the area of potential impacts is defined as the boundary of the Proposed Action Area and 9 immediately adjacent areas.

#### 10 3.2.9.2.1 Preferred Action Alternative

#### 11 Construction

12 Construction of the Preferred Action Alternative would have direct, short-term, minor, adverse impacts on hazardous materials. The construction contract would require the contractor to handle the 13 14 disposal of all hazardous wastes, including contaminated soil, if encountered, in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations and requirements and the Dobbins ARB Hazardous 15 16 Waste Management Plan (Dobbins ARB, 2020c). The Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Regulation outlines spill prevention, control, and countermeasure measures to minimize the risk of 17 18 hazardous materials releases to the environment. BMPs for the handling, storing, and using of fuels 19 and other potentially hazardous substances would be implemented. The two groundwater monitoring 20 wells located within the Proposed Action Area would be abandoned in accordance with GAEPD 21 procedures. Since the wells are not part of any current investigation, there would be no need to 22 establish new monitoring wells as part of the Preferred Action Alternative.

#### 23 Operation

24 Operation of the Preferred Action Alternative would have minor, long-term, direct, insignificant adverse impacts due to the use of hazardous materials and/or the generation of hazardous waste 25 during operation. During operation of the proposed Readiness Center, hazardous materials such as 26 fuels, hydraulic fluid, lubricants, and other similar materials would be used and stored by the USAR 27 28 as part of vehicle maintenance activities conducted at the VMS. Additionally, the VMS would generate small quantities of hazardous waste, including waste oil and automotive batteries, and 29 include the installation and use of one oil-water separator. The new oil-water separator would be 30 registered with Cobb County and follow all ordinances and safety precautions. The oil-water 31

- 32 separator would also be connected to the sanitary sewer system. Hazardous materials and waste will
- be used, managed, and disposed of in accordance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations. 33
- 34 BMPs for the handling, storage, and use of fuels and other potentially hazardous substances would
- 35 be implemented in order to minimize potential impacts and to contain impacts to the Proposed Action
- 36 Area. All handling of hazardous waste would comply with the Dobbins ARB Hazardous Waste
- Management Plan. 37

3.2.9.2.2 No Action Alternative 1

2 No new construction would occur under the No Action Alternative, and existing conditions would 3 continue. Therefore, hazardous waste would not be impacted.

# **3.2.10** Traffic and Transportation

4 5 For this analysis, traffic and transportation are specifically defined as ground transportation which generally include roadways and street systems. Level of service is a qualitative measure used to relate 6 7 the quality of motor vehicle traffic service. Level of service ranges from A (an area with lots of 8 capacity, free-flowing traffic) to F (area with length delays). Areas with a level of service with D are 9 approaching unsteady flow and stating to experience congestion.

10 **3.2.10.1 Affected Environment** 

11 Dobbins ARB is approximately one mile west of Interstate (I-)75 and 1.5 miles north of I-285.

12 Dobbins ARB has two entry control points. The main gate provides access from Cobb Parkway

13 Southeast (United States Highway 41). Gate 2 is accessed from South Cobb Drive. Cobb Parkway

14 Southeast can be accessed by I-75 through either Delk Road Southeast or South Marietta Parkway

Southeast. According to 2022 Georgia Department of Transportation (DOT) data, the segment of 15

South Cobb Parkway, bordering the Proposed Action Area, experiences a daily volume of 29,300 16

17 vehicles. Atlanta Road Southwest, bordering the western side of Dobbins ARB, experiences a daily

18 volume of 18,700 vehicles (Georgia DOT, 2022).

19

# **3.2.10.2** Environmental Consequences

Effects to the traffic and transportation resource category would be insignificant unless the Proposed 20 21 Action (1) resulted in a reduction of level of service to a level at or below D, defined as borderline 22 unstable level of service conditions, or (2) the existing or proposed traffic and transportation 23 infrastructure would be incapable of supporting the Proposed Action. For the purposes of this 24 evaluation, the area of potential impacts is defined as the boundary of the Proposed Action Area, 25 immediately adjacent areas, and the local road and utility networks in the vicinity of Dobbins ARB.

#### 26 3.2.10.2.1 Preferred Action Alternative

#### 27 Construction

28 Construction of the Preferred Action Alternative, direct, short-term, minor adverse impacts to the 29 transportation network would occur during construction from increased traffic associated with 30 construction equipment and contractor vehicles. Materials would be delivered and debris removed from the construction site during construction. The construction traffic would utilize entry control 31 point 2 off South Cobb Drive to access 6th Street, Industrial Drive, Atlantic Avenue Southeast, and 32 33 Gym Road, which abuts the Proposed Action Area. If necessary, traffic control procedures would be 34 used to minimize impacts on traffic flow. Construction traffic would account for a small percentage

35 of the total traffic on the installation or the surrounding public roadways.

### 1 **Operation**

- 2 Operation of the Preferred Action Alternative would result in direct and indirect, long-term,
- 3 insignificant adverse effects on the transportation network. Approximately 206 permanent staff and
- 4 1,202 Guard or Reserve staff would utilize the proposed facilities included in the Preferred Action
- 5 Alternative. During drill weekends, 600 USAR personnel would be present. Compared to the 29,300
- 6 vehicles currently utilizing South Cobb Parkway and the 27,000 vehicles currently utilizing South
- 7 Cobb Drive, traffic volume in the Proposed Action Area would not substantially increase or reduce
- 8 free-flowing traffic of the adjacent roadway, intersection, or business. The peak of USAR personnel
- 9 would utilize the proposed ARC approximately 3 times a month on weekends. Increased traffic flow
- 10 may be experienced during these times but would be negligible in comparison to the typical traffic
- 11 on South Cobb Parkway and South Cobb Drive.

# 12 **3.2.10.2.2** No Action Alternative

13 No new construction would occur under the No Action Alternative, and existing conditions would 14 continue. There would be no impacts to traffic and transportation from the No Action Alternative.

### 15 **3.2.11 Recreation**

16 The recreation resource category considers the human pursuit of recreational enjoyment and the 17 physical areas or facilities where recreation occurs.

### 18 **3.2.11.1 Affected Environment**

Recreational facilities at Dobbins ARB include a fitness center and running track adjacent to the
Proposed Action Area. A FamCamp is approximately 1,813 feet southwest of the Proposed Action
Area. FamCamp offers recreational vehicle camping sites overlooking Dobbins Lake for both short-

and long-term use. A.L. Burrus Nature Park, which is owned by Cobb County, is approximately

- 1,050 feet east of the Proposed Action Area and outside the Dobbins ARB.
- 24 **3.2.11.2 Environmental Consequences**
- 25 Effects on recreational resources would be considered insignificant unless the Proposed Action
- 26 would result in a major reduction in the number or quality of recreational facilities or access to such
- 27 facilities. For the purposes of this evaluation, the area of potential impacts is defined as the boundary
- 28 of the Proposed Action Area and immediately adjacent areas.

### 29 **3.2.11.2.1** Preferred Action Alternative

### 30 <u>Construction</u>

- Construction of the Preferred Action Alternative would have no impact on existing recreational facilities on Dobbins ARB and would not impact the nearby A.L. Burrus Nature Park. FamCamp would not experience adverse noise effects from the Proposed Action's construction (see Section 3.2.4). Construction activities would be limited to typical working hours to further reduce any
- 35 adverse noise effects.

### 36 **Operation**

- 1 Operation of the Preferred Action Alternative would have no impact on existing recreational facilities
- 2 on Dobbins ARB and would not impact the nearby A.L. Burrus Nature Park. FamCamp would not
- 3 experience adverse noise effects from the Proposed Action (see Section 3.2.4).
- 4 3.2.11.2.2 No Action Alternative
- 5 No new construction would occur under the No Action Alternative, and existing conditions would 6 continue. Therefore, there would be no impact on recreational resources.

# 7 **3.2.12 Utilities**

8 The utility resource category considers the physical human-made systems and structures enabling a 9 population to access utilities. The availability of water, wastewater, stormwater, solid waste 10 management, energy, and communications and its capacity to support growth are generally regarded 11 as essential to the economic expansion of an area. Access to standard public utilities meaningfully 12 contributes to the human environment.

# 13 **3.2.12.1 Affected Environment**

14 Electrical service is provided to Dobbins ARB by Georgia Power through the Lockheed Martin

15 Substation. Various aspects of electrical service infrastructure were upgraded when the system was

16 privatized, and it provides sufficient capacity for peak operation. Natural gas is supplied to Dobbins

17 ARB by Atlanta Gas Light Company. Natural gas capacity is adequate for current operation; demand

18 approaches capacity only during peak winter (cold) periods (AFRC, 2020).

19 There are currently water lines that run the northern perimeter of the Proposed Action Area, as well 20 as an electric utility line that comes into the Proposed Action Area from South Cobb Drive. There 21 are also three sanitary sewer lines that cross the Proposed Action Area. Cobb County-Marietta Water

Authority provides potable water for Dobbins ARB through a contract agreement with Lockheed

22 Authority provides potable water for Dobbins AKB through a contract agreement with Lockied 23 Martin. The Cobb County-Marietta Water Authority has two water treatment plants that are permitted

to produce 86 and 72 million gallons of water per day, respectively (AFRC, 2020).

The proposed ARC would be tied into the Cobb County wastewater system. Nonhazardous solid waste would be managed by the 81<sup>st</sup> RD ARC, who would likely use their own solid waste contractor

20 waste would be managed by the 81 KD ARC, who would likely use their own solid waste contractor 27 unless specified in a tenant agreement with Dobbins ARB. Likewise, Dobbins ARB will not be

collecting or processing recyclables for the 81<sup>st</sup> RD ARC. All recyclables and solid waste would be

29 left to the  $81^{\text{st}}$  RD ARC to properly store and dispose of.

# 30 **3.2.12.2 Environmental Consequences**

31 Effects to the utility resource category would be insignificant unless the existing or proposed utility

32 infrastructure would be incapable of supporting the Proposed Action when considered along with

33 current and reasonably foreseeable future demand. For the purposes of this evaluation, the area of

- 34 potential impacts is defined as the boundary of the Proposed Action Area and immediately adjacent
- 35 areas.

### 3.2.12.2.1 Preferred Action Alternative

### 2 <u>Construction</u>

1

3 Construction of the Preferred Action Alternative would result in direct, long and short-term, minor 4 adverse impacts on utilities. The new ARC would require the expansion of existing utility delivery 5 to provide service. The proposed ARC would require extensions of electric, gas, sewer, and water 6 utilities from their nearest location. Short-term interruptions could occur when buildings are 7 disconnected from or connected to utilities. Interruptions in services would be coordinated with area 8 users prior to disconnection to the extent practicable. Should service interruptions occur, they would 9 be limited to on-base users and would not affect off-base facilities. Existing utilities in or near the 10 construction footprint would be identified in advance of construction to limit impacts.

Solid waste generated from the proposed construction activities would consist of building materials such as solid pieces of concrete, metals, and lumber. Contractors would be required to recycle construction debris to the maximum extent practicable, thereby diverting it from landfills. Materials with possible recycling potential include glass, plastics, asphalt, concrete, metal, carpeting, gypsum wallboard, and lumber. Nonrecyclable construction debris would be generated throughout construction, which would require the permanent use of landfill capacity. However, the quantity of waste generated would not exceed the capacity of regional facilities.

### 18 **Operation**

The operation of the Preferred Action Alternative would result in direct, long-term, negligible adverse impacts to utility systems because of increased demand for services (e.g., electricity, natural gas, potable water, sewerage, and solid waste disposal) associated with the operation of the facilities. Energy supply, water supply, and wastewater treatment capacity are sufficient to accommodate the increased demand resulting from the new structures. There would be negligible long-term change in the future quantity of solid waste generated compared to existing levels because personnel currently at the East Point ARC would report to the proposed ARC on Dobbins ARB, and the facility functions

26 would remain similar.

### 27 **3.2.12.2.2** No Action Alternative

28 No new construction would occur under the No Action Alternative, and existing conditions would

29 continue. Therefore, there would be no impact on utilities.

# 1 4 Finding and Conclusions

# 2 4.1 Findings

- 3 No significant environmental or socioeconomic impacts have been identified from the Preferred
- 4 Action Alternative. **Table 4-1** summarizes the consequences of the Preferred Action Alternative and
- 5 the No Action Alternative. The following section provides a summary of the anticipated impacts of
- 6 each alternative.
- 7 Table 4-1. Summary of Potential Environmental and Socioeconomic Consequences.

	Propose	d Action	No Action Alternative
Phase of Proposed Action (C = Construction; O = Operation)	С	0	N/A
<b>Resource</b> Category	+ = Benefic	ial Effect, Ø =	= Insignificant Adverse Effect, = No Effect
Geology and Soils			Ø
Water Resources			Ø
Air Quality			Ø
Cultural Resources	Ø	Ø	Ø
<b>Biological Resources</b>		Ø	Ø
Socioeconomic Resources	+	+	Ø
Safety and Occupational Health	Ø	+	
Hazardous Materials			Ø
Traffic and Transportation			Ø
Recreation	Ø	Ø	Ø
Utilities			Ø

### 8

### 4.1.1 Mitigation Measures

9 All resource categories evaluated in this EA resulted in a finding of insignificant or no impact; 10 therefore, mitigation measures are not necessary. Compliance with applicable federal, state, and local 11 regulations and requirements would occur as necessary. Measures such as avoidance, limitation of 12 action, restoration, protection and maintenance, replacement/ compensation, and adaptive 13 management strategies may be utilized, as appropriate, during the implementation of the Preferred

- 1 Action Alternative to protect resources further. However, no specific mitigation measures are
- 2 necessary to reduce the effects of the Proposed Action to insignificant levels. Avoidance and
- 3 minimization measures discussed in Section 3 are presented in Table 4-2.
- 4 **Table 4-2.** Summary of Proposed Measures to Avoid or Minimize Impacts.

Category	Avoidance and Minimization Measures
Tree Clearing – Migratory Birds	MBTA clearing restriction from April 15 – September 30 or else conduct preconstruction surveys for breeding birds and protect active nests until with a suitable buffer.
Tree Clearing – Protected Bats	Clearing restrictions from December 15 – February 15 and March 15 – July 15 to avoid potential take of federally-protected bat species. In the event that implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative is not able to comply with the tree clearing restrictions, then a biological determination of May Affect Likely to Adversely Affect would be appropriate for the northern long-eared bat, gray bat, and tricolored bat (assuming that ESA-listing has occurred) and formal consultation with the USFWS would be required prior to the start of construction.
Note: Implementatior	n of the Proposed Action would comply with all applicable local, state, and federal laws and
regulations, a	as well as applicable standard procedures, practices, and plans in-use by Dobbins ARB and/or

# 5 4.1.2 Cumulative Impact Analysis

6 CEQ regulations stipulate that potential environmental impacts resulting from cumulative impacts 7 should be considered within an EA. A cumulative impact is an impact on the environment that results 8 from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably 9 foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency or person undertakes such other actions (40 CFR § 1508.8). Cumulative impacts also can result from individually minor but collectively 10 11 significant actions taking place over a period of time (40 CFR § 1508.7). Table 4-3 describes additional current and reasonably foreseeable projects that may occur at Dobbins ARB, and the 12 13 subsequent text describes the potential for cumulative impacts.

	<b>Project/Action</b>	Timeframe	Description
1	Security Forces Facility	FY 2024	Expand Security Forces administrative building, which would be approximately 0.24 mile south of the Proposed Action.
2	New Entry Control Point	Future	Construction of new entry-control point. Two alternatives for the location of the entry point have been. The nearest proposed location is 0.76 mile east of the Proposed Action.
3	Multi-Cube Munitions Storage	Future	Construction of new multi-cube munitions storage facilities approximately 1.59 miles south of the Proposed Action.

