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Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)
Mike O’Callaghan Federal Medical Center Campus at
Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada

Introduction

Nellis Air Force Base (AFB) prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) to identify and evaluate potential environmental effects from construction and operation of improvements at the Mike O’Callaghan Federal Medical Center (MOFMC) campus. The EA was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (PL 91-190; 42 USC 4321-4347), as amended; Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations for Implementing the Provisions of NEPA (CEQ Regulations, 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500-1508); and Air Force Instruction 32-7061 as promulgated in 32 CFR 989.

Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives

The United States Air Force (USAF) proposes to construct improvements at the MOFMC campus to meet the growing mission requirements of the USAF and Air Combat Command (ACC). The improvements would include renovation of all three floors of the MOFMC building to make use of space vacated by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to allow reorganization and access between departments while providing additional space for care operations. A new separate Medical Education & Training Facility would be constructed adjacent to the MOFMC to replace the existing temporary structure and accommodate existing plus expanded medical training operations that cannot be accommodated within the MOFMC building. An addition to an existing warehouse facility would provide needed space for consolidation of Medical Logistics functions not requiring patient contact outside of the MOFMC. A Fisher House would be constructed by the Fisher House Foundation near the front entrance to the MOFMC building to provide temporary accommodations for patients and their families while receiving medical treatment. Lastly, a sidewalk, turnstile gate, and crosswalk would be constructed to provide pedestrian access between the MOFMC and the area south of North Las Vegas Boulevard for main base access. All of the proposed facilities would be constructed within developed areas. The Proposed Action includes demolition of the existing Medical Education & Training Facility and antenna shack.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action were considered. Alternatives to the MOFMC renovation included replacement or expansion of the existing MOFMC, however, cost analyses indicate that return on investment would be substantially diminished and the alternatives were dismissed from further consideration. Replacement of the Medical Education & Training Facility in its current location was considered but was removed from further consideration because it would leave the education and training operations without facilities for the length of the construction. Construction of a separate medical center administration space was also considered but dismissed because the delay in planning and budgeting would not meet the immediate needs of the growing staff. Alternative locations for the Fisher House were considered, but none provided better ease of access to the medical center.

The USAF also analyzed the No Action Alternative which would result in the construction of no new facilities at the MOFMC campus. The No Action Alternative would not meet the purpose and need of the proposed project. Baseline conditions as reflected by the No Action Alternative provide a comparison for the environmental impacts of the Proposed Action.

Summary of Environmental Consequences

The EA provides an analysis of the potential environmental consequences resulting from implementation of the Proposed Action, including the No Action Alternative. According to the analysis in the EA, implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to any resource category. The potential impacts under the Proposed Action and No Action Alternative are summarized below.
Land Use. The Proposed Action calls for renovation of an existing facility, construction of new facilities, and the demolition of older facilities. The Proposed Action would result in a temporary change in land use during construction and demolition. However, no substantially new land uses would be introduced by the Proposed Action. Construction of the Proposed Action would not result in new structures of greater height than existing structures and would not interfere with aviation operations. Coordination with the 57th Wing, 53 Wing and 563rd Rescue Group would be necessary to ensure construction does not impede emergency landings at the MOFMC or aviation operations in Area I. The No Action Alternative would not result in changes to current land use.

Utilities. The Proposed Action would result in a slight increase in electrical use as a result of the additional facility space; however, new facility construction would employ energy conserving equipment to the maximum extent possible. System capacity would be adequate to meet this demand. Potable water demand and sanitary sewer discharge would increase slightly with the planned increase in staff. However, any increase in water demand or sanitary sewer discharge would not exceed the capacity of the existing systems. The No Action Alternative would not result in any change in utility usage.

Transportation. The Proposed Action would not result in direct impacts or changes to the existing roadways or vehicle access within or around the project area. The proposed Fisher House location would eliminate a portion of the unusable drive-up circle directly in front of the MOFMC building, but would not alter the existing condition. The new turnstile and crosswalk would improve pedestrian access to the MOFMC and potentially reduce traffic and parking. Increases in traffic could result during construction, but would be temporary and localized. The No Action Alternative would not result in changes to existing roadways or pedestrian access.

Socioeconomics. The Proposed Action would result in a short-term, positive input to the local economy during the construction period. Operation of the new facilities would draw from existing USAF staffing and would not create new jobs beyond those already expected. Therefore, no substantial beneficial or adverse impacts would be expected if the Proposed Action were implemented. The No Action Alternative would not result in any change to the socioeconomic condition.

Environmental Justice and Protection of Children. There are no residences within the project area so there is no potential for adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations as a result of the Proposed Action. There would not be an increased risk to the health or safety of children. The No Action Alternative would not result in adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations or the health and safety of children.

Cultural Resources. There are no eligible properties within the area of the medical center complex. The medical center was constructed in 1994 and thus excluded from an architectural historical or Cold War survey. The Proposed Action would not result in impacts to cultural resources. The No Action Alternative would not result in any impacts to cultural resources.

Biological Resources. The Proposed Action would take place in a completely developed environment and would not result in adverse impacts to native vegetation or wildlife. The developed nature of the project site provides no habitat for threatened, endangered, or sensitive species that occur elsewhere on Nellis AFB. The No Action Alternative would not result in any impacts to biological resources or rare species.

Soils and Water Resources. The Proposed Action would not increase surface runoff. Some soil erosion could occur during construction, but no long-term adverse impacts to soils or surface water would occur. Standard best management practices (e.g., watering, erosion control, and sediment retention measures and silt fencing) would be employed to reduce the chance of sediment transport. The project area is not located within a floodplain and contains no wetland habitat. Therefore, no impacts would occur to water resources if the Proposed Action were implemented. The No Action Alternative would not result in any impacts to soil or water resources.
Air Quality. No impacts to regional air quality would result if the Proposed Action were implemented. Impacts to air quality associated with construction activities would be short-term and insufficient in scope to require a general conformity determination. During construction, fugitive dust would be minimized through implementation of dust control measures (i.e., water application on soil). The No Action Alternative would not result in any impacts to air quality.

Hazardous Materials and Waste Management. The Proposed Action would result in no changes to the generation, collection, or disposal of hazardous materials, medical wastes, or other waste streams. No Environmental Restoration Program sites would be disturbed as none are found in the project area. Construction and demolition debris would be created during construction and would be disposed of in a regulated disposal facility. The No Action Alternative would result in no changes to waste handling and would not generate construction or demolition wastes.

Visual Resources. The Proposed Action would be constructed within a developed area and be consistent with the existing visual landscapes. The No Action Alternative would result in no change from the existing visual resources.

Noise. The Proposed Action would not alter the existing noise levels within the project area. Newly constructed facilities would include noise attenuation in accordance with existing Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) requirements. Noise levels would be temporarily elevated during construction from operation of construction equipment but would be localized. The No Action Alternative would not alter the existing noise levels within the project area or the noise levels generated by aviation activities on Nellis AFB.

Conclusion

Based on the analysis of the Proposed Action, alternatives and No Action Alternative, and conclusions presented in the EA conducted in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, the Council on Environmental Quality regulations, and Air Force Environmental Impact Analysis Process, as promulgated in Title 32 of the Code of Federal Regulations Part 989, and after careful review of the potential impacts, I conclude that implementation of the Proposed Action would result in no significant impacts on the quality of the human or natural environments. Therefore, a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) is warranted, and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required.

STEVEN D GARLAND
Brig Gen (Sel), USAF
Commander

22 MAR 2012
Date
**Responsible Agency:** United States Air Force (USAF), Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada

**Proposed Action:** The USAF proposes improvements at the Mike O’Callaghan Federal Medical Center (MOFMC) campus at Nellis Air Force Base to include repairs and renovations to the interior of the existing medical center building, construction of new facilities, and demolition of outdated facilities.

Written comments and inquiries regarding this document should be directed to:

99 ABW/PA  
4430 Grissom Ave, Suite 107  
Nellis AFB NV 89191  
ATTN: Major Mae-Li Allison

In addition, the document can be viewed on and downloaded from the World Wide Web at [www.nellis.af.mil/library/environment.asp](http://www.nellis.af.mil/library/environment.asp)

**Designation:** Final Environmental Assessment (EA)

**Abstract:** The USAF proposes to construct improvements at the MOFMC campus to meet the growing mission requirements of the USAF Air Combat Command (ACC). The improvements include renovation of all three floors of the MOFMC building to make use of space vacated by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) and to allow reorganization to allow logical arrangement of and access between departments. A new and separate Medical Education & Training Facility would be constructed adjacent to the MOFMC to replace the existing temporary structure and to accommodate existing and expanded medical training operations that cannot be accommodated within the MOFMC building. An addition to an existing warehouse facility would provide additional space to consolidate Medical Logistics functions not requiring patient contact less expensively than within the MOFMC. A Fisher House would be constructed by the Fisher House Foundation near the front entrance to the MOFMC building to provide temporary accommodations for patients and their families while receiving medical treatment. Lastly, a sidewalk, turnstile gate, and crosswalk would be constructed to provide pedestrian access between the MOFMC and the area south of North Las Vegas Boulevard. All of the proposed facilities would be constructed within developed areas of the MOFMC campus. The Proposed Action includes demolition of the Medical Education & Training Facility and antenna shack.

This EA analyzes the potential environmental consequences of the Proposed Action and includes analysis of the No Action Alternative. The Proposed Action would result in no significant impacts on the quality of the human or natural environments. No new facilities would be constructed at the MOFMC campus under the No Action Alternative.
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Final Environmental Assessment
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Executive Summary

Introduction
This Environmental Assessment (EA) analyzes the potential environmental consequences resulting from the United States Air Force (USAF) proposal to construct improvements to the Mike O’Callaghan Federal Medical Center (MOFMC) campus Nellis Air Force Base (AFB). This EA examines the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative, and the impacts each could have on the natural, social, and economic environments.

Purpose and Need for Action
Because the Medical infrastructure and facilities at Nellis AFB cannot meet the growing mission requirements of the USAF Air Combat Command (ACC), there is a need to provide additional space for the 99th Medical Group (MDG) to accommodate mission growth, provide sufficient space for existing departments, and meet current medical standards of care. Renovation of the existing medical center would allow reorganization to allow logical arrangement of and access between departments within the medical center. Construction of additional training and administrative space would consolidate training and administrative functions in more efficient and cost-effective space.