14 **Table 4-3.** Summary of Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions.

	<b>Project/Action</b>	Timeframe	Description
4	New Fitness Center	Future	Construction of new fitness center. Two alternatives for the location of the fitness center have been proposed. The nearest proposed location is approximately 0.15-mile northeast of the Proposed Action.
5	94 Logistics Readiness Squadron Support Facility	Future	Construction of new Logistics Readiness Squadron facility approximately 0.57 mile southwest of the Proposed Action.
6	622 Civil Engineering Group- Civil Engineering Fire Training Facility	Future	Construction of the 622 Civil Engineering Group- Civil Engineering Fire specialized training facility approximately 1.31 miles southeast of the Proposed Action.

Source: Dobbins ARB 2020 Installation Development Plan

1 The potential for indirect, negative impacts resulting from the interaction of the Preferred Action

2 Alternative with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects is less than significant.

3 Construction projects could result in localized short-term, indirect impacts if multiple proposed

4 projects occur simultaneously. Projects 2, 3, 5, and 6 are more than 0.5 mile from the Proposed

5 Action Area and are the least likely to contribute to impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

6 Project 6 is also anticipated to occur sooner than the Proposed Action according to the Dobbins ARB

7 2020a Installation Development Plan. Projects 1 and 4 have the potential to contribute to impacts

8 associated with the Proposed Action.

9 Air Quality. All foreseeable projects would be expected to have direct, short-term, negligible 10 adverse impacts on criteria pollutants and GHG emissions during construction. These impacts would 11 include an increase in criteria pollutants and GHG emissions. Direct, long-term, negligible adverse 12 cumulative impacts on air quality also would be anticipated from heating and cooling new building 13 spaces. If implemented, the incremental impact of the Preferred Action Alternative, when added to 14 other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, is negligible and would not result in a 15 significant cumulative increase in criteria pollutants or GHG emissions.

16 Noise. Noise associated with the construction of the Preferred Action Alternative could contribute 17 to indirect, short-term, negligible adverse noise impacts from projects 1 and 4 being constructed at 18 the same time and in the same area. Multiple concurrent sources of periodic loud noises associated 19 with construction could result in increased annoyance and disruption of outdoor activities compared 20 to single sources. However, considering that the construction of the Preferred Action Alternative 21 may not occur simultaneously with the construction of other planned projects, and that not all projects 22 are close enough for noise effects to combine, no significant indirect noise levels would be expected. 23 Therefore, the Preferred Action Alternative, when added to other past, present, and reasonably 24 foreseeable future actions, is negligible and would not result in a significant cumulative increase in 25 noise.

1 **Traffic and Transportation.** If multiple construction projects were to occur at the same time due to

- 2 the increased demand on local roadways in the vicinity of Dobbins ARB, indirect, long-term,
- 3 negligible adverse impacts to traffic could occur as a result of the Preferred Action Alternative and
- 4 other recently completed, ongoing, or planned projects. The implementation of traffic control
- 5 procedures would minimize impacts on traffic flow.

6 Utilities. The Preferred Action Alternative would interact with other recently completed, ongoing,

7 or planned projects and increase the demand on local utilities. However, the increased demand would

8 be within the regional capacity, and no significant indirect impacts would be expected. The impact

9 of the Preferred Action Alternative, when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable

10 future actions, is negligible and would not result in a significant cumulative effect on utilities.

# 11 4.1.3 Consequences of No Action Alternative

12 Under the No Action Alternative, the Army National Guard unit would be forced to operate and train 13 in suboptimal facilities for the most effective training to complete mission requirements. This would 14 continue to have a negative impact on unit training, recruiting, and retention objectives. The existing 15 overcrowded and outdated facilities would continue to place unnecessary stress on limited annual operating and maintenance budgets. The existing ARC would remain landlocked in a residential area. 16 17 Inadequate MEP and POV parking would continue to be a health and safety issue. The USAR would 18 continue to pay excessive sustainment, maintenance, and repair costs to keep the existing ARC 19 functional.

# 20 4.2 Conclusions

- 21 Based on the findings of this EA, we recommend that the Preferred Action Alternative, as it is written
- and proposed, be implemented and that a FNSI be issued for the Proposed Action.

### 1 **5 References**

- AFCEC. 2016. Air Force Air Quality Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) Guide –
   Fundamentals. Volume 1 of 2.
- AFCEC. 2018. Final Site Inspection Report of Fire Fighting Foam Usage at Dobbins Air Reserve
   Base, Cobb County, Georgia. October.
- 6 AFRC. 2011. Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) Study at Dobbins Air Reserve Base.
   7 October.
- 8 AFRC. 2022. Bat Survey at Dobbins Air Reserve Base. July 2022.
- 9 Dobbins ARB. 2020a. Dobbins AR 2020 Installation Development Plan. October.
- Dobbins ARB. 2020b. United States Air Force Hazardous Waste Management Plan 94th Airlift
   Wing. January.
- Dobbins ARB. 2020c. Draft Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan, 94th Airlift Wing.
   27 June.
- 14 Dobbins ARB. 2023. Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, 2023-2028. March.
- Frankson, R., K. Kunkel, L. Stevens, B. Stewart, W. Sweet, and B. Murphey. 2017. *Georgia State Climate Summary*. NOAA Technical Report NESDIS 149-GA, 4 pp.
   <u>https://statesummaries.ncics.org/chapter/ga/</u>
- 18 General Services Administration. 2024. United States General Services Administration.
   19 Environmental Programs Hazardous Materials. April 15, 2024. Accessed May 19, 2024.
   20 https://www.gsa.gov/real-estate/environmental-programs/hazardous-materials
- Georgia DOT. *Traffic Analysis and Data Application*. 2022. Accessed March 14, 2024.
   <u>https://gdottrafficdata.drakewell.com/publicmultinodemap.asp</u>.
- Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission. 2016. Manual for Erosion and Sediment Control
   *in Georgia*. 2016 Edition.
- Krishnan, G., R. Barrett, S. Holsinger, and R. Adams. 2011. Stormwater Compliance for Air Force
   Bases. The Military Engineer, V. 103, No. 669.
- Natural Resource Conservation Service. 1996. Update for the Soil Survey of Cobb County, Georgia.
   May.
- Natural Resource Conservation Service. 2024. Web Soil Survey. Accessed February 26, 2024.
   <u>https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx</u>
- Parsons. 1995. Installation Restoration Program Remedial Investigation Report, Dobbins Air
   Reserve Base, Georgia. Volume I. May.
- 33 Pond & Company-Tetra Tech Joint Venture. 2024a. *Environmental Baseline Survey*. May.
- 34 Pond & Company-Tetra Tech Joint Venture, 2024b. *Natural Resources Survey Report*. May.
- 35 Terracon on behalf of Pond & Company. 2024. Large Facility Development- Dobbins ARB.
   36 GeoReport.
- 37 TerraXplorations on behalf of Pond & Company. 2024. A Phase I Cultural Resource Survey for the
   38 Army Reserve Center at Dobbins Air Reserve Base.

- 1 USAF. 2020. Air Quality Environmental Impact Analysis Process Guide. Volume 2. July.
- USAR, 81st RD. 2020. East Point/Dobbins ARB Area Development Plan Future Fiscal Year
   Development Plan (FYDP). April.
- 4 USAR. 2022. DD Form 1391-Dobbins Air Force Base. 02 March.
- 5 USAR. 2023. Design Guide, USAR Facilities. 20 October.
- 6 United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2023. *Economy at a Glance*. 7 <u>https://www.bls.gov/eag/eag.ga.htm</u>
- 8 USCB. 2022. https://data.census.gov/
- 9 United States Climate Data. 2024. Accessed March 27, 2024. 10 <u>https://www.usclimatedata.com/climate/atlanta/georgia/united-states/usga0028</u>
- 11 US DOT. 2006. Construction Noise Handbook. August.
- USEPA. 1974. Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health
   and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety. Prepared by the United States EPA Office
   of Noise Abatement and Control. March.
- USEPA. 1996. Protecting Natural Wetlands: A Guide to Stormwater Best Management Practices.
   Office of Water (4502F), Washington, DC.
- 17 USEPA. 2024a. *EJSCREEN Report*, Accessed on March 28, 2024.
   18 <u>www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice</u>
- 19 USEPA. 2024b. National Ambient Air Quality Standards Table. Accessed on February 26, 2024.
   20 <u>https://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants/naaqs-table</u>.
- USEPA. 2024c. Overview of Greenhouse Gases. Accessed on February 26, 2024.
   https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/overview-greenhouse-gases.
- 23 USFWS. 2024. Range-wide Indiana Bat & Northern Long-eared Bat Survey Guidelines.
- 24 United States Geologic Survey. 1997. United States Geological Survey Fact Sheet FS-01.

# 1 6 List of Preparers

# 2 **Table 6-1.** List of Preparers.

Names	Degree(s)	Years of Work Experience
Aaron Burgess	B.S. in Environmental Studies	11
Nicholas Mullaney	B.S. in Marine Science and Biology	1
Alexa Banke	B.S. in Environmental Science and Policy	1
Lauren Schramm	B.A. in Biology and Environmental Studies M.S. in Wildlife and Fisheries Resources	7
Glenn Martin	B.S. in Forest Resources M.S. in Forest Resources	18
Clif Payne	B.S. in Geology M.S. in Ecology MPA in Evolutionary Biology	36

3

This Page Was Intentionally Left Blank.

# 1 FIGURES

2

1

This Page Was Intentionally Left Blank.





1

This Page Was Intentionally Left Blank.





Dobbins ARB, USAR ARC Marietta, Georgia January 2024 1

This Page Was Intentionally Left Blank.



Service Layer Credits: Source: Esri, Maxar, Earthstar Geographics, and the GIS User Community

### Figure 1-3 Project Location Map



230 Meters

690 Feet

1 inch = 333 feet

Dobbins ARB, USAR ARC Marietta, Georgia January 2024 1

This Page Was Intentionally Left Blank.



Service Layer Credits: World Imagery: Maxar, Microsoft Hybrid Reference Layer: Esri Community Maps Contributors, City of Marietta, GA, © OpenStreetMap, Microsoft, Esri, TomTom, Garmin, SafeGraph, GeoTechnologies, Inc, METI/NASA, USGS, EPA, NPS, US Census Bureau, USDA, USFWS Figure 3-1 Floodplain Map



1:4,000

Dobbins ARB, USAR ARC Marietta, Georgia March 2024 1

This Page Was Intentionally Left Blank.
# **APPENDIX A:**

# 2 **Coordination Letters and Responses**

3

1

This Page Was Intentionally Left Blank.

### **Distribution List**

Georgia Environmental Protection Division Mr. Rusty Roth	
Georgia Department of Natural Resources Director, City of Marietta Department of Planning and Zon	ing
2 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive SE Development Services	0
Suite 1456, East Tower P.O. Box 609	
Atlanta, GA 30334 Marietta, GA 30061-0609	
U.S. American Strations	
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Cobb County Department of Transportation	
South Atlantic Division 60 1890 County Services Parkway	
Forsyth Street SW Marietta, GA 30008	
Atlanta, GA 30303-8801	
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4 Georgia State Parks and Historic Sites	
Office of the Regional Administrator Georgia Department of Natural Resources	
Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center2600 Highway 155 SW	
61 Forsyth Street, SW Stockbridge, GA 30281	
Atlanta, GA 30303-3104	
Mr. William Bruton. Jr. Mr. Rich Buss	
Marietta City Manager Director, City of Marietta Parks, Recreation, and Facilities	
205 Lawrence Street P.O. Box 609	
Marietta, GA 30060 Marietta, GA 30061	
Cabb County Community Development Department City of Smyrna	
P.O. Poy 640	
Mariatta CA 30061 Smyrna CA 30080	
Cobb County Chamber of Commerce Atlanta Regional Commission	
P.O. Box 671868 229 Peachtree St NE, Suite 100	
Marietta, GA 30006-0032 Atlanta, GA 30303	
Cobb County Board of Commissioners Chuck Hoskin, Jr.	
100 Cherokee Street Principal Chief, Cherokee Nation	
Marietta, GA 30090 P.O. Box 948	
Tahlequah, OK 74465	
Ms. Lisa Cunid Michell Hicks	
Cobb County Commission Chairwoman Principal Chief. Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians	
100 Cherokee Street P.O. Box 1927	
Marietta, GA 30090 Cherokee, NC 28719	
Dr. Laskia MaMarwis	
Cabb County Managar Disastar Cabb County Community Development Department	nt
100 Character D. Do Day (40	int
100 Cherokee Street     F.O. D0X 049       Mariatta CA 20000     Mariatta CA 20061	
Marieua, GA 50070 Marieua, GA 50001	
Stephanie A. Bryan Wilson Yargee	
Tribal Chair, Poarch Band of Creek Indians Chief, Alabama-Quassarte Tribal Town	
5811 Jack Springs Road 101 E Broadway	
Atmore, AL 36502 Wetumka, OK 74883	
Cobb County Soil and Water Conservation District Brian Harris	
678 South Cobb Drive, Suite 150 Chief, Catawba Indian Nation	
Marietta, GA 30060 996 Avenue of the Nations	

Please note the letter mailed to the Alabama-Quassarte Tribal Town was returned to the sender. A second letter was mailed to an alternative address which was also returned. Three letters were mailed out to the tribes associated addressed and a copy was also emailed to the THPO. (2122 Highway 27, Wetumka, OK 74883/PO Box 218, Wetumka, OK 74883 and PO Box 646 Okemah, OK 74859. A copy of the letter arrived to the tribe on July 8, 2024.

1

This Page Was Intentionally Left Blank.



#### DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE HEADQUARTERS 94TH AIRLIFT WING (AFRC) DOBBINS AIR RESERVE BASE, GEORGIA

April 22, 2024

MEMORANDUM FOR Principal Chief Michell Hicks Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians P.O. Box 1927 Cherokee, NC 28719

FROM: 94 MSG/CEV 901 Industrial Drive Dobbins ARB, GA 30069

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment for Construction of Army Reserve Center on Dobbins ARB, Georgia

1. The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), on behalf of the United States Army Reserve (USAR) 81st Readiness Division (RD) and in coordination with the United States Air Force (USAF), is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). The EA will analyze the potential impacts and environmental consequences associated with the construction and operation of an Army Reserve Center (ARC) on the Dobbins Air Reserve Base (ARB) (see Attachment 1, Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives (DOPAA). The EA will evaluate the potential environmental consequences of the Proposed Action and alternatives in accordance with the provisions of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 32, Part 989, and 40 CFR Parts 1500 through 1508 (Council on Environmental Quality's NEPA implementing regulations).

2. The USAR proposes to construct and operate an 800-member ARC on an approximately 12.7acre (553,212 square feet (sf)) site at Dobbins ARB in Marietta, Georgia. The ARC would include a training facility, a vehicle maintenance shop (VMS), and unheated storage building (USB). The proposed facilities would be capable of meeting facility requirements of the USAR Design Guide, USAR Facilities (October 20, 2023) as well as Antiterrorism/Force Protection (AT/FP) requirements and physical security measures. Supporting facilities would include concrete aprons, vehicle wash rack/platform(s), and utility connections. Supporting actions would include land clearing, paving, fencing, and general site improvements.

3. The new ARC would consist of an 82,427 square foot (sf) ARC training building, an 8,346 sf VMS, a 3,500 sf USB, 5,525 square yards (sy) of military equipment parking (MEP), 6,405 sy of privately owned vehicle (POV) parking, one vehicle wash rack, and site utility connections. Actions to support these facilities include land clearing, paving, fencing, and general site improvements. Physical security and AT/FP measures would be incorporated into the design including standoff distance from roads, parking areas, and vehicle unloading areas.