Proposed Action
The Proposed Action would consist of five primary project elements; 1) renovation of the MOFMC, 2) construction of a new Medical Education & Training Facility, 3) expansion of existing a warehouse structure, 4) construction of a Fisher House, and 5) installation of a pedestrian turnstile and crosswalk. All three floors of the MOFMC building would be renovated to make use of space vacated by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) and to allow reorganization to allow logical arrangement of and access between departments. A new Medical Education & Training Facility would be constructed to provide a permanent and efficient training location for that portion of the Education and Training department that cannot be accommodated within the MOFMC building. Expansion of an existing warehouse facility would allow consolidation of Medical Logistics functions on the MOFMC campus, creating room for internal expansion and realignment within the main medical center structure. A Fisher House would be constructed by the Fisher House Foundation to provide temporary accommodations for patients and their families while receiving medical treatment. Lastly, a sidewalk, turnstile gate, and crosswalk would be constructed to provide pedestrian access between the MOFMC and the area south of North Las Vegas Boulevard.

Alternatives Considered
Alternatives to the Proposed Action included consideration of replacing or expanding the existing MOFMC to accommodate both the improvements to current medical standards of care and the additional space necessary to accommodate mission growth. Replacement of the MOFMC at this time would result in substantial loss of investment in the existing facility and meeting the immediate and planned spatial needs through construction of a medical center addition is not financially viable due to the relatively small area of additional space required at this time.

Construction of a new Medical Education & Training Facility at the existing site would leave those operations without facilities for the length of the construction and would interrupt accomplishment of the training mission. Construction of a separate facility dedicated to Medical Center Administration would require five to ten years of planning and budgeting to accomplish and would not meet the immediate needs to accommodate growing staff.

Several alternative sites for the Fisher House construction were evaluated, but dismissed from further consideration in preference to the site near the front of the medical center.

Mitigation Measures
In accordance with 32 CFR 989.22, the USAF must indicate if any mitigation measures would be needed to implement the Proposed Action. However, no mitigation measures beyond compliance with permit conditions and implementation of best management practices during construction would be required.
Summary of Potential Environmental Consequences
This EA provides an analysis of the potential environmental consequences resulting from implementation of the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative. According to the analysis in this EA, implementation of the Proposed Action would result in no significant environmental impacts in any resource category. The following Table ES-1 summarizes and highlights the results of the analysis by resource category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Category</th>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>No Action Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>• No new land uses would be introduced.</td>
<td>• Current land uses would remain unchanged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No hazards to aviation operations would result, however, coordination with 57 OSS (TERPS) and Airfield Management required to avoid intrusions into protected airport airspace during construction and coordination with the 57th Wing Airspace and 563rd Rescue Group required to ensure compatibility with emergency landings at Medical center or helicopter operations in Area I.</td>
<td>• No construction and no potential adverse impacts to aviation safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>• Minor increases in electrical and natural gas resulting from increase in facility space would be offset by energy efficiency of new facilities.</td>
<td>• Electric and natural gas usage would remain unchanged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minor increases in potable water demand and sanitary sewer discharge would result from increased staffing.</td>
<td>• Minor increases in potable water demand and sanitary sewer discharge would result from increased staffing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>• Current roadway conditions would remain unchanged with potential temporary increases in traffic during construction/demolition.</td>
<td>• Current roadway conditions and pedestrian access would remain unchanged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pedestrian access from the airmen dormitories to the MOFMC would be improved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>• Construction activity would provide short term socioeconomic benefit, but no long term increase in employment beyond that already planned.</td>
<td>• No changes to existing socioeconomic resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice and Protection of Children</td>
<td>• There are no residences and therefore no adverse impacts to low income or minority populations in the project area.</td>
<td>• There are no residences and therefore no adverse impacts to low income or minority populations in the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No increase in risk to the health or safety of children.</td>
<td>• No increase in risk to the health or safety of children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>• There are no eligible properties within the project area.</td>
<td>• No change to the existing conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>• No adverse impacts to native vegetation, wildlife, or special-status species.</td>
<td>• No change to existing biological resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Soil Resources</td>
<td>• No impact to wetlands or waters of the U.S.</td>
<td>• No change to existing conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No impact to floodplains.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Temporary increase in potential for water and wind erosion during construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impacts would be minimized by use of best management practices required by the base and permits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Category</td>
<td>Proposed Action</td>
<td>No Action Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong></td>
<td>• Construction impacts would be temporary and insufficient to require a general</td>
<td>• No change to current air quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conformity determination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No impacts to regional air quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazardous Materials and Waste</strong></td>
<td>• No changes to the generation, collection, or disposal of hazardous materials,</td>
<td>• No changes to the generation, collection, or disposal of hazardous materials, medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medical wastes, or other waste streams.</td>
<td>wastes, or other waste streams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No ERP sites would be disturbed.</td>
<td>• No generation of construction waste or demolition debris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Temporary generation of construction and demolition wastes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Resources</strong></td>
<td>• No change to visual resources.</td>
<td>• No change to existing visual resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise</strong></td>
<td>• Construction impacts would be temporary and localized to the project site.</td>
<td>• No changes to existing noise conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Newly constructed facilities would include noise attenuation in accordance with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>existing Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table of Contents

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)  
Cover Page  
Executive Summary  
Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Purpose of and Need for Action</td>
<td>1-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>1-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Purpose of the Proposed Action</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>Mike O’Callaghan Federal Medical Center</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>Medical Education &amp; Training Facility</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3</td>
<td>Medical Center Administration Space</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.4</td>
<td>Fisher House</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.5</td>
<td>Turnstile Gate and Crosswalk</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Need for the Proposed Action</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Proposed Action and Project Alternatives</td>
<td>2-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Proposed Action</td>
<td>2-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>Construct New Medical Education &amp; Training Facility near Bldg 1300</td>
<td>2-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>Construct Warehouse Addition</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>Construct Fisher House on MOFMC Campus</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5</td>
<td>Construct Turnstile Gate and Crosswalk</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Alternatives Considered but not Carried Forward</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>Replace Mike O’Callaghan Federal Medical Center</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>Expand Existing Mike O’Callaghan Federal Medical Center</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>Medical Education &amp; Training Facility on Current Site</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4</td>
<td>Separate Medical Center Administration Space</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.5</td>
<td>Fisher House Alternative Sites</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.5.1</td>
<td>Northwest of Medical Center</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.5.2</td>
<td>North/Northeast of Medical Center</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.5.3</td>
<td>East of Medical Center</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.5.4</td>
<td>Southeast of Medical Center</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.5.5</td>
<td>Southwest of Medical Center</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>No Action Alternative</td>
<td>2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Regulatory Compliance and Permit Requirements</td>
<td>2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Affected Environment</td>
<td>3-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Affected Environment</td>
<td>3-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>3-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>3-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>3-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>3-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Environmental Justice and Protection of Children</td>
<td>3-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table of Contents (Continued)

3.7 Cultural Resources........................................................................................................ 3-2
3.8 Biological Resources..................................................................................................... 3-2
  3.8.1 Vegetation ........................................................................................................ 3-3
  3.8.2 Wildlife ............................................................................................................. 3-3
  3.8.3 Rare Species ..................................................................................................... 3-3
3.9 Water and Soil Resources ............................................................................................. 3-3
  3.9.1 Floodplains ..................................................................................................... 3-3
  3.9.2 Wetlands .......................................................................................................... 3-4
  3.9.3 Soils .................................................................................................................. 3-4
3.10 Air Quality .................................................................................................................. 3-4
3.11 Hazardous Materials and Waste .................................................................................. 3-5
3.12 Visual Resources ........................................................................................................ 3-5
3.13 Noise .......................................................................................................................... 3-5
4.0 Environmental Consequences ......................................................................................... 4-1
  4.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................ 4-1
    4.1.1 Analysis Approach ........................................................................................ 4-1
  4.2 Land Use .................................................................................................................... 4-1
    4.2.1 Proposed Action ............................................................................................ 4-1
    4.2.2 No Action Alternative ................................................................................. 4-2
  4.3 Utilities ....................................................................................................................... 4-2
    4.3.1 Proposed Action ............................................................................................ 4-2
    4.3.2 No Action Alternative ................................................................................. 4-2
  4.4 Transportation ............................................................................................................ 4-2
    4.4.1 Proposed Action ............................................................................................ 4-2
    4.4.2 No Action Alternative ................................................................................. 4-2
  4.5 Socioeconomic Impacts .............................................................................................. 4-3
    4.5.1 Proposed Action ............................................................................................ 4-3
    4.5.2 No Action Alternative ................................................................................. 4-3
  4.6 Environmental Justice and Protection of Children ....................................................... 4-3
    4.6.1 Proposed Action ............................................................................................ 4-3
    4.6.2 No Action Alternative ................................................................................. 4-3
  4.7 Cultural Resources ........................................................................................................ 4-3
    4.7.1 Proposed Action ............................................................................................ 4-3
    4.7.2 No Action Alternative ................................................................................. 4-3
  4.8 Biological Resources ................................................................................................... 4-3
    4.8.1 Vegetation ........................................................................................................ 4-4
      4.8.1.1 Proposed Action ................................................................................. 4-4
      4.8.1.2 No Action Alternative ....................................................................... 4-4
    4.8.2 Wildlife ............................................................................................................ 4-4
      4.8.2.1 Proposed Action ................................................................................. 4-4
      4.8.2.2 No Action Alternative ....................................................................... 4-4
### Table of Contents (Continued)

- **4.8.3** Rare Species ................................................................. 4-4
  - **4.8.3.1** Proposed Action ........................................................... 4-4
  - **4.8.3.2** No Action Alternative .................................................. 4-4
- **4.9** Water and Soil Resources .................................................. 4-4
  - **4.9.1** Water Quality ................................................................. 4-4
    - **4.9.1.1** Proposed Action .......................................................... 4-4
    - **4.9.1.2** No Action Alternative ................................................. 4-5
  - **4.9.2** Floodplains ...................................................................... 4-5
    - **4.9.2.1** Proposed Action .......................................................... 4-5
    - **4.9.2.2** No Action Alternative ................................................. 4-5
  - **4.9.3** Wetlands .......................................................................... 4-5
    - **4.9.3.1** Proposed Action .......................................................... 4-5
    - **4.9.3.2** No Action Alternative ................................................. 4-5
  - **4.9.4** Soils ............................................................................... 4-5
    - **4.9.4.1** Proposed Action .......................................................... 4-5
    - **4.9.4.2** No Action Alternative ................................................. 4-5
- **4.10** Air Quality ....................................................................... 4-5
  - **4.10.1** Proposed Action ............................................................ 4-6
  - **4.10.2** No Action Alternative .................................................... 4-6
- **4.11** Hazardous Materials and Waste ....................................... 4-6
  - **4.11.1** Proposed Action ............................................................ 4-6
  - **4.11.2** No Action Alternative .................................................... 4-6
- **4.12** Visual Resources ............................................................... 4-7
  - **4.12.1** Proposed Action ............................................................ 4-7
  - **4.12.2** No Action Alternative .................................................... 4-7
- **4.13** Noise ............................................................................... 4-7
  - **4.13.1** Proposed Action ............................................................ 4-7
  - **4.13.2** No Action Alternative .................................................... 4-7
- **5.0** Cumulative Effects and Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources ........................................................................ 5-1
  - **5.1** Cumulative Effects ............................................................. 5-1
  - **5.2** Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources ........ 5-1
- **6.0** Interagency, Intergovernmental, and Public Coordination .............. 6-1
- **7.0** Distribution List ................................................................... 7-1
- **8.0** List of Preparers and Contributors ......................................... 8-1
  - **8.1** Preparers ............................................................................ 8-1
  - **8.2** Contributors ....................................................................... 8-1
- **9.0** References Cited .................................................................. 9-1
### Table of Contents (Continued)

#### List of Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 2-1</td>
<td>Other Major Federal Environmental Statutes, Regulations, and Executive Orders Applicable to Federal Projects</td>
<td>2-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2-2</td>
<td>Summary of Review and Permit Requirements</td>
<td>2-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4-1</td>
<td>Summary of Construction and Demolition Area for the Proposed Action</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### List of Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1-1</td>
<td>Nellis AFB Location Map</td>
<td>1-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1-2</td>
<td>Mike O'Callaghan Federal Medical Center Location Map</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2-1</td>
<td>Project Elements of the Proposed Action</td>
<td>2-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2-2</td>
<td>New Pedestrian Access</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2-3</td>
<td>Alternative Locations Considered for the Fisher House</td>
<td>2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3-1</td>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>3-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### List of Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A</td>
<td>Proposed MOFMC Renovation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B</td>
<td>SHPO Concurrence Letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABW</td>
<td>Air Base Wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Air Combat Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB</td>
<td>Air Force Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFI</td>
<td>Air Force Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AICUZ</td>
<td>Air Installation Compatible Use Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ</td>
<td>Council on Environmental Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERCLA</td>
<td>Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>Clean Water Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAQEM</td>
<td>Clark County Department of Air Quality &amp; Environmental Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoD</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Environmental Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIAP</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Analysis Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMT</td>
<td>Emergency Medical Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERP</td>
<td>Environmental Restoration Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td>Federal Aviation Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FONSI</td>
<td>Finding of No Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gpd</td>
<td>gallons per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>Intensive Care Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IICEP</td>
<td>Interagency/Intergovernmental Coordination for Environmental Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INRMP</td>
<td>Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Medical Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOFMC</td>
<td>Mike O’Callaghan Federal Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTF</td>
<td>Medical training facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDOT</td>
<td>Nevada Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDOW</td>
<td>Nevada Department of Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTTR</td>
<td>Nevada Test and Training Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRA</td>
<td>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SABC</td>
<td>Self Aid Buddy Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>United States Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF</td>
<td>United States Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAFWC</td>
<td>United States Air Force Weapons Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>United States Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEPA</td>
<td>United States Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Department of Veterans Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 Purpose of and Need for Action

1.1 Introduction

Nellis Air Force Base (AFB) has prepared this Environmental Assessment (EA) to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (PL 91-190; 42 USC 4321-4347), as amended. Preparation of this EA followed regulations and instructions established in 32 CFR Part 989, Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) for the USAF, and 40 CFR 1500 – 1508, Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). This EA evaluates the potential environmental impacts of activities associated with the proposed master-planned projects at the Mike O’Callaghan Federal Medical Center (MOFMC) Campus on Nellis AFB.

1.2 Background

Nellis AFB, Air Combat Command (ACC), United States Air Force (USAF), is located approximately eight (8) miles northeast of Las Vegas, Nevada. The base itself covers more than 14,000 acres, while the total land area occupied by Nellis AFB and its restricted ranges is about 5,000 square miles. An additional 7,700 square miles of airspace north and east of the restricted ranges are also available for military flight operations.

Figure 1-1 – Nellis AFB Location Map

Nellis AFB, named in honor of Lieutenant William Harrell Nellis, began as the Las Vegas Army Air Field in late 1941 and was closed in January 1947 following the end of the World War II. It was reopened in 1949 as Las Vegas Air Force Base for advanced pilot training. Today, as part of the United States Air Force Warfare Center
(USAFWC), units at Nellis AFB continue to provide training for composite strike forces that include every type of aircraft in the USAF inventory, along with air and ground units of the Army, Navy, Marines and air units from allied nations. The 57th Wing is the operational element of the center. Other USAFWC units at Nellis AFB are the 99th Air Base Wing (ABW) and the Nevada Test and Training Range (NTTR), along with the 53rd Test & Evaluation Group (53rd Wing, Eglin AFB, FL) and 505th Operations Group (505th Command & Control Wing, Hurlburt Field, FL).

The 99th Medical Group (MDG), one of three groups under the 99th ABW, provides a growing range of medical services to Nellis AFB and the retiree population at the MOFMC. The MOFMC is a 94-bed medical treatment facility opened in 1994 and operated jointly with the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA).

![Mike O'Callaghan Federal Medical Center Location Map](image)

**Figure 1-2 – Mike O'Callaghan Federal Medical Center Location Map**

The mission of the MOFMC is to provide world-class prevention-focused, quality healthcare that delivers maximum readiness. The 99th MDG is comprised of approximately 1,400 members dedicated to providing preventive, emergency and acute care services for approximately 22,000 active duty members and their dependants. Health care services are also provided directly or coordinated for almost 50,000 retirees, their dependents or other eligible beneficiaries on a space-available basis.

The USAF provides executive oversight of the facility, staffs all outpatient activities, and manages 38 of the beds for Department of Defense (DoD) beneficiaries. The VA manages 48 beds and provides care for VA inpatients admitted from the medical center emergency room and the VA Ambulatory Care Center in Las Vegas, Nevada.
The USAF and the VA jointly manage 8 beds in the Intensive Care Unit (ICU). The VA is planning to open a new hospital off Nellis AFB in FY12. Subsequent relocation of VA services and staff from the MOFMC to their new facility will open up much needed area for internal expansion and realignment of services for the 99th MDG. The MOFMC will continue to partner with the VA even after the opening of the new VA hospital to offer world class medical care.

1.3 Purpose of the Proposed Action

Because the Medical infrastructure and facilities at Nellis AFB are not currently meeting the mission requirements, there is a need to address the following five areas of deficiency in order to bring these medical facilities up to expected standards.

1.3.1 Mike O’Callaghan Federal Medical Center

The purpose of the Proposed Action in this deficiency area is to address the requirement for extensive renovation to modernize the existing building to accommodate mission growth, provide sufficient space for existing departments, and meet current medical standards of care. The 374,528 square-foot MOFMC is currently undersized for its authorized manpower and mission. Departments operate out of spaces of opportunity not originally designed for their specific function resulting in inefficiencies to the medical training facility (MTF) operational functions.

As the 99th MDG transitions to a major Air Force Medical Service medical center, it is receiving additional manning starting in FY 11 to support expanded as well as new service lines. The expected 180+ additional staff are currently arriving and are compounding the existing space problems in the constrained facility.

1.3.2 Medical Education & Training Facility

The purpose of the Proposed Action in this deficiency area is to construct a new Medical Education & Training Facility which would provide a permanent and efficient training location for that portion of the Education and Training department not accommodated within the MOFMC building. The Education and Training flight provides all life support, emergency medical technician (EMT), and self aid buddy care (SABC) instructor training to the medical group and to the three wings and tenant units at Nellis AFB. The flight tracks all training accomplished by the medical group to include medical center orientation/suicide prevention/operation security (OPSEC)/annual training/nursing and non-nursing licenses.

The Education and Training flight currently operates out of a 20-year-old structure (Bldg. 1305) located north of the MOFMC building. The structure was originally brought to Nellis AFB in 1992 as a construction trailer for use during construction of the medical center building. These temporary facilities have been made more permanent with the addition of exterior concrete block veneer to improve appearance. The structure was not designed to accommodate the type and level of current use and had an expected operational lifespan of between five and seven years. The structure has failing infrastructure systems that are well beyond their designed life spans and are not energy efficient. The trailer is incompatible with providing high quality training and cannot meet the mission requirement to train the growing clinical staff.

1.3.3 Medical Center Administration Space

The purpose of the Proposed Action in this deficiency area is the expansion of an existing warehouse structure which would consolidate Medical Logistics functions on the MOFMC campus, creating room for internal expansion and realignment within the main medical center structure and supporting the proposed Repair/Renovation project. Although the VA’s departure from the MOFMC will free up space for internal expansion and realignment of services, the nearly 180+ additional staff and growth in medical center enrollment will continue to challenge the space allocation and use within the medical center building. Administrative personnel not having patient contact responsibilities utilize space that could be used more effectively for medical center or clinical functions. In fact, housing of administrative functions outside the medical center environment is
a more modern standard in medical center operations. Without adequate space within the medical center for these administrative functions, additional administrative space is necessary.

1.3.4 Fisher House

The purpose of the Proposed Action in this deficiency area is construction of a modern facility to provide living quarters for the families of long-term patients of the MOFMC. The Fisher House program donates facilities to the military and VA that provide a place where families can stay together, free of charge, while a loved one is receiving treatment. Additionally, the Foundation ensures that families of critically ill or injured service men and women are not burdened with unnecessary expense during a time of crisis. Since inception, the program has saved military and veteran families an estimated $165 million in out of pocket costs for lodging and transportation. Nellis AFB and the MOFMC wish to provide opportunity for construction of a similar facility to benefit the families of patients using the variety of services provided at the medical center.

1.3.5 Turnstile Gate and Crosswalk

The purpose of the Proposed Action in this deficiency area is construction of a turnstile gate and crosswalk to provide airmen easy and safe pedestrian access to the MOFMC campus from the Main Base (Area I) south of North Las Vegas Boulevard. A crosswalk exists across North Las Vegas Boulevard at the MOFMC medical center entrance, however, no gate in the perimeter fence allows easy access to the crosswalk and the MOFMC campus from the dormitories located immediately to the south.