4. The Area of Potential Effects (APE) includes the maximum footprint for the Proposed Action, comprising all construction, demolition, and staging areas as identified previously and depicted in Figure 1-3- Project Location Map within the DOPAA. The APE consists of approximately 12.8 acres and was investigated for archaeological as well as architectural/historic resources.

5. According to Dobbins ARB's Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP) (Dobbins ARB, 2023), approximately 1,600 acres within Dobbins ARB have been surveyed for cultural resources.

- Archaeological Resources: Four archaeological resources have been identified at Dobbins ARB, compromising an agricultural trench, foundations for two different houses, and a prehistoric isolated find. None of these resources are listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).
- Architectural Resources: Dobbins has been fully surveyed for architectural resources by a number of cultural resources studies. Building 510 was listed in the NRHP in 1994. In addition, the Big Lake Dam was evaluated as eligible for listing in the NRHP.

6. In accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and to ensure the effects of the Proposed Action on properties listed in, or eligible for listing in, the NRHP are accounted for, and Dobbins ARB is initiating Section 106 consultation with your Tribe pursuant to 36 CFR Section 800.2.

7. A Phase I cultural resource survey of the APE is in progress in compliance with Federal and state regulations. The cultural resource surveys were conducted between October 31, 2023 and November 1, 2023. A draft of the Phase I Cultural Resource Survey is currently being reviewed by the USACE, the USAR, and the USAF. Once approved by those entities, the findings will be coordinated further. The ICRMP documents no known archeological sites in the APE.

8. If your Tribe has any special knowledge of Traditional Cultural Properties, sacred sites, or sites of religious or cultural importance, please provide specific comments so measures can be taken to ensure that the project will avoid, minimize, or mitigate effects on such properties.

9. If any unanticipated discoveries of archaeological resources or "cultural items" subject to the provision of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) occur during the implementation of the Proposed Action, work would be halted at the discovery site, the Dobbins ARB Installation Cultural Resources Manager would be contacted, and all appropriate measures would be implemented to avoid disturbance, as detailed in the ICRMP. Dobbins ARB would immediately inform you of the discovery and invite you to consult on the procedures to minimize adverse effects and/or render disposition of NAGRPA cultural items.

10. We request your feedback at your earliest convenience. If possible, please respond within 30 days of your receipt of this letter so that we have sufficient time to consider any information you provide. Please provide information or comments to Mr. Parker Johnson, 901 Industrial Drive Building 510 Dobbins ARB, GA 30069, call Mr. Johnson at (678) 655-3549 or send an email via william.johnson.200@us.af.mil. Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely, MICHAEL B. PARKS, Col, USAF

Commander

Attachment: 1. DOPAA

1

This Page Was Intentionally Left Blank.

From:	Elizabeth Toombs
To:	JOHNSON, WILLIAM P CIV USAF AFRC 94 CE/CEV
Subject:	[Non-DoD Source] Construction of Army Reserve Center on Dobbins Air Reserve Base
Date:	Monday, June 17, 2024 1:22:51 PM
Attachments:	061724 Air Force COR ARC Dobbins.pdf

You don't often get email from elizabeth-toombs@cherokee.org. Learn why this is important

Good Afternoon, Mr. Johnson:

Attached is Cherokee Nation's response to the proposed undertaking. Please let me know if there are any questions or concerns.

Wado,

Elizabeth Toombs, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Cherokee Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Office PO Box 948 Tahlequah, OK 74465-0948 918.453.5389





P.O. Box 948 • Tahlequah, OK 74465-0948 918-453-5000 • www.cherokee.org Chuck Hoskin Jr. Principal Chief GP ቁወዮ <del>\$</del>Л\$ ዑደፀር*አ* 

Bryan Warner Deputy Principal Chief รัZภิศังภิ พศภา DLdภา 0-EOGภิ

June 17, 2024

Parker Johnson Department of the Air Force 901 Industrial Drive, Building 510 Dobbins, ARB, GA 30069

Re: Army Reserve Center on Dobbins ARB

Mr. Parker Johnson:

The Cherokee Nation (Nation) is in receipt of your correspondence about **Army Reserve Center on Dobbins ARB**, and appreciates the opportunity to provide comment upon this project. This communication is intended for government-to-government consultation with a sovereign federally recognized Tribal Nation. Information received in consultation will be deemed confidential unless explicit consent is provided by the Nation.

The Nation maintains databases and records of cultural, historic, and pre-historic resources in this area. Our Historic Preservation Office (Office) reviewed this project, cross referenced the project's legal description against our information, and found no instances where this project intersects or adjoins such resources. Thus, the Nation does not foresee this project imparting impacts to Cherokee cultural resources at this time.

However, the Nation requests that the Department of the Air Force (Air Force) halt all project activities immediately and re-contact our Office for further consultation if items of cultural significance are discovered during the course of this project. Additionally, the Nation requests that the Air Force conduct appropriate inquiries with other pertinent Historic Preservation Offices regarding historic and prehistoric resources not included in the Nation's databases or records.

If you require additional information or have any questions, please contact me at your convenience. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Wado,

Elizabeth Toombs, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Cherokee Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Office elizabeth-toombs@cherokee.org 918.453.5389



#### DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE HEADQUARTERS 94TH AIRLIFT WING (AFRC) DOBBINS AIR RESERVE BASE, GEORGIA

March 7, 2024

MEMORANDUM FOR U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE Southeast Region 1875 Century Blvd., Suite 200 Atlanta, GA 30345

FROM: 94 MSG/CEV 901 Industrial Drive Dobbins ARB, GA, 30069

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment for Construction of Army Reserve Center on Dobbins ARB, Georgia

1. The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), on behalf of the United States Army Reserve (USAR) 81st Readiness Division (RD) and in coordination with the United States Air Force (USAF), is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate the potential environmental consequences of constructing and operating an Army Reserve Center (ARC) on the Dobbins Air Reserve Base (ARB) within the Proposed Action Area (see Description of Proposed Action Alternatives (DOPAA) [Attachment 1]).

2. Under the Proposed Action, the USAR would construct and operate an 800-member ARC at the Dobbins ARB. The ARC would include a training facility, a vehicle maintenance shop, and an unheated storage building. The proposed facilities would be capable of meeting facility requirements of the USAR Design Guide, as well as Antiterrorism/Force Protection requirements and physical security measures. Supporting facilities would include concrete aprons, vehicle wash rack/platform(s), and utility connections. Supporting actions would include land clearing, paving, fencing, and general site improvements.

3. The purpose of this correspondence is to solicit your comments and concerns regarding the Proposed Action, which is described further in the DOPAA (see Attachment 1). Identification of issues early in the environmental impact analysis process allows us to focus our analysis on issues identified in the development stage and, if practicable, identify alternatives to minimize environmental impacts.

4. Dobbins ARB manages its natural resources in accordance with its Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP). The most current Dobbins INRMP is in effect from March 31, 2023, through March 31, 2028. The most recent 5-year revision was reviewed and approved by the Environmental Protection Division (EPD) of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on March 16, 2023 and March 20, 2023, respectively. Threatened and Endangered species surveys were conducted on Dobbins ARB in February 2022 and the findings of the surveys were reported in the January 2023 Bird, Mammal, Plant and Animal Threatened and Endangered Species Survey. In the summer of 2022, an

acoustical monitoring survey at Dobbins ARB detected the Tricolored Bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*; proposed endangered) as documented in the July 2022 Bat Survey Report. In addition, an Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) report (Project Code 2024-0010231 [see Attachment 2]) was obtained on January 16, 2024 which identified the following federally-protected species as having ranges that overlap the Proposed Action Area: Tricolored Bat , Whooping Crane (*Grus americana*; experimental population non-essential), Monarch Butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*; candidate), Michaux's Sumac (*Rhus michauxii*; endangered), and White Fringeless Orchid (*Platanthera integrilabia*; threatened). A field investigation was conducted on October 30, 2023, to identify the presence of natural resources, including suitable habitat of protected species, wetlands and water bodies, flora and fauna, and other sensitive resources within the Proposed Action Area. A draft of the Natural Resource Survey Report is currently under review by the USACE, the USAR, and the USAF. The findings indicate that suitable habitat for the Monarch Butterfly and Tricolored Bat is present within the Proposed Action Area. Once these findings are finalized, the USAF will consider potential effects to these species as part of the EA and will take appropriate steps to avoid and/or minimize adverse effects, as practicable.

5. The USAF will accept comments during the environmental process. To ensure sufficient time to consider your input in the preparation of this EA, please provide information or comments to Mr. Parker Johnson within 30 days of receipt of this letter. Mr. Johnson can be reached by phone at (678) 655-3549 or william.johnson.200@us.af.mil. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

POWELL.WILLIA Digitally signed by POWELL.WILLIAM.C.1030153312 Date: 2024.03.06 15:15:13 -05'00' WILLIAM C. POWELL, GS-12, DAF Chief, Environmental Flight

Attachments: 1. DOPAA 2. USFWS IPaC Report

From:	GAES Assistance, FW4
То:	JOHNSON, WILLIAM P CIV USAF AFRC 94 CE/CEV
Subject:	[Non-DoD Source] Fw: Received in RO: Dobbins AFB Construction EA Letter
Date:	Thursday, April 11, 2024 3:19:43 PM
Attachments:	20240325 Air Force EA Letter Dobbins.pdf

You don't often get email from gaes\_assistance@fws.gov. Learn why this is important

### William,

we would have no additional species to add for consideration for this project than those listed in your March 7, 2024 letter. Please let me know if have any questions.

Thank you, Sandy Abbott

Georgia Ecological Services U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 355 E. Hancock Ave, Suite 320, Box 7 Athens, GA 30601 Email (preferred): GAES\_Assistance@FWS.gov Website: https://www.fws.gov/office/georgia-ecological-services Project Planning & Review Guidance: https://www.fws.gov/office/georgia-ecological-services/project-planningreview

Our mission is to work with others to conserve, protect, and enhance fish, wildlife, plants, and their habitats for the continuing benefit of the American people.

Note: This email correspondence and any attachments to and from this sender is subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and may be disclosed to third parties.

From: Maholland, Peter D <peter\_maholland@fws.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2024 7:17 AM
To: GAES Assistance, FW4 <gaes\_assistance@fws.gov>
Cc: Marion, Cathy A <cathy\_marion@fws.gov>
Subject: FW: Received in RO: Dobbins AFB Construction EA Letter

For review.

Peter Maholland (<u>he/him/his</u>) Field Supervisor Georgia Ecological Services U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service RG Stephens, Jr. Federal Building 355 East Hancock Avenue, Room 320, **Box 7** Athens, GA 30601

Office: 706-535-2099 Cell: 706-352-1160 Email: <u>Peter\_Maholland@fws.gov</u> <u>Website</u> | <u>Facebook</u>

"pInaDqu' tuqlIj wInaDqu' je"

NOTE: This email correspondence and any attachments to and from this sender is subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and may be disclosed to third parties.

From: Tawes, Robert <robert\_tawes@fws.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2024 7:00 AM
To: Maholland, Peter D <peter\_maholland@fws.gov>; Marion, Cathy A <cathy\_marion@fws.gov>
Cc: Santana, Megann W <megann\_santana@fws.gov>; Devolder, Andy <Andy\_Devolder@fws.gov>
Subject: Received in RO: Dobbins AFB Construction EA Letter

Hi Peter and Cathy. I was in the RO today and this was in the mail.

Rob Tawes Division Supervisor, Environmental Review U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Southeast Regional Office 1875 Century Boulevard Atlanta, GA 30345 404/679-7142 https://www.fws.gov/program/southeast-region www.fws.gov NOTE: This email correspondence and any attachments t

NOTE: This email correspondence and any attachments to and from this sender is subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and may be disclosed to third parties.



## United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE Georgia Ecological Services Field Office 355 East Hancock Avenue Room 320 Athens, GA 30601-2523 Phone: (706) 613-9493 Fax: (706) 613-6059



In Reply Refer To: Project Code: 2024-0010231 Project Name: Dobbins Air Reserve Base - New Facility Construction

November 28, 2023

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you for your request for information on federally listed species and important wildlife habitats that may occur in your project area. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has responsibility for certain species of wildlife under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973 as amended (16 USC 1531 et seq.), the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) as amended (16 USC 701-715), Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA) (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.) and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) as amended (16 USC 668-668c). We are providing the following guidance to assist you in determining which federally imperiled species may or may not occur within your project area and to recommend some conservation measures that can be included in your project design if you determine those species or designated critical habitat may be affected by your proposed project.

### FEDERALLY-LISTED SPECIES AND DESIGNATED CRITICAL HABITAT

Attached is a list of endangered, threatened, and proposed species that may occur in your project area. Your project area may not necessarily include all or any of these species. Under the ESA, it is the responsibility of the Federal action agency, project proponent, or their designated representative to determine if a proposed action "may affect" endangered, threatened, or proposed species, or designated critical habitat, and if so, to consult with the Service further. Similarly, it is the responsibility of the Federal action agency or project proponent, not the Service, to make "no effect" determinations. If you determine that your proposed action will have "no effect" on threatened or endangered species or their respective critical habitat, you do not need to seek concurrence with the Service. Nevertheless, it is a violation of Federal law to harm or harass any federally listed threatened or endangered fish or wildlife species without the appropriate permit. If you need additional information to assist in your effect determination, please contact the Service.

If you determine that your proposed action may affect federally listed species, please consult with the Service. Through the consultation process, we will analyze information contained in a biological assessment or equivalent document that you provide. If your proposed action is associated with Federal funding or permitting, consultation will occur with the Federal agency under section 7(a)(2) of the ESA. Otherwise, an incidental take permit pursuant to section 10(a) (1)(B) of the ESA (also known as a Habitat Conservation Plan) may be necessary to exempt harm or harass federally listed threatened or endangered fish or wildlife species. For more information regarding formal consultation and HCPs, please see the Service's <u>Section 7</u> <u>Consultation Library</u> and <u>Habitat Conservation Plans Library</u> Collections.

Action Area. The scope of federally listed species compliance not only includes direct effects, but also any indirect effects of project activities (e.g., equipment staging areas, offsite borrow material areas, or utility relocations). The action area is the spatial extent of an action's direct and indirect modifications or impacts to the land, water, or air (50 CFR 402.02). Large projects may have effects to land, water, or air outside the immediate footprint of the project, and these areas should be included as part of the action area. Effects to land, water, or air outside of a project footprint could include things like lighting, dust, smoke, and noise. To obtain a complete list of species, the action area should be uploaded or drawn in IPaC rather than just the project footprint.

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. An updated list may be requested through IPaC.

ESA Section 7 consultation (and related tools such as the EDGES and/or DKeys) apply to projects being permitted or funded by a Federal agency. However, please note that a lead federal agency may consider an action area that excludes portions of the project footprint. In these cases, further coordination with our office may be required to ensure compliance with the ESA. It is the responsibility of the project proponent to coordinate with the lead federal agency to understand the action area being reviewed as part of ESA Section 7 consultation.

**How to Submit a Project Review Package.** If you determine that your action may affect any federally listed species and would like technical assistance from our office, please send us a complete project review package. A step by step guide is available at the Georgia Ecological Services <u>Project Planning and Review</u> page (https://www.fws.gov/office/georgia-ecological-services/project-planning-review).

Beginning April 1, 2023, requests for threatened and endangered species project reviews must be submitted to our office using the process described below. (If you are not emailing us to submit a project for review, your email will be forwarded to the appropriate staff.) This is a three-step process. All steps must be completed to ensure your project is reviewed by a biologist in our office and you receive a timely response. In brief the steps are:

Step 1. Request an official species list for your project through IPaC (Done!)