1.4 Need for the Proposed Action

The MOFMC is inadequate to meet growing mission requirements for the 99th MDG. Existing facilities are outdated and undersized, no facilities exist to house families of the seriously ill and injured, and no safe and easy pedestrian access is available from the Main Base. The proposed action is required to correct these deficiencies.
2.0 Proposed Action and Project Alternatives

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (P.L. 91-190, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321 et. seq.), requires the evaluation of the Proposed Action, as well as identification and review of reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Action and a No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative means the proposed project would not take place and provides an environmental baseline against which impacts of the Proposed Action and alternatives can be compared. This chapter includes a detailed description of the Proposed Action, No Action Alternative, alternatives considered and measures included in the Proposed Action to avoid, minimize, and mitigate potential environmental impacts.

2.1 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action consists of several individual and interrelated elements on the existing MOFMC campus that are proposed to be constructed over the next three-year period. Construction of the Fisher House is currently unfunded, but would be expected to be constructed in the next several years.

![Figure 2-1 – Project Elements of the Proposed Action](image)

The existing MOFMC building would be renovated to accommodate mission growth, provide sufficient space for existing departments, and meet current medical standards of care.

The renovation would include reorganization and use of vacated VA spaces to allow reorganization and logical arrangement of and access between departments. The reconfiguration would generally consolidate Administrative
Departments to the basement, outpatient clinics and medical center diagnostics to the first floor, surgical services to the second floor, and inpatient services to the third floor. The third floor would also house a Women’s Health center including labor and delivery, post-partum, OB/GYN, and mammography.

The reconfiguration would provide for the following:

**Basement**
- Administration
- DFAC/Nutritional Medicine
- Logistics
- IM/IT

**1st Floor**
- Outpatient & Patient Administration/Admitting
- Primary/Preventative Care Specialties
- Diagnostics & Ancillary Care
- Emergency Department (with access to 2nd and 3rd Floors)

**2nd Floor**
- Surgery Center with Adjacent Surgery Clinics
- Dialysis/Respiratory Therapy
- Command- IM/IT
- Dental

**3rd Floor**
- Nursing Units (with access to 2nd Floor Surgery and 1st Floor ED)
- Comprehensive In-Patient OB Services (labor and delivery, Post Partum, and Women’s Health Center with OB/GYN and specialty Women’s Diagnostics)

**Appendix A** includes graphical depiction of the restructuring and the logical arrangement and access between departments to be gained.

Interim to the proposed renovation project, a modular facility would be constructed for use by the growing medical center staff during the repair and renovation of the MOFMC building. The temporary structure would remain operational until improved medical center facilities are complete and available for occupancy. The temporary facility would be constructed immediately east of the existing MOFMC. It is expected that Pediatric and Surgery clinics would occupy these facilities.

The temporary facility would be dismantled and removed after the staff using these facilities is relocated to the renovated MOFMC when the interim space is no longer required. The site footprint would be restored to its existing condition after removal of the structure.

**2.1.2 Construct New Medical Education & Training Facility near Bldg 1300**

A new Medical Education & Training Facility would be constructed to accommodate existing and expanded medical training operations. The new Medical Education & Training Facility would be constructed north of the existing MOFMC and would provide nearly 4,000 square feet (SF) of administration, training, and classroom space.
Bldg 1305, the existing Education & Training facility located northwest of the MOFMC building, would be demolished following completion of the medical center repair/renovation project. The building demolition, and demolition of the adjacent antenna shack, would provide a potential opportunity for construction of additional parking. The antenna shack consists of a small structure and antennae previously used by a private contractor that are no longer in use.

2.1.3 Construct Warehouse Addition

An addition would be made to the existing warehouse facility located north of the MOFMC building to consolidate Medical Logistics functions and allow additional space for internal expansion and realignment within the main medical center structure. The proposed addition would be constructed on the east end of the existing warehouse structure.

2.1.4 Construct Fisher House on MOFMC Campus

The Fisher House would be constructed near the front entrance to the MOFMC building. It would be designed and constructed by the Fisher House Foundation and would consist of between 8 and 21 suites, with private bedrooms and baths. Families would share a common kitchen, laundry facilities, spacious dining room and an inviting living room with a library and toys for children.

2.1.5 Construct Turnstile Gate and Crosswalk

Pedestrian access improvements would consist of construction of two new concrete sidewalk segments from the parking lot of Dorm 727 to the existing crosswalk at the traffic signal on North Las Vegas Boulevard. One sidewalk segment would extend from the dorm parking lot to the southern curb of Mountain Home Road, which runs parallel to and south of North Las Vegas Boulevard. The second sidewalk segment would extend from the northern curb of Mountain Home Road to the southern shoulder of North Las Vegas Boulevard at the location of the existing pedestrian crosswalk. A new pedestrian turnstile in the perimeter fence would provide access between the sidewalk segments. A new crosswalk and signage would be installed at the crossing of Mountain Home Road.
Figure 2-2 – New Pedestrian Access

2.2 Alternatives Considered but not Carried Forward

2.2.1 Replace Mike O’Callaghan Federal Medical Center

Construction of a new medical center facility would provide opportunity to design and construct a modern, state-of-the-art facility with adequate space to accommodate all of the existing medical center functions and services with capacity for future growth in staff and facility enrollees. This alternative would require five to ten years of planning and budgeting and would not meet the immediate needs of accommodating growing staff and new service lines. Further, the existing structure is 17 years old, approximately in the middle of its anticipated 40-year average life cycle. Cost analysis for this alternative indicates that return on investment would be substantially diminished. Thus, this alternative was removed from further consideration.

2.2.2 Expand Existing Mike O’Callaghan Federal Medical Center

The existing medical center building is structurally incapable of supporting vertical expansion. Horizontal expansion of the facility would be structurally feasible. However, the VA departure from select spaces within the existing medical center building provides the opportunity for repurposing the vacated space within the existing structure without physical expansion of the medical center. Those remaining functions that cannot be accommodated within the existing structure include Medical Education & Training and some medical center...
administration, both of which do not require patient contact and can be housed in separate and less expensive facilities. Cost analysis for this alternative indicates that return on investment would be substantially diminished. Thus, this alternative was removed from further consideration.

2.2.3 Medical Education & Training Facility on Current Site

Construction of a new Medical Education & Training Facility on the site of the existing temporary structure would leave the education and training operations without facilities for the length of the construction. This would interrupt accomplishment of training the growing clinical staff. Thus, this alternative was removed from further consideration.

2.2.4 Separate Medical Center Administration Space

Construction of a separate facility dedicated to Medical Center Administration would require five to ten years of planning and budgeting to accomplish. The delay would not meet the immediate needs to accommodate growing staff. Thus, this alternative was removed from further consideration.

2.2.5 Fisher House Alternative Sites

Several alternative sites for the Fisher House construction were evaluated, but dismissed from further consideration in preference to the site near the front of the medical center.

2.2.5.1 Northwest of Medical Center

Construction of the Fisher House on or near the site of the existing Medical Education & Training Facility that would be removed after construction of the new facility is problematic because the existing medical center loading dock creates difficult access to medical center services. The site is adjacent to warehouse and campus mechanical facilities incompatible with the residential use. This alternative was removed from further consideration because it would not provide safe and easy access to the medical center nor reduction in potential environmental impact or benefit over the preferred site.

2.2.5.2 North/Northeast of Medical Center

Construction of the Fisher House north or northeast of the medical center is also incompatible with adjacent industrial uses. It would be isolated from easy access to medical center services with the nearest access being through the Emergency Department. This location also blocks future, long-term horizontal expansion capabilities for the existing MOFMC. This alternative was removed from further consideration because it would not provide easy access to the medical center nor reduction in potential environmental impact or benefit over the preferred site.

2.2.5.3 East of Medical Center

Construction of the Fisher House east of the medical center would take up scarce parking area and would be incompatible with long-term plans for medical center expansion. This alternative was removed from further consideration because it would not provide reduction in potential environmental impact or benefit over the preferred site.

2.2.5.4 Southeast of Medical Center

Construction of the Fisher House southeast of the medical center would take up scarce parking area and could be incompatible with adjacent industrial uses to the east. This alternative was removed from further consideration because it would not provide reduction in potential environmental impact or benefit over the preferred site.

2.2.5.5 Southwest of Medical Center

Construction of the Fisher House southwest of the medical center would be compatible with adjacent land uses and provide access to the medical center entrance. However, this alternative is at greater distance from the medical center than the preferred location and would take up scarce parking area. This alternative was removed
from further consideration because it would not provide reduction in potential environmental impact or benefit over the preferred site.

Figure 2-3 – Alternative Locations Considered for the Fisher House

2.3 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would result in the construction of no new facilities at the MOFMC campus. The No Action Alternative would include routine maintenance of existing facilities in their current positions to accommodate continued operations at the medical center. This alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the proposed project. However, in accordance with NEPA requirements, the “No Action” Alternative is evaluated in the EA to serve as a baseline for comparison to the Proposed Action.

2.4 Regulatory Compliance and Permit Requirements

This EA is prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (Public Law [PL] 91-190, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321 et. seq.), the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500-1508, 1993), and Air Force Instruction (AFI) 32-7061, the Environmental Impact Analysis Process which is implemented by 32 C.F.R. Part 989. NEPA (PL 91-190, 1969) requires federal agencies to consider environmental consequences of all proposed actions in their decision-making process. The intent of the NEPA is to protect, restore, or enhance the environment through a well-informed decision-making process. The CEQ was established under NEPA to implement and oversee federal policy in this process. To this end, the CEQ issued the Regulations for
Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 CFR 1500-1508, 1993). Other federal statutes that may apply to the Proposed Action are listed in Table 2-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Resource</th>
<th>Statutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Clean Air Act (CAA) of 1970 (PL 95-95), as amended in 1977 and 1990 (PL 91-604); U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Subchapter C-Air Programs (40 CFR 52-99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Noise Control Act of 1972 (PL 92-574) and Amendments of 1978 (PL 95-609); USEPA, Subchapter G-Noise Abatement Programs (40 CFR 201-211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Federal Water Pollution Control Act (FWPCA) of 1972 (PL 92-500) and Amendments; Clean Water Act (CWA) of 1977 (PL 95-217); USEPA, Subchapter D-Water Programs (40 CFR 100-149); Water Quality Act of 1987 (PL 100-4); USEPA, Subchapter N-Effluent Guidelines and Standards (40 CFR 401-471); Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) of 1972 (PL 95-523) and Amendments of 1986 (PL 99-339); USEPA, National Drinking Water Regulations and Underground Injection Control Program (40 CFR 141-149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976 (PL 94-579); Military Lands Withdrawal Act (PL 99-606); Land Withdrawal Regulations (43 CFR 2300); Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1988 (PL 105-263)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 (16 United States Code [USC] 470 et seq.) (PL 89-665) and Amendments of 1980 (PL 96-515) and 1992 (PL 102-575); Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment-1971 (EO 11593); Indian Sacred Sites-1966 (EO 13007); American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) of 1978 (PL 95-341); Antiquities Act of 1906; Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979 (PL 96-95); Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) of 1990 (PL 101-601)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
<td>Federal Action to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (EO 12898); Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety risks (EO 13045)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following permits would be required should the Proposed Action be implemented.

**Demolition:** An Clark County Surface Disturbance Permit would be required from Clark County if the demolition activities cause 0.25 acre or more of topsoil disturbance. The Clark County Surface Disturbance Permit would be applied for by Nellis AFB prior to the demolition activities. In addition, a Demolition Form is to be completed.
and submitted before a building or structure is to be demolished. If the building or structure contains friable asbestos-containing materials, the NESHAP Notification of Asbestos Abatement Form (ASB01) must be completed and submitted to Clark County, Department of Air Quality & Environmental Management (DAQEM). This form would not be accepted for reporting the removal or encapsulation of friable asbestos-containing materials from buildings or structures scheduled for demolition. This form is to be received by the DAQEM no less than 10 working days before the demolition project is scheduled.

**Asbestos and Lead-Based Paint Removal and Disposal:** Prior to demolition or additions to buildings, asbestos surveys are required by AFI 32-1052 Facility Asbestos Management. For the removal of asbestos, a notification process with Clark County, the state health board, the USEPA, and the base asbestos and lead-based paint coordinator is required. Removal would be contracted out to state-certified and licensed contractors. Contractors would obtain the necessary permits for the removal, handling, and transportation of asbestos. Contractors must have access to a permitted landfill for disposal of asbestos.

**Stormwater:** Under the Proposed Action, the Nellis AFB Water Quality Program Manager would update applicable base permits and assist in obtaining all stormwater-related permits for new construction. Nellis AFB would need to reevaluate its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans to ensure compliance.

**Aviation Safety:** FAA Form 7460 must be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) through OE-AAA system prior to initiation of construction. Additionally, coordination with the 57th Wing Airspace and 563rd Rescue Group should be conducted to ensure construction does not impede ability for emergency landings at Medical Center or helicopter operations in Area I. Coordination with 57 OSS (TERPS) and Airfield Management should also be conducted to ensure no impacts to flying operations or intrusions into imaginary surfaces in accordance with UFC 3-260-01 para 1.2.2, 1.9, attachment 6 and CFAR Part 77.

**Nevada Department of Transportation.** The Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) would require an Encroachment Permit, a type of Occupancy Permit, for sidewalk construction within the right-of-way of North Las Vegas Boulevard. The Encroachment Permit would be applied for by Nellis AFB prior to construction of the proposed pedestrian improvements. The permit application would require a site plan depicting the proposed improvements and coordination with the NDOT District Traffic Engineer. Contact in advance of construction would also be required to activate the permit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2-2</th>
<th>Summary of Review and Permit Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Permit Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Dust Control Permit; Authority to Construct/Operating Permit (ATC/OP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Clark County Surface Disturbance Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm water</td>
<td>National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Discharge Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Safety</td>
<td>Review and compliance per UFC 3-260-01 para 1.2.2, 1.9, attachment 6 and CFAR Part 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Permanent Encroachment/Right-of-Way Permit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 Affected Environment

NEPA requires focused analysis of the areas and resources potentially affected by an action or alternative. This chapter provides a description of the existing environmental conditions of the project area and describes the existing baseline conditions of resources potentially affected or created by the Proposed Action.

3.1 Affected Environment

The Proposed Action affects the area within the MOFMC campus, an area essentially bounded by Hospital Drive and that area between Hospital Drive and Stafford Drive on the north side of the medical campus. The area encompasses 34.8 acres within Area III of Nellis AFB.

Figure 3-1 – Study Area
3.2 Land Use

The project area is fully developed as the MOFMC campus. The MOFMC building is located near the center of the medical campus and is surrounded by paved parking areas within the Hospital Drive loop. The medical center loading dock and access is located on the north side of the medical center building. A designated landing area for emergency helicopters is located outside the Emergency entrance of the MOFMC. This landing area is not yet in use, awaiting installation of proper lighting.

The area between Hospital Drive and Stafford Drive on the north side of the medical campus is also fully developed. The existing Medical Education & Training Facility and associated parking area is located north of the medical center building. The area immediately west of the Medical Education & Training Facility currently houses a small building and several satellite antennas. The existing mechanical building and warehouse structure is located to the east of the Medical Education & Training Facility. A small gravel pad immediately east of the warehouse (the site of the proposed warehouse expansion) remains vacant.

Immediately adjacent land use includes community service and private property to the west, outdoor recreation to the northwest, and industrial to the northeast. The Main Base (Area I) is located to the south, south of North Las Vegas Boulevard, including the airfield and most base functions.

3.3 Utilities

The majority of Nellis AFB water is purchased from Southern Nevada Water Authority via bulk-supply lines from Lake Mead. Nellis AFB also draws water from multiple government-owned and operated wells. A small quantity is also purchased from the City of North Las Vegas Water District. All water sources for Nellis AFB meet USEPA and State of Nevada standards.

Nellis AFB discharges approximately 1.5 million gallons per day (gpd) of sanitary sewage from Nellis AFB to the Clark County Water Reclamation District.

The primary electric power supplier to Nellis AFB is NV Energy. However, 25% of Nellis AFB electric power is purchased from Solar Star LLC, owners of the Nellis AFB solar array, constructed in 2007, and 10% of Nellis AFB electric power is purchased from Western Area Power Administration (hydroelectric). A back-up system comprised of 38 fixed generators and an additional 27 mobile generators provides power for contingency or emergency operations (NAFB, 2008).

Southwest Gas Company distributes natural gas to Nellis AFB primarily for the heating of facilities. The actual gas commodity is purchased on the natural gas spot market.

3.4 Transportation

Access to the Mike O’Callaghan Federal Medical Center campus is provided by Hospital Drive off North Las Vegas Boulevard in the northwest portion of Nellis AFB. Hospital Drive forms a loop around the medical campus, encircling the medical center building and associated parking areas.

Hospital Drive once provided access directly to the front of the MOFMC building. However, increases in security have required closure of portions of the interior roadway. Access to the front of the building is afforded through the parking areas near the front of the medical center.

In addition to access from the Hospital Drive loop, access to the northern portion of the project area, including the existing Medical Education & Training Facility, is also available via Stafford Drive which extends west from Range Road north of the existing Medical Education & Training Facility and antenna shack. Access from the east is available via Range Road and Loring Drive.
Pedestrian access to the MOFMC is provided by two concrete sidewalks located along either side of the medical center entrance road and extending north to the medical center entrance. A concrete sidewalk is located along the north side of North Las Vegas Boulevard. Pedestrian access across North Las Vegas Boulevard is provided by a crosswalk at the intersection with the medical center entrance.

### 3.5 Socioeconomics

Socioeconomics is defined as the social and economic activities associated with the human environment, particularly population and economic activity.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, there are no residents within the project area (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Nellis AFB, along with Creech AFB and the NTTR, is among the area's largest employers with a workforce that totaled 13,776 personnel in FY 2010 (NAFB 2010). The types of personnel included 9,410 active duty military, 3,435 non-appropriated contract civilians and private business employees, and 931 appropriated civilians. The total annual payroll expenditures in FY 2010 were more than $1.152 million. Further, the USAF estimates that the economic stimulus of Nellis AFB created approximately 6,416 secondary jobs in the civilian economy, generating nearly $257 million in the local region. Nellis AFB also purchases considerable quantities of goods and services from local and regional firms. In total, Nellis AFB contributed over $5 billion to the local economy in FY 2010. Also generating substantial economic activity are over 27,700 military retirees who receive and spend payrolls exceeding $645 million in the region (NAFB 2010). As one of the single largest government employers in Clark County, Nellis AFB and its continuing operations represent a significant source of regional economic activity.

### 3.6 Environmental Justice and Protection of Children

In 1994, EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations, was issued to focus attention of federal agencies on human health and environmental conditions in minority and low-income communities and to ensure that disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on these communities were addressed. In 1997, EO 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks (Protection of Children), was issued to ensure the protection of children.

Environmental justice addresses the disproportionate effect of a federal action on low-income or minority populations. There are no permanent residents and therefore, no minority populations or low-income households residing in the project area.

### 3.7 Cultural Resources

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 requires that Federal agencies take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. A Class III Inventory of 222 acres in Area II and 300 acres in Area III of Nellis AFB was conducted in 2000 to identify and evaluate cultural resource properties according to 36 CFR 800.4 (NAFB, 2000). The determination included one site for eligibility in Area II, three miles northeast of the medical center complex. The medical center complex is not considered within the Area of Potential Effect for preservation of the site. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) concurred with the determination on 12 April 2001 (see letter dated 3 January 2001 in Appendix B). There are no eligible properties within the area of the medical center complex.

### 3.8 Biological Resources

The developed nature of the project area limits opportunity for native habitat and associated native vegetation and wildlife. The Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan for Nellis Air Force Base (NAFB 2007) includes descriptions of the natural resources on the Nellis AFB.
3.8.1 Vegetation
The Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan (INRMP) describes the desert scrub creosote bush/white bursage community that is characteristic of much of the Mojave Desert and can still be observed in less developed areas of Nellis AFB. The project area is fully developed leaving no remaining native habitats intact. Vegetation in the project area is limited to narrow areas of manicured grass along walkways and ornamental shrubs in xeriscapes between structures and parking areas.

3.8.2 Wildlife
The developed nature of the project area, as well as the location of Nellis AFB adjacent to metropolitan Las Vegas, limits wildlife use to those adapted to high levels of human activity and disturbance. Developed areas, including the project area, contain mainly common bird species including house finch and house sparrow. Open spaces, such as the golf course, are frequented by American coot (Fulica americana), horned lark (Eremophila alpestris), great-tailed grackle (Quiscalus mexicanus), and domestic geese and ducks. The areas with the most diverse wildlife are those containing native desert scrub vegetation, mostly located in clear zones in Area II, attract coyote (Canis latrans), Gambel’s quail (Callipepla gambelii), mourning dove (Zenaida macroura), desert spiny lizard (Sceloporus magister), and side-blotched lizard (Uta stansburiana) (NAFB, 2007).