**Step 2.** Complete applicable Determination Keys

**Step 3.** Send your complete project project review package to **GAES\_Assistance@FWS.gov** for review if no DKey is applicable or all aspects of the project are not addressed by DKeys, i.e. a species returned by IPaC does not have a DKey to address impacts to it. A complete project review package should include:

- 1. A description of the proposed action, including any measures intended to avoid, minimize, or offset effects of the action. The description shall provide sufficient detail to assess the effects of the action on listed species and critical habitat, such as the purpose of the action; duration and timing of the action; location (latitude and longitude); specific activities involving disturbance to land, water, and air, and how they will be carried out; current description of areas to be affected directly or indirectly by the action; and maps, drawings, or similar schematics of the action.
- 2. An updated Official Species List and DKey results
- 3. Biological Assessments (may include habitat assessments and information on the presence of listed species in the action area);
- 4. Description of effects of the action on species in the action area and, if relevant, effect determinations for species and critical habitat;
- 5. Conservation measures and any other available information related to the nature and scope of the proposed action relevant to its effects on listed species or designated critical habitat (e.g., management plans related to stormwater, vegetation, erosion and sediment plans). Visit the <u>Georgia Conservation Planning Toolbox</u> (https://www.fws.gov/story/ conservation-tools-georgia) for information about conservation measures.
- 6. In the email subject line, use the following format to include the Project Code from your IPaC species list and the county in which the project is located (Example: Project Code: 2023-0049730 Gwinnett Co.). For Georgia Department of Transportation related projects, please work with the Office of Environmental Services ecologist to determine the appropriate USFWS transportation liaison.

The Georgia Ecological Services Field Office will send a response email within approximately 30 days of receipt with technical assistance or further recommendations for specific species.

### WETLANDS AND FLOODPLAINS

Under Executive Orders 11988 and 11990, Federal agencies are required to minimize the destruction, loss, or degradation of wetlands and floodplains, and preserve and enhance their natural and beneficial values. These habitats should be conserved through avoidance, or mitigated to ensure that there would be no net loss of wetlands function and value. We encourage you to use the National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps in conjunction with ground-truthing to identify wetlands occurring in your project area. The Service's <u>NWI program website</u> (https://www.fws.gov/program/national-wetlands-inventory) integrates digital map data with other resource information. We also recommend you contact the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for

permitting requirements under section 404 of the Clean Water Act if your proposed action could impact floodplains or wetlands.

### **MIGRATORY BIRDS**

The MBTA prohibits the taking of migratory birds, nests, and eggs, except as permitted by the Service's <u>Migratory Birds Program</u> (https://fws.gov/program/migratory-birds). To minimize the likelihood of adverse impacts to migratory birds, we recommend construction activities occur outside the general bird nesting season from March through August, or that areas proposed for construction during the nesting season be surveyed, and when occupied, avoided until the young have fledged.

We recommend review of Birds of Conservation Concern to fully evaluate the effects to the birds at your site. This list identifies birds that are potentially threatened by disturbance and construction. It can be found at the Service's <u>Migratory Birds Conservation Library Collection</u> (https://fws.gov/library/collections/migratory-bird-conservation-documents).

Information related to best practices and migratory birds can be found at the Service's <u>Avoiding</u> <u>and Minimizing Incidental Take of Migratory Birds Library Collection</u> (https://fws.gov/library/ collections/avoiding-and-minimizing-incidental-take-migratory-birds).

### **BALD AND GOLDEN EAGLES**

The bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) was delisted under the ESA on August 9, 2007. Both the bald eagle and golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*) are still protected under the MBTA and BGEPA. The BGEPA affords both eagles protection in addition to that provided by the MBTA, in particular, by making it unlawful to "disturb" eagles. Under the BGEPA, the Service may issue limited permits to incidentally "take" eagles (e.g., injury, interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior nest abandonment). For information on bald and golden eagle management guidelines, we recommend you review information provided at the Service's <u>Bald</u> and <u>Golden Eagle Management Library Collection</u> (https://fws.gov/library/collections/bald-and-golden-eagle-management).

### NATIVE BATS

If your species list includes Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) or northern long-eared bat (*M. septentrionalis*) and the project is expected to impact forested habitat that is appropriate for maternity colonies of these species, forest clearing should occur outside of the period when bats may be present. Federally listed bats could be actively present in forested landscapes from April 1 to October 15 of any year and have non-volant pups from May 15 to July 31 in any year. Non-volant pups are incapable of flight and are vulnerable to disturbance during that time.

Indiana, northern long-eared, and gray (*M. grisescens*) bats are all known to utilize bridges and culverts in Georgia. If your project includes maintenance, construction, or any other modification or demolition to transportation structures, a qualified individual should complete a survey of these structures for bats and submit your findings via the Georgia Bats in Bridges cell phone application, free on Apple and Android devices. Please include these findings in any biological

assessment(s) or other documentation that is submitted to our office for technical assistance or consultation.

Additional information can be found at Georgia Ecological Services' <u>Conservation Planning</u> <u>Toolbox</u> and <u>Bat Conservation in Georgia</u> pages.

### **MONARCH BUTTERFLY**

On December 20, 2020, the Service determined that listing the Monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*) under the Endangered Species Act is warranted but precluded at this time by higher priority listing actions. With this finding, the monarch butterfly becomes a candidate for listing. The Service will review its status each year until we are able to begin developing a proposal to list the monarch.

As it is a candidate for listing, the Service welcomes conservation measures for this species. Recommended, and voluntary, conservation measures for projects in Georgia can be found at our <u>Monarch Conservation in Georgia</u> (https://www.fws.gov/project/monarch-conservation-georgia) page.

### EASTERN INDIGO SNAKE

Our office has published guidance documents to assist project proponents in avoiding and minimizing potential impact to the eastern indigo snake. The <u>Visual Encounter Survey Protocol</u> for the Eastern Indigo Snake (*Drymarchon couperi*) in Georgia is recommended for project proponents or their designees to evaluate the possible presence of the Eastern indigo snake at a proposed project site. The <u>Standard Protection Measures for the Eastern Indigo Snake</u> (*Drymarchon couperi*) include educational materials and training that can help protect the species by making staff working on a project site aware of their presence and traits. In Georgia, indigo snakes are closely associated with the state-listed gopher tortoise (*Gopherus polyphemus*), a reptile that excavates extensive underground burrows that provide the snake shelter from winter cold and summer desiccation.

### SOLAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

The <u>Recommended Practices for the Responsible Siting and Design of Solar Development in</u> <u>Georgia</u> were published in September 2023 and are intended to provide voluntary guidance to support consideration of natural resources during the development of photovoltaic solar in Georgia. Furthermore, the Georgia Low Impact Solar Siting Tool (LISST) is available as a <u>web</u> <u>application</u> and as a map layer in IPaC (Find it in the "Layers" Box > "Environmental Data") to provide project managers with the data to identify areas that may be preferred for low-impact development. The tool seeks to support the acceleration of large-scale solar development in areas with less impact to the environment.

### STATE AGENCY COORDINATION

Additional information that addresses at-risk or high priority natural resources can be found in the State Wildlife Action Plan (https://georgiawildlife.com/WildlifeActionPlan), at Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Division Biodiversity Portal (https://georgiawildlife.com/conservation/species-of-concern), Georgia's Natural, Archaeological, and

Historic Resources GIS portal (https://www.gnahrgis.org/gnahrgis/index.do), and the <u>Georgia</u> <u>Ecological Services HUC10 Watershed Guidance</u> page.

Thank you for your concern for endangered and threatened species. We appreciate your efforts to identify and avoid impacts to listed and sensitive species in your project area. For further consultation on your proposed activity, please email <u>gaes\_assistance@fws.gov</u> and reference the project county and your Service Project Tracking Number.

This letter constitutes Georgia Ecological Services' general comments under the authority of the Endangered Species Act.

Attachment(s):

- Official Species List
- Bald & Golden Eagles
- Migratory Birds
- Wetlands

# **OFFICIAL SPECIES LIST**

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:

### **Georgia Ecological Services Field Office**

355 East Hancock Avenue Room 320 Athens, GA 30601-2523 (706) 613-9493

### **PROJECT SUMMARY**

Project Code:2024-0010231Project Name:Dobbins Air Reserve Base - New Facility ConstructionProject Type:Military DevelopmentProject Description:Facility constructionProject Location:Vertical Action

The approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: <u>https://www.google.com/maps/@33.92363965,-84.51476780878595,14z</u>



Counties: Cobb County, Georgia

### **ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT SPECIES**

There is a total of 4 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.

Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries<sup>1</sup>, as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

1. <u>NOAA Fisheries</u>, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

### BIRDS

NAME	STATUS		
<ul> <li>Whooping Crane Grus americana</li> <li>Population: U.S.A. (AL, AR, CO, FL, GA, ID, IL, IN, IA, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MO, NC, NM, OH, SC, TN, UT, VA, WI, WV, western half of WY)</li> <li>No critical habitat has been designated for this species.</li> <li>Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/758</u></li> </ul>	Experimental Population, Non- Essential		
INSECTS NAME	STATUS		
Monarch Butterfly <i>Danaus plexippus</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9743</u>	Candidate		
FLOWERING PLANTS NAME	STATUS		
Michaux's Sumac <i>Rhus michauxii</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5217</u>	Endangered		
White Fringeless Orchid Platanthera integrilabia Population: No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1889</u>	Threatened		

### **CRITICAL HABITATS**

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA UNDER THIS OFFICE'S JURISDICTION.

YOU ARE STILL REQUIRED TO DETERMINE IF YOUR PROJECT(S) MAY HAVE EFFECTS ON ALL ABOVE LISTED SPECIES.

# **BALD & GOLDEN EAGLES**

Bald and golden eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act<sup>1</sup> and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act<sup>2</sup>.

Any person or organization who plans or conducts activities that may result in impacts to bald or golden eagles, or their habitats<sup>3</sup>, should follow appropriate regulations and consider implementing appropriate conservation measures, as described below.

- 1. The <u>Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act</u> of 1940.
- 2. The Migratory Birds Treaty Act of 1918.
- 3. 50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)

THERE ARE NO BALD AND GOLDEN EAGLES WITHIN THE VICINITY OF YOUR PROJECT AREA.

# **MIGRATORY BIRDS**

Certain birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act<sup>1</sup> and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act<sup>2</sup>.

Any person or organization who plans or conducts activities that may result in impacts to migratory birds, eagles, and their habitats<sup>3</sup> should follow appropriate regulations and consider implementing appropriate conservation measures, as described below.

- 1. The Migratory Birds Treaty Act of 1918.
- 2. The <u>Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act</u> of 1940.
- 3. 50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)

For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to migratory birds on your list, click on the PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY at the top of your list to see when these birds are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
Cerulean Warbler Dendroica cerulea This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2974</u>	Breeds Apr 28 to Jul 20
Chimney Swift Chaetura pelagica This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9406</u>	Breeds Mar 15 to Aug 25
Prairie Warbler <i>Dendroica discolor</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9513</u>	Breeds May 1 to Jul 31
Red-headed Woodpecker <i>Melanerpes erythrocephalus</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9398</u>	Breeds May 10 to Sep 10
Rusty Blackbird <i>Euphagus carolinus</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9478</u>	Breeds elsewhere
Wood Thrush <i>Hylocichla mustelina</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9431</u>	Breeds May 10 to Aug 31

## **PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY**

The graphs below provide our best understanding of when birds of concern are most likely to be present in your project area. This information can be used to tailor and schedule your project activities to avoid or minimize impacts to birds. Please make sure you read the supplemental information and specifically the FAQ "Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report" before using or attempting to interpret this report.

### **Probability of Presence** (**■**)

Green bars; the bird's relative probability of presence in the 10km grid cell(s) your project overlaps during that week of the year.

### Breeding Season (=)

Yellow bars; liberal estimate of the timeframe inside which the bird breeds across its entire range.

### Survey Effort ()

Vertical black lines; the number of surveys performed for that species in the 10km grid cell(s) your project area overlaps.

#### No Data (-)

A week is marked as having no data if there were no survey events for that week.

				probability of presence breeding season survey effort								– no data
SPECIES	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
Cerulean Warbler BCC Rangewide (CON)	++++	++++	++++	┼┼╪╉	++++	++++	<u>+</u> ++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++
Chimney Swift BCC Rangewide (CON)	++++	++++	┼┼┼		111	1+11	┼╋┼╋	┼╪┼	+###	<b>##</b> +#	++++	++++
Prairie Warbler BCC Rangewide (CON)	++++	++++	++++	┼┼╪┼	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++
Red-headed Woodpecker BCC Rangewide (CON)	₩₩++	┼╪┼╪	<b>₩₩₩</b> +	H###	∳ <mark>∦</mark> ∔∎	∎┼┼┼	₽┼┼Ш	∎┼┼┼	<mark>┼┼</mark> ♥♥	₩+₩+	<b>₩</b> ₩+₩	#+#+
Rusty Blackbird BCC - BCR	++++	┼┼╪╙	┼┼鯽┼	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++
Wood Thrush BCC Rangewide (CON)	++++	++++	++++	┼┼║┼	<b>∳</b> ┼┼∎	<b>₩</b> ₽++	┼╋┼┼	$\left  \right $	++++	++∎+	++++	++++

Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Eagle Management <u>https://www.fws.gov/program/eagle-management</u>
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds <u>https://www.fws.gov/library/</u> <u>collections/avoiding-and-minimizing-incidental-take-migratory-birds</u>
- Nationwide conservation measures for birds <u>https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/</u> <u>documents/nationwide-standard-conservation-measures.pdf</u>
- Supplemental Information for Migratory Birds and Eagles in IPaC <u>https://www.fws.gov/media/supplemental-information-migratory-birds-and-bald-and-golden-eagles-may-occur-project-action</u>

# WETLANDS

Impacts to <u>NWI wetlands</u> and other aquatic habitats may be subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, or other State/Federal statutes.

For more information please contact the Regulatory Program of the local <u>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers District</u>.

Please note that the NWI data being shown may be out of date. We are currently working to update our NWI data set. We recommend you verify these results with a site visit to determine the actual extent of wetlands on site.

RIVERINE

R4SBC

### **IPAC USER CONTACT INFORMATION**

Agency: Pond & Company Tyler Schwartz Name: 3500 Parkway Ln #500 Address: Address Line 2: 3500 Peachtree Corners City: State: GA Zip: 30092 Email tyler.schwartz@pondco.com Phone: 6783367740

### LEAD AGENCY CONTACT INFORMATION

Lead Agency: Air Force Name: Tyle 1

This Page Was Intentionally Left Blank.



March 7, 2024

#### MEMORANDUM FOR STACY RIEKE

Environmental Review and Preservation Planning Program Manager Georgia Department of Community Affairs 60 Executive Park South, NE Atlanta, GA 30329

FROM: 94 MSG/CEV 901 Industrial Drive Dobbins ARB, GA 30069

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment for Construction of Army Reserve Center on Dobbins ARB, Georgia

1. The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), on behalf of the United States Army Reserve (USAR) 81st Readiness Division (RD) and in coordination with the United States Air Force (USAF), is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). The EA will analyze the potential impacts and environmental consequences associated with the construction and operation of an Army Reserve Center (ARC) on the Dobbins Air Reserve Base (ARB) (see Attachment 1, Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives (DOPAA). The EA will evaluate the potential environmental consequences of the Proposed Action and alternatives in accordance with the provisions of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 32, Part 989, and 40 CFR Parts 1500 through 1508 (Council on Environmental Quality's NEPA implementing regulations).

2. Project Description: The USAR proposed to construct and operate an 800-member Army Reserve Center (ARC) at the Dobbins ARB in Marietta, Georgia. The ARC would include a training facility, a vehicle maintenance shop, and an unheated storage building. The proposed facilities would be capable of meeting facility requirements of the USAR Design Guide, USAR Facilities (October 20, 2023) as well as Antiterrorism/Force Protection (AT/FP) requirements and physical security measures. Supporting facilities would include concrete aprons, vehicle wash rack/platform(s), and utility connections. Supporting actions would include land clearing, paving, fencing, and general site improvements.

3. Area of Potential Effects (APE): The APE includes a direct effects APE and a visual indirect effect APE (see Attachment 2, Figures). The direct effect APE consists of approximately 12.8 acres. The direct effect APE was investigated for archaeological resources as well as architectural/historic resources. The visual indirect effect APE consists of a 0.25-mile buffer around the direct APE and was investigated for architectural/historic resources.

a. The new ARC would consist of an 82,427 square foot (sf) ARC training building, an 8,346 sf VMS, a 3,500 sf USB, 5,525 square yards (sy) of military equipment parking (MEP), a 6,405

sy of privately owned vehicles (POV) parking, one vehicle wash rack and site utility connections. Actions to support these facilities include land clearing, paving, fencing, and general site improvements. Physical security and AT/FP measures would be incorporated into the design including standoff distance from roads, parking areas, and vehicle unloading areas.

4. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources: According to Dobbins ARB's Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP) (Dobbins ARB, 2023), approximately 1,600 acres within Dobbins ARB have been surveyed for cultural resources. The ICRMP documents information regarding three buildings within the visual APE; Building 700, Building 486, and Building 401. These buildings have previously been considered not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

a. Archaeological Resources: Four archaeological resources have been identified at Dobbins ARB, comprising an agricultural trench, foundations for two different houses, and a prehistoric isolated find. None of these resources are listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the NRHP.

b. Architectural Resources: Dobbins has been fully surveyed for architectural resources by a number of cultural resources studies. Building 510 was listed in the NRHP in 1994. In addition, the Big Lake Dam was evaluated as eligible for listing in the NRHP.

5. Upcoming and Ongoing Cultural Studies: A Phase I cultural resource survey of the APE was conducted in compliance with federal and state regulations. The cultural resource surveys were conducted between October 31, 2023 and November 1, 2023. A draft of the Phase I Cultural Resource Survey is currently being reviewed by the USACE, the USAR, and the USAF. Once approved by those entities the findings will be coordinated further.

a. If any unanticipated discoveries of archaeological resources or "cultural items" subject to the provision of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) occur during the implementation of the Proposed Action, work would be halted at the discovery site, the Dobbins ARB Installation Cultural Resources Manager would be contacted, and all appropriate measures would be implemented to avoid disturbance, as detailed in the ICRMP. Dobbins ARB would immediately inform you of the discovery and invite you to consult on the procedures to minimize adverse effects and/or render disposition of NAGRPA cultural items.

6. The purpose of this correspondence is to solicit your comments and concerns regarding the Proposed Action, which is described further in the DOPAA (see Attachment 1). Identification of issues early in the environmental impact analysis process allows us to focus our analysis on issues identified in the development stage and, if practicable, identify alternatives to minimize environmental impacts.

7. The USAF will accept comments at any time during the environmental process. To ensure sufficient time to consider your input in the preparation of this EA, please provide information or comments to Mr. Parker Johnson within 30 days of receipt of this letter. Mr. Johnson can be reached by phone at (678) 655-3549 or william.johnson.200@us.af.mil. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

POWELL.WILLIA Digitally signed by POWELL.WILLIAM.C.1030153312 Date: 2024.03.06 15:24:11 -05'00' WILLIAM C. POWELL, GS-12, DAF Chief, Environmental Flight

Attachments: 1. DOPAA

2. Figures





1

This Page Was Intentionally Left Blank.



**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION** 

Jeffrey E. Cown, Director

Land Protection Branch 2 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive Suite 1058, East Tower Atlanta, Georgia 30334 404-657-8600

April 19, 2024

Mr. William Johnson 94 MSG/CEV 901 Industrial Drive Dobbins ARB, Georgia 30069

RE: Environmental Assessment for Construction of Army Reserve Center on Dobbins ARB; Dobbins Air Reserve Base, Marietta, Georgia

Dear Mr. Johnson:

The Land Protection Branch of the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) has reviewed the above-referenced document (EA) dated March 7, 2024, and received April 9, 2024. No comments were generated during the review. A copy of the EA will be placed in EPD's files as submitted. If you have any questions regarding this correspondence, please contact Jim Ashworth at (470) 524-2883 or Heather Clark at (470) 524-2348.

Sincerely,

Kim B. Hembree

Kim Hembree, Manager Department of Defense Facilities Unit Hazardous Waste Management Program

cc: William Johnson (William.Johnson200@us.af.mil) Gina Rose (gina.rose@us.af.mil)

File: DARB; 245-0285; (B)

1

This Page Was Intentionally Left Blank.
From:	Mason, Sharon
To:	JOHNSON, WILLIAM P CIV USAF AFRC 94 CE/CEV
Subject:	[Non-DoD Source] Environmental Assessment for Construction of the Army Reserve Center on Dobbins ARB, Georgia
Date:	Monday, April 22, 2024 11:39:35 AM
Attachments:	image001.png

You don't often get email from smason@cobbchamber.org. Learn why this is important

Mr. Johnson,

Thank you for sending me the Environmental Assessment for Construction of the Army Reserve Center on Dobbins ARB, Georgia. We are thrilled about this opportunity and are here to support you in any way possible. I read your analysis and do not have any additional comments. It was very thorough for each step in the process. Dobbins ARB is the perfect spot for this, and we have a very supportive community that will help in any way needed to ensure their continued success. Please let me know if you need anything else from me and my team. Thank you!

#### **SHARON MASON**

President & CEO o 770-859-2369 | c 404-308-8181 | <u>smason@cobbchamber.org</u>



1

This Page Was Intentionally Left Blank.

# **APPENDIX B:**

# 2 Notice of Availability

3

1

This Page Was Intentionally Left Blank.

- **APPENDIX C:**
- 2 Air Quality Emissions Calculations and
- **3 Record of Conformity Analysis**
- 4

This Page Was Intentionally Left Blank.

**1. General Information:** The Air Force's Air Conformity Applicability Model (ACAM) was used to perform a net change in emissions analysis to assess the potential air quality impact/s associated with the action. The analysis was performed in accordance with the Air Force Manual 32-7002, *Environmental Compliance and Pollution Prevention*; the *Environmental Impact Analysis Process* (EIAP, 32 CFR 989); the *General Conformity Rule* (GCR, 40 CFR 93 Subpart B); and the USAF Air Quality Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) *Guide*. This report provides a summary of the ACAM analysis.

Report generated with ACAM version: 5.0.23a

a. Action Location: Base: DOBBINS JARB State: Georgia County(s): Cobb Regulatory Area(s): Atlanta, GA

- b. Action Title: Army Reserve Center/OMS/UHS
- c. Project Number/s (if applicable): 85736

d. Projected Action Start Date: 6 / 2025

#### e. Action Description:

The Proposed Action is to provide for an 800-member ARC to support the USAR mission and function within the Atlanta Metropolitan Area. The ARC would include training facilities, VMS, and USB and be capable of meeting facility requirements of the USAR Design Guide, USAR Facilities (October 20, 2023) as well as AT/FP requirements and physical security measures. Supporting facilities include land clearing, paving, concrete aprons, vehicle wash rack/platform(s), fencing, general site improvements and utility connections.

Construction and Operation of a New ARC at Dobbins ARB: This alternative includes constructing and operating a new ARC at the Dobbins ARB in Marietta, Georgia. The new ARC would consist of an 82,427 sf ARC training building, an 8,346 sf VMS, a 3,500 sf USB, a 5,525 square yard (sy) MEP, a 6,405 sy POV parking lot, and one vehicle wash rack. Construction to support these facilities includes land clearing, paving, concrete aprons, vehicle wash platforms, fencing, general site improvements and utility connections. Physical security and AT/FP measures would be incorporated into the design including maximum standoff distance from roads, parking areas and vehicle unloading areas.

List of Assumptions

#### f. Point of Contact:

Name:	Aaron Burgess
Title:	Scientist III
Organization:	Pond & Company-Tetratech
Email:	aaron.burgess@pondco.com
Phone Number:	4047484887

**2. Analysis:** Total reasonably foreseeable net change in direct and indirect emissions associated with the action were estimated through ACAM on a calendar-year basis for the "worst-case" (highest annual emissions) and "steady state" (no net gain/loss in emission stabilized and the action is fully implemented) emissions. General Conformity under the Clean Air Act, Section 1.76 has been evaluated for the action described above according to the requirements of 40 CFR 93, Subpart B.

**1. General Information:** The Air Force's Air Conformity Applicability Model (ACAM) was used to perform a net change in emissions analysis to assess the potential air quality impact/s associated with the action. The analysis was performed in accordance with the Air Force Manual 32-7002, *Environmental Compliance and Pollution Prevention*; the *Environmental Impact Analysis Process* (EIAP, 32 CFR 989); the *General Conformity Rule* (GCR, 40 CFR 93 Subpart B); and the USAF Air Quality Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) *Guide*. This report provides a summary of the ACAM analysis.

Report generated with ACAM version: 5.0.23a

a. Action Location: Base: DOBBINS JARB State: Georgia County(s): Cobb Regulatory Area(s): Atlanta, GA

- b. Action Title: Army Reserve Center/OMS/UHS
- c. Project Number/s (if applicable): 85736

d. Projected Action Start Date: 6 / 2025

#### e. Action Description:

The Proposed Action is to provide for an 800-member ARC to support the USAR mission and function within the Atlanta Metropolitan Area. The ARC would include training facilities, VMS, and USB and be capable of meeting facility requirements of the USAR Design Guide, USAR Facilities (October 20, 2023) as well as AT/FP requirements and physical security measures. Supporting facilities include land clearing, paving, concrete aprons, vehicle wash rack/platform(s), fencing, general site improvements and utility connections.

Construction and Operation of a New ARC at Dobbins ARB: This alternative includes constructing and operating a new ARC at the Dobbins ARB in Marietta, Georgia. The new ARC would consist of an 82,427 sf ARC training building, an 8,346 sf VMS, a 3,500 sf USB, a 5,525 square yard (sy) MEP, a 6,405 sy POV parking lot, and one vehicle wash rack. Construction to support these facilities includes land clearing, paving, concrete aprons, vehicle wash platforms, fencing, general site improvements and utility connections. Physical security and AT/FP measures would be incorporated into the design including maximum standoff distance from roads, parking areas and vehicle unloading areas.

List of Assumptions

#### f. Point of Contact:

Aaron Burgess
Scientist III
Pond & Company-Tetratech
aaron.burgess@pondco.com
4047484887

**2. Analysis:** Total reasonably foreseeable net change in direct and indirect emissions associated with the action were estimated through ACAM on a calendar-year basis for the "worst-case" (highest annual emissions) and "steady state" (no net gain/loss in emission stabilized and the action is fully implemented) emissions. General Conformity under the Clean Air Act, Section 1.76 has been evaluated for the action described above according to the requirements of 40 CFR 93, Subpart B.

All emissions estimates were derived from various sources using the methods, algorithms, and emission factors from the most current *Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Stationary Sources*, *Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Mobile Sources*, and/or *Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Transitory Sources*. For greater details of this analysis, refer to the Detail ACAM Report.



#### **Conformity Analysis Summary:**

	20	25	
Pollutant	Action Emissions (ton/yr)	GENERAL C	CONFORMITY
		Threshold (ton/yr)	Exceedance (Yes or No)
Atlanta, GA			
VOC	0.157	100	No
NOx	1.342	100	No
СО	1.556		
SOx	0.003		
PM 10	10.454		
PM 2.5	0.050		
Pb	0.000		
NH3	0.003		

2026

	<b>_</b> 0		
Pollutant	Action Emissions (ton/yr)	GENERAL C	ONFORMITY
		Threshold (ton/yr)	Exceedance (Yes or No)
Atlanta, GA			
VOC	0.183	100	No
NOx	1.477	100	No
СО	1.926		
SOx	0.003		
PM 10	1.613		
PM 2.5	0.049		
Pb	0.000		
NH3	0.005		

2027

	20	<i>4</i>	
Pollutant	Action Emissions (ton/yr)	GENERAL C	ONFORMITY
		Threshold (ton/yr)	Exceedance (Yes or No)
Atlanta, GA			
VOC	0.075	100	No
NOx	0.568	100	No
СО	0.757		
SOx	0.001		
PM 10	0.021		
PM 2.5	0.019		
Pb	0.000		
NH3	0.002		

#### 2028 - (Steady State)

Pollutant	Action Emissions (ton/yr)	GENERAL C	ONFORMITY
		Threshold (ton/yr)	Exceedance (Yes or No)
Atlanta, GA			

VOC	0.000	100	No
NOx	0.000	100	No
СО	0.000		
SOx	0.000		
PM 10	0.000		
PM 2.5	0.000		
Pb	0.000		
NH3	0.000		

The Criteria Pollutants (or their precursors) with a General Conformity threshold listed in the table above are pollutants within one or more designated nonattainment or maintenance area/s for the associated National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). These pollutants are driving this GCR Applicability Analysis. Pollutants exceeding the GCR thresholds must be further evaluated potentially through a GCR Determination.

The pollutants without a General Conformity threshold are pollutants only within areas designated attainment for the associated NAAQS. These pollutants have an insignificance indicator for VOC, NOx, CO, SOx, PM 10, PM 2.5, and NH3 of 250 ton/yr (Prevention of Significant Deterioration major source threshold) and 25 ton/yr for Pb (GCR de minimis value). Pollutants below their insignificance indicators are at rates so insignificant that they will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of one or more NAAQSs. These indicators do not define a significant impact; however, they do provide a threshold to identify actions that are insignificant. Refer to the *Level II, Air Quality Quantitative Assessment Insignificance Indicators* for further details.

None of the annual net change in estimated emissions associated with this action are above the GCR threshold values established at 40 CFR 93.153 (b); therefore, the Proposed Action has an insignificant impact on Air Quality and a General Conformity Determination is not applicable.

Aaron Burgess, Scientist III	Mar 19 20
Name, Title	Date

#### **1. General Information**

- Action Location
   Base: DOBBINS JARB
   State: Georgia
   County(s): Cobb
   Regulatory Area(s): Atlanta, GA
- Action Title: Army Reserve Center/OMS/UHS
- Project Number/s (if applicable): 85736
- Projected Action Start Date: 6 / 2025

#### - Action Purpose and Need:

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to provide adequate facilities for an 800-member unit currently utilizing an insufficient Army Reserve Center (ARC) located within the Atlanta Metropolitan Area. The ARC would include training facilities, a Vehicle Maintenance Shop (VMS), and an Unheated Storage Building (USB) and would be capable of meeting facility requirements of the meeting facility requirements of the USAR Design Guide, as well as Antiterrorism/Force Protection requirements and physical security measures.

A new facility for the 800-member unit is needed to support the USAR's mission to provide trained and ready units and individuals to mobilize and deploy in support of the national military strategy.

#### - Action Description:

The Proposed Action is to provide for an 800-member ARC to support the USAR mission and function within the Atlanta Metropolitan Area. The ARC would include training facilities, VMS, and USB and be capable of meeting facility requirements of the USAR Design Guide, USAR Facilities (October 20, 2023) as well as AT/FP requirements and physical security measures. Supporting facilities include land clearing, paving, concrete aprons, vehicle wash rack/platform(s), fencing, general site improvements and utility connections.