3.8.3 Rare Species
The INRMP identifies five sensitive animal species that have been observed, or which may occur, on Nellis AFB. Of the five, only the desert tortoise (Gopherus agassizii) is federally-listed as threatened, and therefore is protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The western burrowing owl (Athene cunicularia) is a former USFWS C-2 species and species of concern. The chuckwalla (Sauromalus obesus) is a former federal species of concern, and the phainopepla (Phainopepla nitens) is a State of Nevada protected species. The banded Gila monster (Heloderma suspectum cinctum) is a State of Nevada protected species and a U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) sensitive species. The project area contains no habitat to support any of these sensitive animal species.

The Las Vegas bearpoppy (Arctomecon californica) and Las Vegas buckwheat (Eriogonum corymbosum) are two Federal species of concern present on Nellis AFB. A conservation area containing the largest Las Vegas bearpoppy and Las Vegas buckwheat populations on Nellis AFB has been established in Area III (NAFB, 2007) approximately one mile northwest of the project area. The project area contains no habitat to support these sensitive plant species.

3.9 Water and Soil Resources
Nellis AFB lies in the southern portion of the Las Vegas Valley within the Colorado River Basin. No natural surface waters or perennial streams exist on Nellis AFB. Ephemeral streams occur on Nellis AFB, but are located east of the airfield approximately two miles southeast of the project area.

No natural lakes or other open bodies of water are found on Nellis AFB. Seven man-made ponds are found within the boundary of Nellis AFB on the Sunrise Vista Golf Course located approximately two miles south of the project area south of the airfield.

No surface water resources are present within the project area. Natural surface water is scarce in the project area. Average annual precipitation is approximately 4 inches and evaporation rates have been estimated at approximately 58 to 69 inches per year.

3.9.1 Floodplains
A 100-year floodplain lies adjacent to the southeastern portion of the golf course more than two miles south of the project area. No 100-year floodplains occur within the developed portions of Nellis AFB, including the project area (NAFB, 2008).
3.9.2 Wetlands

Wetlands are defined in Executive Order 11990 as “areas that are inundated or saturated by surface water or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances, do support a prevalence of vegetation or aquatic life typically adapted for saturated soil conditions.”

The only waters on Nellis AFB that could be considered wetlands are the golf course ponds. However, United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) personnel have determined that these man-made water sources are not subject to wetlands protection under the provisions of the Clean Water Act (CWA) because they are man-made and the water source is not natural (NAFB, 2007).

3.9.3 Soils

Nellis AFB lies primarily on two types of soil, the Las Vegas-Destazo soil complex and the Las Vegas-Skyhaven soil complex (USDA 1985); the project area is comprised of the former. These are alluvial soils common in the Las Vegas Valley basin that contain very fine soil particles that can be subject to erosion. Erosion from precipitation and runoff is minimal in the project area because of the flat topography. However, ground disturbance during construction could lead to wind erosion (NAFB, 2007).

3.10 Air Quality

The Clean Air Act (CAA) established National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for six pollutants, termed “criteria pollutants”. The six “criteria” pollutants include ozone (O3), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), sulfur dioxide (SO2), particulate matter (PM) less than 10 and 2.5 microns (PM10 and PM2.5), and lead (Pb). The Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP), Bureau of Air Quality (BAQ) has adopted the NAAQS, with several exceptions and additions: the state annual SO2 standard is more stringent than the national standard; Nevada has added an 8-hour CO standard specific to elevations greater than 5,000 feet above mean sea level; and Nevada has added standards for visibility impairment and 1-hour hydrogen sulfide (H2S) concentrations.

Conditions in the Las Vegas Valley exceed federal air quality standards for CO on a seasonal basis and a portion of the Las Vegas Valley, including the portion of Clark County in which Nellis AFB is located, is designated as nonattainment for CO, particulate matter, and 8-hour ozone. The USEPA classified the Las Vegas Valley area as a "serious" nonattainment area for PM10 and CO. It is basic (subpart 1) nonattainment for 8-hour ozone whose precursor pollutants are NOx and VOCs. The Clark County Board of Commissioners developed State Implementation Plans (SIP) for CO and PM10.

Improvements in air quality in the Las Vegas Valley have been achieved. The USEPA determined in 2005 that the Valley was in attainment for CO and a request was made in 2008 for formal redesignation. (Clark County DAQEM, 2008). The USEPA approved the CO Maintenance Plan and request for redesignation in September 2010 (USEPA 2010). USEPA determined in August 2010 that the Las Vegas Valley had reached attainment for PM10 by the applicable date of December 31, 2006. The Valley remains in serious nonattainment for PM10 until Nevada meets the CAA requirements for redesignation to attainment (USEPA 2010b). Clark County submitted their Ozone Early Progress Plan to USEPA in July 2008 and in May 2009 the USEPA found the information sufficient to demonstrate progress towards attainment (USEPA 2009). Clark County submitted the Ozone Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan to USEPA in March 2011 (CC DAQEM 2011). Upon USEPA approval, emissions goals contained therein will be regulated by the County.

Ground-based air emissions at Nellis AFB are primarily generated from aviation activities including maintenance shops, aerospace ground equipment (AGE), boilers, and paint booths. The total annual CO, PM10, and VOCs and NOx (ozone precursors) represent a fraction of one percent of the total Clark County contribution and none of these pollutants represents a substantive contributor to nonattainment for the Las Vegas Valley area (USAF, 2011).
3.11 Hazardous Materials and Waste

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) is the culmination of a long series of pieces of legislation, dating back to the passage of the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, which addresses the problem of solid waste disposal and eventually evolved into an expression of the national concern with the safe and proper disposal of hazardous waste. Executive Order 12088 as amended, directs federal agencies to comply with applicable federal, state, and local pollution control standards when implementing their actions.

Nellis AFB generates sufficient RCRA hazardous waste to be considered a large quantity generator by the USEPA. A variety of activities on Base contribute to the hazardous waste stream including aircraft maintenance and support, civil engineering, and printing operations. Basic processes and waste handling procedures for general aircraft maintenance activities are identified in the Nellis AFB Hazardous Waste Management Plan (Air Force 2002).

Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) sites are those sites where contamination occurred prior to 1985 and thus, remediation efforts are directed by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), commonly known as Superfund. Remediation measures require containment and could include contaminant removal and disposal. ERP sites on Nellis AFB include abandoned landfills, underground contaminant plumes, and ordnance disposal pits. There are currently nine ERP sites in active remediation on Nellis AFB (Air Force, 2004b). None of the ERP sites are within or near the project area.

Medical and biological waste at the MOFMC is collected in designated areas and subject to sterilization prior to proper disposal. No medical or biological wastes are generated at the Medical Education & Training Facility. Solid waste from the MOFMC and other facilities within the medical campus is collected and disposed of in a licensed disposal facility. Solid waste collection at MOFMC provides for separation and collection of recyclable materials.

3.12 Visual Resources

The visual landscape of the project area is a developed, urban service area consisting of the MOFMC campus and associated parking and other ancillary structures and facilities. Adjacent areas are also developed into urban uses, including residential and industrial uses. The existing buildings and parking lots in the MOFMC campus include exterior lighting.

3.13 Noise

The noise environment at Nellis AFB is dominated by the sound levels from flight operations. Sound levels from flight operations at Nellis AFB exceeding ambient background noise typically occur only beneath main approach and departure corridors and in areas immediately adjacent to parking ramps and aircraft staging areas.

The 2004 Nellis AFB AICUZ study (USAF, 2004a) identified baseline noise levels ranging from 65 DNL to greater than 85 DNL. Aircraft noise in the project area is shown by the 2004 noise contours to fall between 70 to 75 DNL. According to the Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise (1980), noise exposure greater than 65 dB DNL is considered generally unacceptable over public services or residential, cultural, recreational, and entertainment areas. Noise levels greater than 65 DNL have been found to be compatible with on-base conditions and facilities (USAF, 2011), however, noise attenuation is employed in accordance with existing Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) requirements to mitigate noise impacts to the medical center.
4.0 Environmental Consequences

This section of the EA addresses potential impacts on environmental resources that would be expected to occur within or near the proposed project area upon implementation of the Proposed Action or the No Action Alternative as described in Chapter 2. Project effects can be either beneficial or adverse and can be either directly related to the action or indirectly caused by the action. Direct impacts are those effects that are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place (40 CFR 1508.8[a]). Indirect impacts are those effects that are caused by the action and are later in time or further removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable (40 CFR 1508.8[b]). The effects can be temporary, short in duration (short-term), long lasting (long-term), or permanent. For purposes of this EA, temporary effects are defined as those that would last for the duration of the construction period.

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 Analysis Approach

The approach used for this environmental impact analysis is to assess and compare potential impacts to environmental resources with implementation of the Proposed Action or the No Action Alternative as discussed in Chapter 2. The direct and indirect effects are identified, and where appropriate, the implementation of best management practices to minimize potential environmental impacts along with any additional practical mitigation measures to minimize impacts are identified. Cumulative effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives when considering past, present, and foreseeable future actions are presented in Chapter 5.

4.2 Land Use

Assessment of land use compatibility considers the potential for an action to change land use in such a manner as to cause incompatibility with adjacent land management and/or uses. Aviation operations within the MOFMC (emergency helicopters) and over Nellis AFB require consideration of changes in land use that could affect aviation safety. Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) 3-260-01, Airfield and Heliport Planning and Design Criteria, limits locations and heights of objects and facilities around and in the immediate vicinity of an airfield to minimize hazards to airfield and flight operations. Any condition not meeting these requirements is classified as an approved waiver, a permissible deviation, an exemption, or a violation (UFC 3-260-01).

4.2.1 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would include renovation of existing and construction of new structures within the MOFMC campus for continued medical use and training. Project construction would introduce temporary changes in land use when construction equipment is in use on the site. However, no substantially new land uses would be introduced by the Proposed Action and no incompatible uses would be created during operation of the new facilities. The renovated MOFMC would continue to be used as a medical facility with no substantial changes in services. The proposed new Medical Education & Training Facility and medical center administration space would provide additional space for medical training and administration that is currently ongoing within the campus. Construction of the new turnstile gate and crosswalk at North Las Vegas Boulevard would be an extension to the existing pedestrian sidewalk system.

The proposed Fisher House would introduce temporary residential living facilities into the medical campus. However, the residential use would be directly related to the treatment provided at the MOFMC and would be for the benefit of MOFMC patients and their families.

Demolition of the existing Medical Education & Training Facility and the adjacent antenna shack would provide a potential opportunity for construction of additional parking. The additional parking would be compatible with the existing surrounding land uses.