Construction and Operation of a New ARC at Dobbins ARB: This alternative includes constructing and operating a new ARC at the Dobbins ARB in Marietta, Georgia. The new ARC would consist of an 82,427 sf ARC training building, an 8,346 sf VMS, a 3,500 sf USB, a 5,525 square yard (sy) MEP, a 6,405 sy POV parking lot, and one vehicle wash rack. Construction to support these facilities includes land clearing, paving, concrete aprons, vehicle wash platforms, fencing, general site improvements and utility connections. Physical security and AT/FP measures would be incorporated into the design including maximum standoff distance from roads, parking areas and vehicle unloading areas.

List of Assumptions

#### - Point of Contact

Name:	Aaron Burgess
Title:	Scientist III
Organization:	Pond & Company-Tetratech
Email:	aaron.burgess@pondco.com
Phone Number:	4047484887

Report generated with ACAM version: 5.0.23a

#### - Activity List:

	Activity Type	Activity Title
2.	Construction / Demolition	Construction and Operation of a New ARC at Dobbins ARB
3.	Heating	Heating of New ARC at Dobbins ARB

4. reisonner Operation of New ARC at Dobbins ARD
--------------------------------------------------

Emission factors and air emission estimating methods come from the United States Air Force's Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Stationary Sources, Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Mobile Sources, and Air Emissions Guide for Air Force Transitory Sources.

#### 2. Construction / Demolition

#### 2.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

 Activity Location County: Cobb Regulatory Area(s): Atlanta, GA

- Activity Title: Construction and Operation of a New ARC at Dobbins ARB

#### - Activity Description:

The alternative involves constructin and operating a new ARC at the Dobbins ARB. The new ARC would consist of an 82,427 square feet (sf) ARC training building, an 8,346 sf VMS, a 3,500 sf USB, a 5,525 square yard (sy) MEP, a 6,405 sy POV parking lot, and one vehicle wash rack. Construction to support these facilities includes land clearing, paving, concrete aprons, vehicle wash platforms, fencing, general site improvements and utility connections. Physical security and AT/FP measures would be incorporated into the design including maximum standoff distance from the roads, parking areas and vehicle unloading areas.

#### - Activity Start Date

Start Month:	6
Start Month:	2025

- Activity End Date

Indefinite:	False
End Month:	9
End Month:	2027

#### - Activity Emissions:

Pollutant	Total Emissions (TONs)	
VOC	0.415059	
SO <sub>x</sub>	0.007305	
NO <sub>x</sub>	3.386976	
СО	4.238791	

#### - Activity Emissions of GHG:

Pollutant	Total Emissions (TONs)	
$CH_4$	0.030483	
$N_2O$	0.015958	

- Global Scale Activity Emissions for SCGHG:

Pollutant	Total Emissions (TONs)	
CH <sub>4</sub>	0.030483	
N <sub>2</sub> O	0.015958	

## 2.1 Site Grading Phase

#### 2.1.1 Site Grading Phase Timeline Assumptions

Pollutant	Total Emissions (TONs)	
PM 10	12.089044	
PM 2.5	0.118705	
Pb	0.000000	
NH <sub>3</sub>	0.010169	

Pollutant	Total Emissions (TONs)
$CO_2$	790.702040
CO <sub>2</sub> e	796.218271

Pollutant	Total Emissions (TONs)	
$CO_2$	790.702040	
CO <sub>2</sub> e	796.218271	

- Phase Start Date	
Start Month:	6
Start Quarter:	1
Start Year:	2025

- Phase Duration Number of Month: 2 Number of Days: 0

#### 2.1.2 Site Grading Phase Assumptions

- General Site Grading Information	
Area of Site to be Graded (ft <sup>2</sup> ):	522720
Amount of Material to be Hauled On-Site (yd <sup>3</sup> ):	0
Amount of Material to be Hauled Off-Site (yd <sup>3</sup> ):	0
•	

#### - Site Grading Default Settings

Default Settings Used:	No
Average Day(s) worked per week:	5

#### - Construction Exhaust

Equipment Name	Number Of Equipment	Hours Per Day
Excavators Composite	2	8
Graders Composite	2	8
Other Construction Equipment Composite	1	8
Rubber Tired Dozers Composite	1	8
Scrapers Composite	2	8
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite	3	8

#### - Vehicle Exhaust

Average Hauling Truck Capacity (yd <sup>3</sup> ):	10
Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile):	20

#### - Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0

#### - Worker Trips

Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile): 20

#### - Worker Trips Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	50.00	50.00	0	0	0	0	0

#### 2.1.3 Site Grading Phase Emission Factor(s)

#### - Construction Exhaust Criteria Pollutant Emission Factors (g/hp-hour)

Excavators Composite [HP: 36] [LF: 0.38]							
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.40191	0.00542	3.44643	4.21104	0.10704	0.09848	
<b>Graders</b> Composite	Graders Composite [HP: 148] [LF: 0.41]						
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	
Emission Factors	0.33951	0.00490	2.85858	3.41896	0.15910	0.14637	

Other Construction Equipment Composite [HP: 82] [LF: 0.42]							
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.29762	0.00487	2.89075	3.51214	0.17229	0.15851	
<b>Rubber Tired Dozen</b>	rs Composite [H	<b>HP: 367] [LF: 0</b>	.4]				
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.37086	0.00491	3.50629	2.90209	0.15396	0.14165	
Scrapers Composite	e [HP: 423] [LF	<b>[: 0.48]</b>					
	VOC	SOx	NO <sub>x</sub>	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.20447	0.00489	1.90932	1.57611	0.07394	0.06803	
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite [HP: 84] [LF: 0.37]							
	VOC	SO <sub>x</sub>	NO <sub>x</sub>	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.19600	0.00489	2.00960	3.48168	0.07738	0.07119	

#### - Construction Exhaust Greenhouse Gasses Pollutant Emission Factors (g/hp-hour)

Excavators Composite [HP: 36] [LF: 0.38]						
	CH4	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e		
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.02382	0.00476	587.13772	589.15263		
<b>Graders</b> Composite	[HP: 148] [LF: 0.41]					
	CH <sub>4</sub>	$N_2O$	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e		
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.02155	0.00431	531.19419	533.01712		
Other Construction Equipment Composite [HP: 82] [LF: 0.42]						
	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e		
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.02141	0.00428	527.74261	529.55369		
<b>Rubber Tired Dozen</b>	rs Composite [HP: 367]	[LF: 0.4]				
	CH4	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e		
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.02159	0.00432	532.17175	533.99803		
Scrapers Composite	[HP: 423] [LF: 0.48]					
	CH <sub>4</sub>	$N_2O$	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e		
Emission Factors	0.02146	0.00429	528.94235	530.75755		
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite [HP: 84] [LF: 0.37]						
	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e		
Emission Factors	0.02149	0.00430	529.86270	531.68105		

#### - Vehicle Exhaust & Worker Trips Criteria Pollutant Emission Factors (grams/mile)

	VOC	SOx	NO <sub>x</sub>	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	NH <sub>3</sub>
LDGV	0.27777	0.00168	0.13961	4.03031	0.00418	0.00370	0.05231
LDGT	0.23699	0.00208	0.18903	3.62362	0.00481	0.00426	0.04375
HDGV	0.87960	0.00467	0.67184	11.04321	0.02158	0.01909	0.09392
LDDV	0.10112	0.00128	0.15037	5.65442	0.00350	0.00322	0.01663
LDDT	0.21054	0.00146	0.48188	5.41566	0.00569	0.00523	0.01761
HDDV	0.12742	0.00425	2.49726	1.57131	0.05253	0.04832	0.06515
MC	2.91855	0.00194	0.62874	12.70064	0.02292	0.02027	0.05254

#### - Vehicle Exhaust & Worker Trips Greenhouse Gasses Emission Factors (grams/mile)

	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e
LDGV	0.01491	0.00510	333.43927	335.32826
LDGT	0.01525	0.00728	412.84364	415.39026
HDGV	0.05582	0.02693	924.36140	933.76280
LDDV	0.04955	0.00070	380.06288	381.51083
LDDT	0.03772	0.00103	431.15861	432.40928
HDDV	0.02569	0.16061	1263.31926	1311.81246
MC	0.11069	0.00315	392.50958	396.21464

#### 2.1.4 Site Grading Phase Formula(s)

#### - Fugitive Dust Emissions per Phase

 $PM10_{FD} = (20 * ACRE * WD) / 2000$ 

PM10<sub>FD</sub>: Fugitive Dust PM 10 Emissions (TONs)
20: Conversion Factor Acre Day to pounds (20 lb / 1 Acre Day)
ACRE: Total acres (acres)
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

#### - Construction Exhaust Emissions per Phase

 $CEE_{POL} = (NE * WD * H * HP * LF * EF_{POL} * 0.002205) / 2000$ 

CEE<sub>POL</sub>: Construction Exhaust Emissions (TONs) NE: Number of Equipment WD: Number of Total Work Days (days) H: Hours Worked per Day (hours) HP: Equipment Horsepower LF: Equipment Load Factor EF<sub>POL</sub>: Emission Factor for Pollutant (g/hp-hour) 0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

#### - Vehicle Exhaust Emissions per Phase

 $VMT_{VE} = (HA_{OnSite} + HA_{OffSite}) * (1 / HC) * HT$ 

VMT<sub>VE</sub>: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles) HA<sub>OnSite</sub>: Amount of Material to be Hauled On-Site (yd<sup>3</sup>) HA<sub>OffSite</sub>: Amount of Material to be Hauled Off-Site (yd<sup>3</sup>) HC: Average Hauling Truck Capacity (yd<sup>3</sup>) (1 / HC): Conversion Factor cubic yards to trips (1 trip / HC yd<sup>3</sup>) HT: Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile/trip)

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{VE} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$ 

V<sub>POL</sub>: Vehicle Emissions (TONs)
VMT<sub>VE</sub>: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds
EF<sub>POL</sub>: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile)
VM: Vehicle Exhaust On Road Vehicle Mixture (%)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

#### - Worker Trips Emissions per Phase

 $VMT_{WT} = WD * WT * 1.25 * NE$ 

VMT<sub>WT</sub>: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
WT: Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile)
1.25: Conversion Factor Number of Construction Equipment to Number of Works
NE: Number of Construction Equipment

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{WT} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$ 

V<sub>POL</sub>: Vehicle Emissions (TONs) VMT<sub>WT</sub>: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)

0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds EF<sub>POL</sub>: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile) VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

#### 2.2 Trenching/Excavating Phase

#### 2.2.1 Trenching / Excavating Phase Timeline Assumptions

- Phase Start Date Start Month: 4 Start Quarter: 1 Start Year: 2026

- Phase Duration Number of Month: 3 Number of Days: 0

#### 2.2.2 Trenching / Excavating Phase Assumptions

- General Trenching/Excavating Information	
Area of Site to be Trenched/Excavated (ft <sup>2</sup> ):	52272
Amount of Material to be Hauled On-Site (yd <sup>3</sup> ):	0
Amount of Material to be Hauled Off-Site (yd <sup>3</sup> ):	0

- Trenching Default Settings	
Default Settings Used:	Yes
Average Day(s) worked per week:	5 (default)

#### - Construction Exhaust (default)

Equipment Name	Number Of Equipment	Hours Per Day
Excavators Composite	2	8
Other General Industrial Equipmen Composite	1	8
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite	1	8

#### - Vehicle Exhaust

Average Hauling Truck Capacity (yd <sup>3</sup> ):	20 (default)
Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile):	20 (default)

- Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0

- Worker Trips

Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile): 20 (default)

#### - Worker Trips Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	50.00	50.00	0	0	0	0	0

#### 2.2.3 Trenching / Excavating Phase Emission Factor(s)

- Construction Exhaust Criteria Pollutant Emission Factors (g/hp-hour) (default) Excavators Composite [HP: 36] [LF: 0.38]

	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.39317	0.00542	3.40690	4.22083	0.09860	0.09071
<b>Other General Indu</b>	strial Equipme	n Composite [H	IP: 35] [LF: 0.3	<b>34</b> ]		
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5
Emission Factors	0.45335	0.00542	3.58824	4.59368	0.11309	0.10404
Tractors/Loaders/B	ackhoes Compo	osite [HP: 84] [	LF: 0.37]			
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5
Emission Factors	0.18406	0.00489	1.88476	3.48102	0.06347	0.05839

#### - Construction Exhaust Greenhouse Gasses Pollutant Emission Factors (g/hp-hour) (default) Excavators Composite [HP: 36] [L.F: 0.38]

Excavators Compos	nu [III . 30] [LI . 0.30]							
	CH4	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e				
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.02381	0.00476	587.02896	589.04350				
Other General Industrial Equipmen Composite [HP: 35] [LF: 0.34]								
	CH <sub>4</sub>	$N_2O$	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e				
Emission Factors	0.02385	0.00477	587.87714	589.89459				
Tractors/Loaders/B	ackhoes Composite [H]	P: 84] [LF: 0.37]						
	CH4	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e				
Emission Factors	0.02149	0.00430	529.70686	531.52468				

#### - Vehicle Exhaust & Worker Trips Criteria Pollutant Emission Factors (grams/mile)

	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	NH <sub>3</sub>
LDGV	0.27777	0.00168	0.13961	4.03031	0.00418	0.00370	0.05231
LDGT	0.23699	0.00208	0.18903	3.62362	0.00481	0.00426	0.04375
HDGV	0.87960	0.00467	0.67184	11.04321	0.02158	0.01909	0.09392
LDDV	0.10112	0.00128	0.15037	5.65442	0.00350	0.00322	0.01663
LDDT	0.21054	0.00146	0.48188	5.41566	0.00569	0.00523	0.01761
HDDV	0.12742	0.00425	2.49726	1.57131	0.05253	0.04832	0.06515
MC	2.91855	0.00194	0.62874	12.70064	0.02292	0.02027	0.05254

#### - Vehicle Exhaust & Worker Trips Greenhouse Gasses Emission Factors (grams/mile)

	CH4	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e
LDGV	0.01491	0.00510	333.43927	335.32826
LDGT	0.01525	0.00728	412.84364	415.39026
HDGV	0.05582	0.02693	924.36140	933.76280
LDDV	0.04955	0.00070	380.06288	381.51083
LDDT	0.03772	0.00103	431.15861	432.40928
HDDV	0.02569	0.16061	1263.31926	1311.81246
MC	0.11069	0.00315	392.50958	396.21464

#### 2.2.4 Trenching / Excavating Phase Formula(s)

#### - Fugitive Dust Emissions per Phase

 $PM10_{FD} = (20 * ACRE * WD) / 2000$ 

PM10<sub>FD</sub>: Fugitive Dust PM 10 Emissions (TONs)
20: Conversion Factor Acre Day to pounds (20 lb / 1 Acre Day)
ACRE: Total acres (acres)
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

#### - Construction Exhaust Emissions per Phase

 $CEE_{POL} = (NE * WD * H * HP * LF * EF_{POL} * 0.002205) / 2000$ 

CEE<sub>POL</sub>: Construction Exhaust Emissions (TONs) NE: Number of Equipment WD: Number of Total Work Days (days) H: Hours Worked per Day (hours) HP: Equipment Horsepower LF: Equipment Load Factor EF<sub>POL</sub>: Emission Factor for Pollutant (g/hp-hour) 0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

#### - Vehicle Exhaust Emissions per Phase

 $VMT_{VE} = (HA_{OnSite} + HA_{OffSite}) * (1 / HC) * HT$ 

VMT<sub>VE</sub>: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles) HA<sub>OnSite</sub>: Amount of Material to be Hauled On-Site (yd<sup>3</sup>) HA<sub>OffSite</sub>: Amount of Material to be Hauled Off-Site (yd<sup>3</sup>) HC: Average Hauling Truck Capacity (yd<sup>3</sup>) (1 / HC): Conversion Factor cubic yards to trips (1 trip / HC yd<sup>3</sup>) HT: Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile/trip)

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{VE} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$ 

 $V_{POL}$ : Vehicle Emissions (TONs) VMT<sub>VE</sub>: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles) 0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds EF<sub>POL</sub>: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile) VM: Vehicle Exhaust On Road Vehicle Mixture (%) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

#### - Worker Trips Emissions per Phase

 $VMT_{WT} = WD * WT * 1.25 * NE$ 

VMT<sub>WT</sub>: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
WT: Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile)
1.25: Conversion Factor Number of Construction Equipment to Number of Works
NE: Number of Construction Equipment

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{WT} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$ 

 $V_{POL}$ : Vehicle Emissions (TONs) VMT<sub>VE</sub>: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles) 0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds EF<sub>POL</sub>: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile) VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

#### 2.3 Building Construction Phase

#### 2.3.1 Building Construction Phase Timeline Assumptions

- Phase Start Date Start Month: 8 Start Quarter: 1 Start Year: 2025 - Phase Duration Number of Month: 21 Number of Days: 0

#### 2.3.2 Building Construction Phase Assumptions

- General Building Construction Information

<b>Building Category:</b>	Office or Industrial
Area of Building (ft <sup>2</sup> ):	93206
Height of Building (ft):	36
Number of Units:	N/A

Building Construction Default Settings
 Default Settings Used: Yes
 Average Day(s) worked per week: 5 (default)

#### - Construction Exhaust (default)

Equipment Name	Number Of Equipment	Hours Per Day
Cranes Composite	1	6
Forklifts Composite	2	6
Generator Sets Composite	1	8
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite	1	8
Welders Composite	3	8

#### - Vehicle Exhaust

Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile): 20 (default)

#### - Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC		
POVs	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0		

- Worker Trips

Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile): 20 (default)

#### - Worker Trips Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	50.00	50.00	0	0	0	0	0

#### - Vendor Trips

Average Vendor Round Trip Commute (mile): 40 (default)

#### - Vendor Trips Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0

#### 2.3.3 Building Construction Phase Emission Factor(s)

#### - Construction Exhaust Criteria Pollutant Emission Factors (g/hp-hour) (default)

Cranes Composite [HP: 367] [LF: 0.29]										
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5				
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.20113	0.00487	1.94968	1.66287	0.07909	0.07277				
Forklifts Composite [HP: 82] [LF: 0.2]										
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5				

Emission Factors	0.26944	0.00487	2.55142	3.59881	0.13498	0.12418		
<b>Generator Sets Con</b>	posite [HP: 14]	[LF: 0.74]						
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5		
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.54223	0.00793	4.34662	2.86938	0.17681	0.16267		
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Composite [HP: 84] [LF: 0.37]								
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5		
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.19600	0.00489	2.00960	3.48168	0.07738	0.07119		
Welders Composite [HP: 46] [LF: 0.45]								
	VOC	SOx	NOx	CO	PM 10	PM 2.5		
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.49757	0.00735	3.67618	4.52476	0.11274	0.10373		

#### - Construction Exhaust Greenhouse Gasses Pollutant Emission Factors (g/hp-hour) (default)

Cranes Composite	HP: 367] [LF: 0.29]							
	CH4	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e				
Emission Factors	0.02140	0.00428	527.58451	529.39505				
Forklifts Composite	[HP: 82] [LF: 0.2]							
	CH4	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e				
Emission Factors	0.02138	0.00428	527.10822	528.91712				
<b>Generator Sets Con</b>	nposite [HP: 14] [LF: 0	.74]						
	CH4	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e				
Emission Factors	0.02305	0.00461	568.32220	570.27253				
Tractors/Loaders/B	ackhoes Composite [H]	P: 84] [LF: 0.37]						
	CH4	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e				
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.02149	0.00430	529.86270	531.68105				
Welders Composite	Welders Composite [HP: 46] [LF: 0.45]							
	CH4	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e				
Emission Factors	0.02305	0.00461	568.30078	570.25105				

#### - Vehicle Exhaust & Worker Trips Criteria Pollutant Emission Factors (grams/mile)

	VOC	SOx	NO <sub>x</sub>	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	NH <sub>3</sub>
LDGV	0.27777	0.00168	0.13961	4.03031	0.00418	0.00370	0.05231
LDGT	0.23699	0.00208	0.18903	3.62362	0.00481	0.00426	0.04375
HDGV	0.87960	0.00467	0.67184	11.04321	0.02158	0.01909	0.09392
LDDV	0.10112	0.00128	0.15037	5.65442	0.00350	0.00322	0.01663
LDDT	0.21054	0.00146	0.48188	5.41566	0.00569	0.00523	0.01761
HDDV	0.12742	0.00425	2.49726	1.57131	0.05253	0.04832	0.06515
MC	2.91855	0.00194	0.62874	12.70064	0.02292	0.02027	0.05254

#### - Vehicle Exhaust & Worker Trips Greenhouse Gasses Emission Factors (grams/mile)

	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e
LDGV	0.01491	0.00510	333.43927	335.32826
LDGT	0.01525	0.00728	412.84364	415.39026
HDGV	0.05582	0.02693	924.36140	933.76280
LDDV	0.04955	0.00070	380.06288	381.51083
LDDT	0.03772	0.00103	431.15861	432.40928
HDDV	0.02569	0.16061	1263.31926	1311.81246
MC	0.11069	0.00315	392.50958	396.21464

#### 2.3.4 Building Construction Phase Formula(s)

#### - Construction Exhaust Emissions per Phase

CEE<sub>POL</sub> = (NE \* WD \* H \* HP \* LF \* EF<sub>POL</sub>\* 0.002205) / 2000

CEE<sub>POL</sub>: Construction Exhaust Emissions (TONs)

NE: Number of Equipment
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
H: Hours Worked per Day (hours)
HP: Equipment Horsepower
LF: Equipment Load Factor
EF<sub>POL</sub>: Emission Factor for Pollutant (g/hp-hour)
0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

#### - Vehicle Exhaust Emissions per Phase

 $VMT_{VE} = BA * BH * (0.42 / 1000) * HT$ 

VMT<sub>VE</sub>: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
BA: Area of Building (ft<sup>2</sup>)
BH: Height of Building (ft)
(0.42 / 1000): Conversion Factor ft<sup>3</sup> to trips (0.42 trip / 1000 ft<sup>3</sup>)
HT: Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile/trip)

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{VE} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$ 

 $V_{POL}$ : Vehicle Emissions (TONs) VMT<sub>VE</sub>: Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Miles Travel (miles) 0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds EF<sub>POL</sub>: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile) VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

#### - Worker Trips Emissions per Phase

 $VMT_{WT} = WD * WT * 1.25 * NE$ 

VMT<sub>WT</sub>: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
WT: Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile)
1.25: Conversion Factor Number of Construction Equipment to Number of Works
NE: Number of Construction Equipment

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{WT} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$ 

 $\begin{array}{l} V_{POL}: \ Vehicle \ Emissions (TONs) \\ VMT_{WT}: \ Worker \ Trips \ Vehicle \ Miles \ Travel (miles) \\ 0.002205: \ Conversion \ Factor \ grams \ to \ pounds \\ EF_{POL}: \ Emission \ Factor \ for \ Pollutant \ (grams/mile) \\ VM: \ Worker \ Trips \ On \ Road \ Vehicle \ Mixture \ (\%) \\ 2000: \ Conversion \ Factor \ pounds \ to \ tons \end{array}$ 

- Vender Trips Emissions per Phase VMT<sub>VT</sub> = BA \* BH \* (0.38 / 1000) \* HT

VMT<sub>VT</sub>: Vender Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
BA: Area of Building (ft<sup>2</sup>)
BH: Height of Building (ft)
(0.38 / 1000): Conversion Factor ft<sup>3</sup> to trips (0.38 trip / 1000 ft<sup>3</sup>)
HT: Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile/trip)

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{VT} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$ 

V<sub>POL</sub>: Vehicle Emissions (TONs)
VMT<sub>VT</sub>: Vender Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds
EF<sub>POL</sub>: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile)
VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%)
2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

#### 2.4 Paving Phase

#### 2.4.1 Paving Phase Timeline Assumptions

- Phase Start Date Start Month: 8 Start Quarter: 1 Start Year: 2027

- Phase Duration Number of Month: 2 Number of Days: 0

#### 2.4.2 Paving Phase Assumptions

- General Paving Inforn	nation
Paving Area (ft <sup>2</sup> ):	150378

Paving Default Settings
 Default Settings Used: Yes
 Average Day(s) worked per week: 5 (default)

#### - Construction Exhaust (default)

Equipment Name	Number Of Equipment	Hours Per Day
Cement and Mortar Mixers Composite	4	6
Pavers Composite	1	7
Paving Equipment Composite	2	6
Rollers Composite	1	7

#### - Vehicle Exhaust

Average Hauling Truck Round Trip Commute (mile): 20 (default)

#### - Vehicle Exhaust Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	0	0	0	0	0	100.00	0

- Worker Trips

Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile): 20 (default)

#### - Worker Trips Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	50.00	50.00	0	0	0	0	0

#### 2.4.3 Paving Phase Emission Factor(s)

- Construction Exhaust Criteria Pollutant Emission Factors (g/hp-hour) (default)

Cement and Mortar Mixers Composite [HP: 10] [LF: 0.56]									
	VOC	SOx	NO <sub>x</sub>	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5			
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.55279	0.00855	4.19775	3.25549	0.16311	0.15007			
Pavers Composite []	HP: 81] [LF: 0.	.42]							
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5			
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.22921	0.00486	2.45013	3.43821	0.11941	0.10986			
Paving Equipment	Composite [HP:	: 89] [LF: 0.36]							
	VOC	SOx	NO <sub>x</sub>	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5			
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.18341	0.00488	2.01586	3.40316	0.07465	0.06867			
Rollers Composite [	Rollers Composite [HP: 36] [LF: 0.38]								
	VOC	SOx	NO <sub>x</sub>	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5			
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.52865	0.00542	3.57666	4.10537	0.14602	0.13434			

#### - Construction Exhaust Greenhouse Gasses Pollutant Emission Factors (g/hp-hour) (default)

Cement and Mortar Mixers Composite [HP: 10] [LF: 0.56]								
	CH4	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e				
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.02313	0.00463	570.32048	572.27767				
Pavers Composite []	HP: 81] [LF: 0.42]							
	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e				
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.02133	0.00427	525.80912	527.61356				
Paving Equipment	Composite [HP: 89] [L]	F: 0.36]						
	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e				
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.02142	0.00428	528.06776	529.87995				
Rollers Composite [	Rollers Composite [HP: 36] [LF: 0.38]							
	CH4	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e				
<b>Emission Factors</b>	0.02382	0.00476	587.12246	589.13732				

#### - Vehicle Exhaust & Worker Trips Criteria Pollutant Emission Factors (grams/mile)

	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	NH <sub>3</sub>
LDGV	0.27777	0.00168	0.13961	4.03031	0.00418	0.00370	0.05231
LDGT	0.23699	0.00208	0.18903	3.62362	0.00481	0.00426	0.04375
HDGV	0.87960	0.00467	0.67184	11.04321	0.02158	0.01909	0.09392
LDDV	0.10112	0.00128	0.15037	5.65442	0.00350	0.00322	0.01663
LDDT	0.21054	0.00146	0.48188	5.41566	0.00569	0.00523	0.01761
HDDV	0.12742	0.00425	2.49726	1.57131	0.05253	0.04832	0.06515
MC	2.91855	0.00194	0.62874	12.70064	0.02292	0.02027	0.05254

#### - Vehicle Exhaust & Worker Trips Greenhouse Gasses Emission Factors (grams/mile)

			ίų γ	
	CH4	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e
LDGV	0.01491	0.00510	333.43927	335.32826
LDGT	0.01525	0.00728	412.84364	415.39026
HDGV	0.05582	0.02693	924.36140	933.76280
LDDV	0.04955	0.00070	380.06288	381.51083
LDDT	0.03772	0.00103	431.15861	432.40928
HDDV	0.02569	0.16061	1263.31926	1311.81246
MC	0.11069	0.00315	392.50958	396.21464

#### 2.4.4 Paving Phase Formula(s)

#### - Construction Exhaust Emissions per Phase

 $CEE_{POL} = (NE * WD * H * EF_{POL}) / 2000$ 

#### - Construction Exhaust Emissions per Phase

 $CEE_{POL} = (NE * WD * H * HP * LF * EF_{POL} * 0.002205) / 2000$ 

CEE<sub>POL</sub>: Construction Exhaust Emissions (TONs) NE: Number of Equipment WD: Number of Total Work Days (days) H: Hours Worked per Day (hours) HP: Equipment Horsepower LF: Equipment Load Factor EF<sub>POL</sub>: Emission Factor for Pollutant (g/hp-hour) 0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Vehicle Exhaust Emissions per Phase VMT<sub>VE</sub> = PA \* 0.25 \* (1 / 27) \* (1 / HC) \* HT

 $\begin{array}{l} VMT_{VE}: \ Vehicle \ Exhaust \ Vehicle \ Miles \ Travel \ (miles) \\ PA: \ Paving \ Area \ (ft^2) \\ 0.25: \ Thickness \ of \ Paving \ Area \ (ft) \\ (1 / 27): \ Conversion \ Factor \ cubic \ feet \ to \ cubic \ yards \ (1 \ yd^3 / 27 \ ft^3) \\ HC: \ Average \ Hauling \ Truck \ Capacity \ (yd^3) \\ (1 / HC): \ Conversion \ Factor \ cubic \ yards \ to \ trips \ (1 \ trip \ / HC \ yd^3) \\ HT: \ Average \ Hauling \ Truck \ Round \ Trip \ Commute \ (mile/trip) \\ \end{array}$ 

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{VE} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$ 

 $\begin{array}{l} V_{POL}: \ Vehicle \ Emissions \ (TONs) \\ VMT_{VE}: \ Vehicle \ Exhaust \ Vehicle \ Miles \ Travel \ (miles) \\ 0.002205: \ Conversion \ Factor \ grams \ to \ pounds \\ EF_{POL}: \ Emission \ Factor \ for \ Pollutant \ (grams/mile) \\ VM: \ Vehicle \ Exhaust \ On \ Road \ Vehicle \ Mixture \ (\%) \\ 2000: \ Conversion \ Factor \ pounds \ to \ tons \\ \end{array}$ 

#### - Worker Trips Emissions per Phase

 $VMT_{WT} = WD * WT * 1.25 * NE$ 

VMT<sub>WT</sub>: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
WD: Number of Total Work Days (days)
WT: Average Worker Round Trip Commute (mile)
1.25: Conversion Factor Number of Construction Equipment to Number of Works
NE: Number of Construction Equipment

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{WT} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$ 

 $V_{POL}$ : Vehicle Emissions (TONs) VMT<sub>VE</sub>: Worker Trips Vehicle Miles Travel (miles) 0.002205: Conversion Factor grams to pounds EF<sub>POL</sub>: Emission Factor for Pollutant (grams/mile) VM: Worker Trips On Road Vehicle Mixture (%) 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

- Off-Gassing Emissions per Phase

 $VOC_P = (2.62 * PA) / 43560 / 2000$ 

VOC<sub>P</sub>: Paving VOC Emissions (TONs) 2.62: Emission Factor (lb/acre) PA: Paving Area (ft<sup>2</sup>)

43560: Conversion Factor square feet to acre (43560 ft2 / acre)<sup>2</sup> / acre) 2000: Conversion Factor square pounds to TONs (2000 lb / TON)

#### 3. Heating

#### 3.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

- Add or Remove Activity from Baseline? Add
- Activity Location County: Cobb Regulatory Area(s): Atlanta, GA
- Activity Title: Heating of New ARC at Dobbins ARB

#### - Activity Description:

The alternative involves constructin and operating a new ARC at the Dobbins ARB. The new ARC would consist of an 82,427 square feet (sf) ARC training building, an 8,346 sf VMS, a 3,500 sf USB, a 5,525 square yard (sy) MEP, a 6,405 sy POV parking lot, and one vehicle wash rack. Construction to support these facilities includes land clearing, paving, concrete aprons, vehicle wash platforms, fencing, general site improvements and utility connections. Physical security and AT/FP measures would be incorporated into the design including maximum standoff distance from the roads, parking areas and vehicle unloading areas.