Renovation of the MOFMC would occur within the existing structure and require no change in structure height or use of large construction equipment. The proposed new facilities would be single-story structures, or lesser
height than the adjacent existing three-story MOFMC building. The existing Medical Education & Training Facility and antenna shack are both single story structures and demolition is not expected to require construction equipment of substantial height. Coordination would be conducted with the 57th Wing Airspace and 563rd Rescue Group on the helicopter landing area to ensure construction does not impede ability for emergency landings at Medical Center or helicopter operations in Area I.

4.2.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not result in any changes to land use in the project area and no potential adverse impacts to aviation safety or emergency helicopter landings at the medical center.

4.3 Utilities

4.3.1 Proposed Action

Construction and operation of the Proposed Action would not result in substantial increased utility use. A slight increase in electrical and natural gas use would be anticipated as a result of the overall increase in facility space; however, new facility construction would be expected to be more energy efficient than the existing infrastructure. System capacity would be adequate to meet any minor increases in demand.

Potable water demand and sanitary sewer discharge would be expected to increase with the increase in staffing currently occurring at the MOFMC. Construction of new facilities with more efficient water conservation design and measures and demolition of existing facilities would help offset any increased water use.

4.3.2 No Action Alternative

No increases in the use of electric power or natural gas would result from the No Action Alternative.

4.4 Transportation

4.4.1 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would not result in direct impacts or changes to the existing roadways or vehicle access within or around the project area. Increases in traffic could result during construction, but would be temporary.

Construction of the new turnstile gate and crosswalk at North Las Vegas Boulevard would be an extension to the existing pedestrian sidewalk system within the MOFMC campus. The new crosswalk at Mountain Home Road would provide safe crossing for pedestrians, as would the existing pedestrian crosswalk at North Las Vegas Boulevard. The improved pedestrian access could reduce automobile traffic and parking congestion at the MOFMC.

The proposed Fisher House location would eliminate a portion of the drive-up circle directly in front of the MOFMC building. However, due to increases in security this vehicle access has largely been commandeered and is inaccessible to vehicles. Construction of the Fisher House in the proposed location would not alter vehicle access to the MOFMC building from the current condition. The footprint of the Fisher House could impact the existing sidewalks in the drive-up circle. Pedestrian access around the Fisher House would be accommodated in the project design.

4.4.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not result in direct impacts or changes to the existing roadways or vehicle assess within or around the project area. The existing drive-up circle in front of the MOFMC building would remain inaccessible.
4.5 Socioeconomic Impacts

4.5.1 Proposed Action

A short-term, positive input into the local economy would occur during the construction period. However, given the minor amount of construction/demolition activities, the benefits would be minimal. Operation of the new facilities would draw from existing USAF staffing and would not create new jobs beyond those already planned. No substantial beneficial or adverse impacts to socioeconomics would be expected.

4.5.2 No Action Alternative

No changes to existing socioeconomic resources would result from the No Action Alternative.

4.6 Environmental Justice and Protection of Children

Executive Order (EO) 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations, was established to avoid the disproportionate placement of adverse environmental, economic, social, or health impacts from federal actions and policies on minority and low-income populations. In 1997, Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks (Protection of Children), was issued to ensure the protection of children.

4.6.1 Proposed Action

There are no residences within the project area and the Proposed Action would not adversely impact any low income or minority populations.

The Proposed Action would not pose environmental and safety risks to children due to the fact that changes and improvements would be limited to the MOFMC campus and there are no children in residence within the project area. Access to the project area would continue through construction and into operation of the improved facilities, but no element of the Proposed Action would increase the health or safety risk to children.

4.6.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not adversely impact low income or minority populations, nor increase the health or safety risk to children.

4.7 Cultural Resources

4.7.1 Proposed Action

The medical center was constructed in 1994 and thus excluded from an architectural historical or Cold War survey (see SHPO correspondence dated 7 November 2011 in Appendix C). There are no eligible properties within the area of the medical center complex and thus, there are no cultural resources conflicts with use or alteration of the medical center complex as currently proposed.

4.7.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not result in any impacts to cultural resources.

4.8 Biological Resources

The Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act encourages all Federal departments and agencies to conserve and promote conservation of non-game fish and wildlife and their habitats.
4.8.1 Vegetation

4.8.1.1 Proposed Action
The Proposed Action would include construction in areas previously paved or otherwise disturbed or developed and would result in no direct or indirect impacts to native habitat.

4.8.1.2 No Action Alternative
The No Action Alternative would not result in any construction in the project area and would result in no direct or indirect impacts to native habitat.

4.8.2 Wildlife

4.8.2.1 Proposed Action
The Proposed Action would not impact native habitat and would result in no adverse impacts to the wildlife adapted to and utilizing the developed, urban conditions.

4.8.2.2 No Action Alternative
The No Action Alternative would result in no adverse impacts to the wildlife adapted to and utilizing the developed, urban conditions.

4.8.3 Rare Species

The Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, requires Federal agencies to consult with the Secretaries of the Interior and Commerce to ensure that actions are “not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of the critical habitat of such species.”

4.8.3.1 Proposed Action
The Proposed Action would include construction in previously disturbed or developed areas and would avoid direct or indirect impacts to any rare species or their habitat.

4.8.3.2 No Action Alternative
The No Action Alternative would not result in any construction in the project area and would result in no direct or indirect impacts to any rare species or their habitat.

4.9 Water and Soil Resources

4.9.1 Water Quality

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (commonly referred to as the Clean Water Act), provides the authority to establish water quality standards, control discharges, develop waste treatment management plans and practices, prevent or minimize the loss of wetlands, and regulate other issues concerning water quality. A significant impact on water resources would include a violation of any water quality standards, substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

4.9.1.1 Proposed Action
The Proposed Action would include construction in areas that are currently paved or graveled and would not result in creation of additional impervious surface or surface water runoff over the existing condition.

The potential for erosion and sedimentation would increase temporarily during construction, but would cease upon completion of construction and stabilization of disturbed areas. Standard construction practices such as silt fencing, straw bales, and/or inlet protection would be implemented to control runoff, erosion, and sedimentation. Since there is very little surface water in the vicinity of the project area and low annual rainfall, potential adverse effects to surface water would be minimal.
A General Storm Water permit from the Nevada Bureau of Water Pollution Control and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be required prior to initiating any construction activity. These documents would outline construction site best management practices (BMPs) designed to minimize erosion and protect the quality of the surface water, groundwater, and natural environment through which they flow.

### 4.9.1.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would result in no change in surface water runoff from existing conditions.

### 4.9.2 Floodplains

#### 4.9.2.1 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would not involve construction within or near a 100-year floodplain. The Proposed Action would not result in an increase in the rate or volume of surface water runoff and would not increase flood hazards on Nellis AFB.

#### 4.9.2.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not increase flood hazards on Nellis AFB.

### 4.9.3 Wetlands

#### 4.9.3.1 Proposed Action

Because there are no jurisdictional wetlands within the project area, the Proposed Action would result in no adverse impact to wetlands.

#### 4.9.3.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would result in no adverse impact to wetlands.

### 4.9.4 Soils

#### 4.9.4.1 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would result in a temporary increase in the potential for soil erosion during construction. The threat of erosion would cease upon completion of construction and stabilization of disturbed areas. Erosion from precipitation and runoff is minimal in the project area because of low annual rainfall and a lack of slope. However, ground disturbance during construction could lead to wind erosion (NAFB, 2007). During construction, fugitive dust would be minimized through implementation of dust control measures (i.e., water application on soil).

#### 4.9.4.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would result in no temporary, short-term, or long-term increases in potential for soil erosion.

### 4.10 Air Quality

The USEPA defines a significant impact to Air Quality if a project violates any ambient air quality standard (NAAQS or State of Nevada); increases the number or frequency of violations; contributes substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; conflicts with or obstructs implementation of the applicable air quality plan; results in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable ambient air quality standard; exposes sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or creates objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

According to USEPA General Conformity Rule in 40 CFR Part 51, Subpart W, any proposed federal action that has the potential to cause violations in a NAAQS nonattainment area must undergo a conformity analysis. An evaluation of demolition/construction scenarios was conducted to determine the greatest amount of ground-disturbance activities that could occur in a given year before de minimus thresholds of any of the three criteria.
pollutants were met. The evaluation determined that if a single project disturbs 16 or more acres in 1 year, a general conformity determination would be required (NAFB, 2008).

### 4.10.1 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would be constructed over a minimum of a three-year period. Table 4-1 below provides a summary of the estimated construction disturbance that could be associated with each of the project elements. The sum of the construction disturbance of the Proposed Action would be less than two acres. Even if all of the project construction and demolition were to occur in the same year, the Proposed Action would not be so substantial so as to threaten exceedance of any air quality thresholds or require a general conformity determination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Element</th>
<th>Approximate Disturbance Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike O’Callaghan Federal Medical Center Renovation</td>
<td>0.00 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Modular Facility Construction</td>
<td>0.35 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Medical Education &amp; Training Facility Construction</td>
<td>0.10 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Warehouse Addition Construction</td>
<td>0.05 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher House Construction</td>
<td>0.15 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Medical Education &amp; Training Facility Demolition</td>
<td>0.60 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Antenna Shack Demolition</td>
<td>0.30 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Facility Demolition</td>
<td>0.30 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New turnstile and crosswalk</td>
<td>0.05 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.90 acres</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.10.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would result in would not result in air quality impacts.

### 4.11 Hazardous Materials and Waste

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) is the culmination of a long series of pieces of legislation, dating back to the passage of the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, which address the problem of solid waste disposal and eventually evolved into an expression of the national concern with the safe and proper disposal of hazardous waste.

#### 4.11.1 Proposed Action

No changes to procedures for collection, treatment, or disposal of medical and biological waste at the MOFMC would occur with implementation of the Proposed Action. No changes in collection of other solid waste or recyclable materials would occur at the MOFMC or the other associated facilities within the medical campus. No substantial increase in volume of either medical/biological waste or other solid waste would be expected as a result of the Proposed Action.

Construction waste would be generated during renovation of the MOFMC and during construction of the proposed new facilities. Demolition waste would be generated from demolition of the existing Medical Education & Training Facility and the antenna shack. Construction and demolition wastes would be collected and disposed of at a regulated disposal facility.