#### - Activity Start Date

Start Month:1Start Year:2028

#### - Activity End Date

Indefinite:	Yes
End Month:	N/A
End Year:	N/A

#### - Activity Emissions of Criteria Pollutants:

Pollutant	<b>Emissions Per Year (TONs)</b>
VOC	0.017465
SO <sub>x</sub>	0.001905
NO <sub>x</sub>	0.317544
CO	0.266737

Pollutant	<b>Emissions Per Year (TONs)</b>
PM 10	0.024133
PM 2.5	0.024133
Pb	0.000000
NH <sub>3</sub>	0.000000

#### - Global Scale Activity Emissions of Greenhouse Gasses:

Pollutant	<b>Emissions Per Year (TONs)</b>
$CH_4$	0.007176
N <sub>2</sub> O	0.007176

Pollutant	<b>Emissions Per Year (TONs)</b>
CO <sub>2</sub>	381.113191
CO <sub>2</sub> e	381.506945

#### 3.2 Heating Assumptions

- Heating

Heating Calculation Type: Heat Energy Requirement Method

- Heat Energy Requirement Method
  - Area of floorspace to be heated (ft<sup>2</sup>): Type of fuel: Type of boiler/furnace:

89750 Natural Gas Industrial (10 - 99 MMBtu/hr)

Heat Value (MMBtu/ft <sup>3</sup> ):	0.00105
Energy Intensity (MMBtu/ft <sup>2</sup> ):	0.0743

- Default Settings Used: No

- Boiler/Furnace Usage Operating Time Per Year (hours): 1098

#### 3.3 Heating Emission Factor(s)

#### - Heating Criteria Pollutant Emission Factors (lb/1000000 scf)

0				/			
VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	Pb	NH <sub>3</sub>
5.5	0.6	100	84	7.6	7.6		

#### - Heating Greenhouse Gasses Pollutant Emission Factors (lb/1000000 scf)

CH4	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e
2.26	2.26	120019	120143

#### **3.4 Heating Formula(s)**

#### - Heating Fuel Consumption ft<sup>3</sup> per Year

FC<sub>HER</sub>= HA \* EI / HV / 1000000

FC<sub>HER</sub>: Fuel Consumption for Heat Energy Requirement Method
HA: Area of floorspace to be heated (ft<sup>2</sup>)
EI: Energy Intensity Requirement (MMBtu/ft<sup>2</sup>)
HV: Heat Value (MMBTU/ft<sup>3</sup>)
1000000: Conversion Factor

#### - Heating Emissions per Year

 $HE_{POL} = FC * EF_{POL} / 2000$ 

HE<sub>POL</sub>: Heating Emission Emissions (TONs) FC: Fuel Consumption EF<sub>POL</sub>: Emission Factor for Pollutant 2000: Conversion Factor pounds to tons

#### 4. Personnel

#### 4.1 General Information & Timeline Assumptions

#### - Add or Remove Activity from Baseline? Add

 Activity Location County: Cobb Regulatory Area(s): Atlanta, GA

- Activity Title: Operation of New ARC at Dobbins ARB

#### - Activity Description:

This alternative includes constructin an operating a new ARC at Dobbins ARB. The new ARC would consist of an 82,427 square feet (sf) ARC training building, an 8,346 sf VMS, a 3,500 sf USB, a 5,525 sy MEP, a 6,405 sy

POV parking lot, an one vehicle wash rack. Construction to support these facilities includes land clearing, paving, concrete apron, vehicles wash platforms, fencings, general site improvements and utility connections. Physical security and AT/FP measures would be incorporated into the design including maximum standoff distance from roads, parking areas, and vehicle unloading areas.

#### - Activity Start Date

Start Month:	1
Start Year:	2028

#### - Activity End Date

Indefinite:	Yes
End Month:	N/A
End Year:	N/A

#### - Activity Emissions of Criteria Pollutants:

Pollutant	<b>Emissions Per Year (TONs)</b>
VOC	0.336035
SO <sub>x</sub>	0.002435
NO <sub>x</sub>	0.161719
СО	4.531759

#### - Global Scale Activity Emissions of Greenhouse Gasses:

Pollutant	<b>Emissions Per Year (TONs)</b>
CH <sub>4</sub>	0.017928
N <sub>2</sub> O	0.007565

# Pollutant Emissions Per Year (TONs) PM 10 0.006195 PM 2.5 0.005484 Pb 0.000000 NH<sub>3</sub> 0.056195

Pollutant	<b>Emissions Per Year (TONs)</b>
CO <sub>2</sub>	483.244448
CO <sub>2</sub> e	485.941141

#### 4.2 Personnel Assumptions

- Number	of Person	nel
----------	-----------	-----

Active Duty Personnel:	84
Civilian Personnel:	36
Support Contractor Personnel:	0
Air National Guard (ANG) Personnel:	0
Reserve Personnel:	601

- Default Settings Used: Yes

- Average Personnel Round Trip Commute (mile): 20 (default)

Personnel Work Schedule	
Active Duty Personnel:	5 Days Per Week (default)
Civilian Personnel:	5 Days Per Week (default)
Support Contractor Personnel:	5 Days Per Week (default)
Air National Guard (ANG) Personnel:	4 Days Per Week (default)
<b>Reserve Personnel:</b>	4 Days Per Month (default)

#### 4.3 Personnel On Road Vehicle Mixture

#### - On Road Vehicle Mixture (%)

	LDGV	LDGT	HDGV	LDDV	LDDT	HDDV	MC
POVs	37.55	60.32	0	0.03	0.2	0	1.9
GOVs	54.49	37.73	4.67	0	0	3.11	0

#### 4.4 Personnel Emission Factor(s)

- On Road	- On Road Venice Criteria i onutant Emission Factors (grains/nine)						
	VOC	SOx	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM 2.5	NH <sub>3</sub>
LDGV	0.22701	0.00161	0.09737	3.60893	0.00400	0.00354	0.04709
LDGT	0.19007	0.00198	0.12182	3.02590	0.00453	0.00401	0.03929
HDGV	0.68003	0.00470	0.48699	8.48573	0.01892	0.01673	0.08955
LDDV	0.09836	0.00126	0.15047	6.19009	0.00408	0.00375	0.01681
LDDT	0.06499	0.00132	0.09765	3.37921	0.00375	0.00345	0.01832
HDDV	0.09173	0.00404	1.96809	1.43049	0.03016	0.02775	0.06687
MC	2.82840	0.00194	0.62390	12.29664	0.02292	0.02028	0.05356

#### - On Road Vehicle Criteria Pollutant Emission Factors (grams/mile)

#### - On Road Vehicle Greenhouse Gasses Emission Factors (grams/mile)

	CH4	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> e
LDGV	0.01210	0.00469	318.44427	320.13885
LDGT	0.01141	0.00645	392.95783	395.16133
HDGV	0.04377	0.02537	930.10890	938.74829
LDDV	0.04908	0.00070	373.85674	375.29200
LDDT	0.03919	0.00103	394.44011	395.72732
HDDV	0.02480	0.16442	1205.28924	1254.89739
MC	0.10635	0.00313	392.79642	396.38672

#### 4.5 Personnel Formula(s)

- Personnel Vehicle Miles Travel for Work Days per Year  $VMT_P = NP \ensuremath{\,^{\circ}} WD \ensuremath{\,^{\circ}} AC$ 

VMT<sub>P</sub>: Personnel Vehicle Miles Travel (miles/year) NP: Number of Personnel WD: Work Days per Year AC: Average Commute (miles)

#### - Total Vehicle Miles Travel per Year

 $VMT_{Total} = VMT_{AD} + VMT_{C} + VMT_{SC} + VMT_{ANG} + VMT_{AFRC}$ 

VMT<sub>Total</sub>: Total Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
 VMT<sub>AD</sub>: Active Duty Personnel Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
 VMT<sub>C</sub>: Civilian Personnel Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
 VMT<sub>SC</sub>: Support Contractor Personnel Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
 VMT<sub>ANG</sub>: Air National Guard Personnel Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)
 VMT<sub>AFRC</sub>: Reserve Personnel Vehicle Miles Travel (miles)

#### - Vehicle Emissions per Year

 $V_{POL} = (VMT_{Total} * 0.002205 * EF_{POL} * VM) / 2000$ 

 $\begin{array}{l} V_{POL}: \ Vehicle \ Emissions \ (TONs) \\ VMT_{Total}: \ Total \ Vehicle \ Miles \ Travel \ (miles) \\ 0.002205: \ Conversion \ Factor \ grams \ to \ pounds \\ EF_{POL}: \ Emission \ Factor \ for \ Pollutant \ (grams/mile) \\ VM: \ Personnel \ On \ Road \ Vehicle \ Mixture \ (\%) \\ 2000: \ Conversion \ Factor \ pounds \ to \ tons \end{array}$ 

1 Appendix D:

# 2 EJ Screen Community Report

1

This Page Was Intentionally Left Blank.

# Sepa EJScreen Community Report

This report provides environmental and socioeconomic information for user-defined areas, and combines that data into environmental justice and supplemental indexes.

# **Cobb County, GA**

1 mile Ring Centered at 33.922981,-84.514283 Population: 6,864 Area in square miles: 3.14



#### LANGUAGES SPOKEN AT HOME

LANGUAGE	PERCENT
English	61%
Spanish	30%
French, Haitian, or Cajun	1%
Other Indo-European	5%

# COMMUNITY INFORMATION



Arabic	1%
Other and Unspecified	1%
Total Non-English	39%

From Ages 1 to 4	6%
From Ages 1 to 18	17%
From Ages 18 and up	83%
From Ages 65 and up	6%

#### LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING BREAKDOWN



Notes: Numbers may not sum to totals due to rounding. Hispanic population can be of any race. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS) 2017 -2021. Life expectancy data comes from the Centers for Disease Control.

# **Environmental Justice & Supplemental Indexes**

The environmental justice and supplemental indexes are a combination of environmental and socioeconomic information. There are thirteen EJ indexes and supplemental indexes in EJScreen reflecting the 13 environmental indicators. The indexes for a selected area are compared to those for all other locations in the state or nation. For more information and calculation details on the EJ and supplemental indexes, please visit the <u>EJScreen website</u>.

#### **EJ INDEXES**

The EJ indexes help users screen for potential EJ concerns. To do this, the EJ index combines data on low income and people of color populations with a single environmental indicator.



#### EJ INDEXES FOR THE SELECTED LOCATION

 $\equiv$ 

# SUPPLEMENTAL INDEXES

The supplemental indexes offer a different perspective on community-level vulnerability. They combine data on percent low-income, percent linguistically isolated, percent less than high school education, percent unemployed, and low life expectancy with a single environmental indicator.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL INDEXES FOR THE SELECTED LOCATION



These percentiles provide perspective on how the selected block group or buffer area compares to the entire state or nation.

Report for 1 mile Ring Centered at 33.922981,-84.514283

# **EJScreen Environmental and Socioeconomic Indicators Data**

SELECTED VARIABLES	VALUE	STATE AVERAGE	PERCENTILE IN STATE	USA AVERAGE	PERCENTILE IN USA
POLLUTION AND SOURCES					
Particulate Matter (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	10.4	9.61	90	8.08	96
Ozone (ppb)	67.9	64	77	61.6	88
Diesel Particulate Matter (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	0.614	0.277	96	0.261	95
Air Toxics Cancer Risk* (lifetime risk per million)	40	35	50	25	94
Air Toxics Respiratory HI*	0.58	0.44	59	0.31	92
Toxic Releases to Air	570	1,600	52	4,600	49
Traffic Proximity (daily traffic count/distance to road)	160	110	83	210	68
Lead Paint (% Pre-1960 Housing)	0.045	0.14	44	0.3	25
Superfund Proximity (site count/km distance)	0.049	0.066	72	0.13	43
RMP Facility Proximity (facility count/km distance)	0.4	0.38	75	0.43	72
Hazardous Waste Proximity (facility count/km distance)	0.46	0.45	74	1.9	48
Underground Storage Tanks (count/km <sup>2</sup> )	5.3	2.3	86	3.9	78
Wastewater Discharge (toxicity-weighted concentration/m distance)	0.098	0.18	92	22	82
SOCIOECONOMIC INDICATORS	-				
Demographic Index	58%	41%	74	35%	81
Supplemental Demographic Index	24%	15%	86	14%	87
People of Color	61%	48%	63	39%	73
Low Income	54%	34%	79	31%	84
Unemployment Rate	7%	6%	70	6%	70
Limited English Speaking Households	13%	3%	94	5%	89
Less Than High School Education	15%	12%	68	12%	73
Under Age 5	6%	6%	57	6%	58
Over Age 64	6%	15%	16	17%	11
Low Life Expectancy	12%	21%	0	20%	2

\*Diesel particulate matter, air toxics cancer risk, and air toxics respiratory hazard index are from the EPA's Air Toxics Data Update, which is the Agency's ongoing, comprehensive evaluation of air toxics in the United States. This effort aims to prioritize air toxics, emission sources, and locations of interest for further study. It is important to remember that the air toxics data presented here provide broad estimates of health risks over geographic areas of the country, not definitive risks to specific individuals or locations. Cancer risks and hazard indices from the A'ir Toxics Data Update are reported to one significant figure and any additional significant figures here are due to rounding. More information on the Air Toxics Data Update can be found at: https://www.epa.gov/haps/air-toxics-data-update.

#### Sites reporting to EPA within defined area:

#### Other community features within defined area:

Superfund	0
Hazardous Waste, Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities	0

Schools	0
Hospitals	0

Water Dischargers 11
Air Pollution
Brownfields 0
Toxic Release Inventory 1

Places of worship I
---------------------

#### Other environmental data:

Air Non-attainment	Yes
Impaired Waters	Yes

Selected location contains American Indian Reservation Lands*	No
Selected location contains a "Justice40 (CEJST)" disadvantaged community	Yes
Selected location contains an EPA IRA disadvantaged community	Yes

Report for 1 mile Ring Centered at 33.922981,-84.514283
## **EJScreen Environmental and Socioeconomic Indicators Data**

HEALTH INDICATORS								
INDICATOR	VALUE	STATE AVERAGE	STATE PERCENTILE	US AVERAGE	US PERCENTILE			
Low Life Expectancy	12%	21%	0	20%	2			
Heart Disease	3.9	6.1	12	6.1	10			
Asthma	10.3	10	63	10	64			
Cancer	3.2	5.5	4	6.1	3			
Persons with Disabilities	7.5%	13.1%	19	13.4%	15			

CLIMATE INDICATORS									
INDICATOR	VALUE	STATE AVERAGE	STATE PERCENTILE	US AVERAGE	US PERCENTILE				
Flood Risk	10%	9%	78	12%	68				
Wildfire Risk	0%	4%	0	14%	0				

CRITICAL SERVICE GAPS									
INDICATOR	VALUE	STATE AVERAGE	STATE PERCENTILE	US AVERAGE	US PERCENTILE				
Broadband Internet	13%	15%	53	14%	55				
Lack of Health Insurance	31%	13%	97	9%	98				
Housing Burden	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
Transportation Access	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
Food Desert	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				

Report for 1 mile Ring Centered at 33.922981,-84.514283

www.epa.gov/ejscreen