#### 4.11.2 No Action Alternative

No impacts to hazardous materials and waste would occur as a result of the No Action Alternative.
4.12 Visual Resources

4.12.1 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would not result in any adverse impact to visual resources. The project elements would be constructed within a developed area and be consistent with the existing visual landscapes. The new structures would utilize building materials and colors similar to and compatible with the other structures within the medical campus, and be landscaped consistent with the existing grounds.

The Proposed Action would not result in changes to the exterior lighting of the existing MOFMC building or the associated parking areas. The new Medical Education & Training Facility, the warehouse addition, and the temporary modular facility would include new exterior lighting, although those on the modular facility would be temporary. New lighting would utilize mitigation measures that follow “Dark Sky” lighting practices, including hoods and shields, to avoid light transmission to adjacent properties.

4.12.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would result in no construction or demolition and no adverse impacts to visual resources.

4.13 Noise

4.13.1 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would not alter the existing noise levels within the project area or the noise levels generated by aviation activities on Nellis AFB. Newly constructed facilities would include noise attenuation in accordance with existing Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) requirements.

Noise levels would be temporarily elevated during construction from operation of construction equipment. However, construction activities would typically be limited to daytime periods and construction equipment would be properly muffled.

4.13.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not alter the existing noise levels within the project area.
5.0 Cumulative Effects and Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources

5.1 Cumulative Effects

Cumulative effects are impacts “on the environment which result from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions” (40 CFR § 1508.7). CEQ regulations require assessment of cumulative effects when an EA is prepared and when a proposed action under review would have a direct and/or indirect effect on a specific natural, historic, or cultural resource or population. The level of analysis and scope of cumulative effect assessment are typically commensurate with the potential impacts, resources affected, project scale, and other factors. If no direct and/or indirect effect to a specific resource is suspected, there is no potential for cumulative effect to that resource.

The Proposed Action evaluated in this EA would not result in substantial environmental effects. The Proposed Action would avoid adverse impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, water resources, noise and air quality, and socioeconomics. Because of the lack of adverse impacts to the natural and human environments, the Proposed Action would not contribute to cumulative impacts.

5.2 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources

NEPA requires that environmental analysis include identification of any irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented. Irreversible and irretrievable resource commitments are related to the use of nonrenewable resources and the effects this use could have on future generations. Irreversible effects primarily result from the use or destruction of a specific resource (e.g., energy and minerals) that cannot be replaced within a reasonable time frame. Irretrievable resource commitments involve the loss in value of an affected resource that cannot be restored as a result of the action (e.g., extinction of a threatened or endangered species or the disturbance of a cultural resource).

For the Proposed Action, most resource commitments are neither irreversible nor irretrievable. Most environmental consequences are short-term and temporary, such as air emissions from construction operations. Construction of the proposed improvements to the MOFMC campus would require consumption of limited amounts of materials typically associated with construction (wood, metal, asphalt, and fuel). However, the amount of these materials used is not expected to significantly decrease the availability of these resources either locally or globally. Based on the analysis in this EA, implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in adverse impacts to the environment or to the health and safety of persons in the affected region.
6.0 Interagency, Intergovernmental, and Public Coordination

Nevada State Clearinghouse
Department of Administration
Division of Budget & Planning
209 East Musser Street, Room 200
Carson City, NV 89701-4298
Request submitted electronically

Ms. Jennifer Olsen
Southern Nevada Regional Planning Commission
240 Water Street, Mail Stop 115
Henderson, NV 89009

Commissioner Susan Brager
Chairperson, Clark County Commission
500 Grand Central Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 89106

City of Las Vegas
Community Development, Planning & Zoning Division
2200 Civic Center Drive, Suite 210
North Las Vegas, NV 89030
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
99TH CIVIL ENGINEER SQUADRON (ACC)  
NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE, NEVADA

Ms. Deborah Stockdale  
99 CES/CEA  
4349 Duffer Drive, Suite 1601  
Nellis AFB, NV 89191-7007

Nevada State Clearinghouse  
Department of Administration  
Division of Budget & Planning  
200 East Musser Street, Room 200  
Carson City, NV 89701-4798  
Clearinghouse@budget.state.nv.us

Gentlemen:

The United States Air Force (USAF) 99th Medical Group at Nellis Air Force Base (AFB) have initiated the preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA) for implementation of improvement projects at the Michael O’Callaghan Federal Hospital Medical Campus at Nellis AFB. Under the proposed actions, Nellis AFB would repair and renovate the Michael O’Callaghan Federal Hospital (MOFH) Building to accommodate growing staff and patient needs. Additional campus improvements would include construction of a new Medical Education & Training Facility, expanded warehouse facilities, and future construction of a Fisher House, a donated facility for use by families of service men and women receiving treatment at MOFH. All elements of the proposed actions would be implemented in previously developed areas within the limits of the existing medical campus.

The EA will evaluate potential environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the proposed actions. In addition to the proposed actions, the EA will assess the no-action alternative. Under the no-action alternative no new facilities or renovations would be conducted and existing conditions would remain unchanged.

In accordance with 32 CFR 989, the Air Force Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP), and 40 CFR 1500 1508, the Council on Environmental Quality guidelines, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, as amended, Nellis AFB requests your agency identify issues or concerns you may have regarding the proposed action. Please forward any identified issues or concerns by November 30, 2011 to Mr. Tod Oppenborn at the above address or tod.oppenborn@nellis.af.mil. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Deborah Stockdale  
Chief, Asset Management

Global Power for America

OCT 27 2011
The United States Air Force (USAF) 99th Medical Group at Nellis Air Force Base (AFB) have initiated the preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA) for implementation of improvement projects at the Michael O'Callaghan Federal Hospital Medical Campus at Nellis AFB. Under the proposed actions, Nellis AFB would repair and renovate the Michael O'Callaghan Federal Hospital (MOFH) Building to accommodate growing staff and patient needs. Additional campus improvements would include construction of a new Medical Education & Training Facility, expanded warehouse facilities, and future construction of a Fisher House, a donated facility for use by families of service men and women receiving treatment at MOFH. All elements of the proposed actions would be implemented in previously developed areas within the limits of the existing medical campus.

The EA will evaluate potential environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the proposed actions. In addition to the proposed action, the EA will assess the no-action alternative. Under the no-action alternative no new facilities or renovations would be conducted and existing conditions would remain unchanged.

In accordance with 32 CFR 989, the Air Force Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP), and 40 CFR 1500-1508, the Council on Environmental Quality guidelines, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, as amended, Nellis AFB requests to your agency identify issues or concerns you may have regarding the proposed action. Please forward any identified issues or concerns by November 30, 2011 to Mr. Tod Oppenborn at the above address or tod oppenborn@nellis.af.mil. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

DEBORAH STOCKDALE
Chief, Asset Management

Global Power for America
Month 27 2011

Ms. Deborah Stockdale
99 CES/CEA
4449 Drifter Drive, Suite 1601
Nellis AFB, NV 89191-7007

Commissioner Susan Brager
Chairperson, Clark County Commission
500 Grand Central Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 89106

Dear Ms. Brager,

The United States Air Force (USAF) 99th Medical Group at Nellis Air Force Base (AFB) has initiated the preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA) for implementation of improvement projects at the Michael O’Callaghan Federal Hospital Medical Campus at Nellis AFB. Under the proposed actions, Nellis AFB would repair and renovate the Michael O’Callaghan Federal Hospital (MOFH) Building to accommodate growing staff and patient needs. Additional campus improvements would include construction of a new Medical Education & Training Facility, expanded warehouse facilities, and future construction of a Fisher House, a donated facility for use by families of service men and women receiving treatment at MOFH. All elements of the proposed actions would be implemented in previously developed areas within the limits of the existing medical campus.

The EA will evaluate potential environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the proposed actions. In addition to the proposed actions, the EA will assess the no-action alternative. Under the no-action alternative no new facilities or renovations would be constructed and existing conditions would remain unchanged.

In accordance with 32 CFR 989, the Air Force Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP), and 40 CFR 1500-1508, the Council on Environmental Quality guidelines, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, as amended, Nellis AFB requests your agency identify issues or concerns you may have regarding the proposed action. Please forward any identified issues or concerns by November 30, 2011 to Mr. Tod Oppenborn at the above address or tod.oppenborn@ nellis.af.mil. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

DEBORAH STOCKDALE
Chief, Asset Management

Global Power for America
Dear Sir or Madam,

The United States Air Force (USAF) 99th Medical Group at Nellis Air Force Base (AFB) have initiated the preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA) for implementation of improvement projects at the Michael O’Callaghan Federal Hospital Medical Campus at Nellis AFB. Under the proposed actions, Nellis AFB would repair and renovate the Michael O’Callaghan Federal Hospital (MOFH) Building to accommodate growing staff and patient needs. Additional campus improvements would include construction of a new Medical Education & Training Facility, expanded warehouse facilities and future construction of a Fisher House, a donated facility for use by families of service men and women receiving treatment at MOFH. All elements of the proposed actions would be implemented in previously developed areas within the limits of the existing medical campus.

The EA will evaluate potential environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the proposed action. In addition to the proposed action, the EA will assess the no action alternative. Under the no action alternative no new facilities or renovations would be conducted and existing conditions would remain unchanged.

In accordance with 32 CFR 989, the Air Force Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP), and 40 CFR 1500-1508, the Council on Environmental Quality guidelines, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, as amended, Nellis AFB requests your agency identify issues or concerns you may have regarding the proposed action. Please forward any identified issues or concerns by November 30, 2011 to Mr. Tod Oppenborn at the above address or tod.oppenborn@nellis.af.mil. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

DEBORAH STOCKDALE
Chief, Asset Management

Global Power for America
The SHPO has reviewed the scoping document for the proposed Environmental Assessment; the U.S. Air Force has previously conducted an architectural review of portions of the base to identify historic properties that exist in the facility. Our records indicate that this facility dates to the early 1990's. If this is correct, it is unlikely that an architectural inventory should be necessary for the proposed undertaking.

Rebecca Lynn Palmer
Deputy Historic Preservation Officer
901 South Stewart Street, Suite 5004
Carson City, NV 89701
Phone (775) 684-3443
Fax (775) 684-3442

Please note, my email is rlpalm@shpo.nv.gov
- Please reply directly from this e-mail and attach your comments.

- Please submit your comments no later than Monday, November 28, 2011.

Clearinghouse project archive

Questions? Skip Canfield, Program Manager, (775) 684-2723 or clearinghouse@state.nv.us

No comment on this project Proposal supported as written

AGENCY COMMENTS:

Signature:

Date:

Distribution: Alissande Maffei, Department of Administration
Sandy Quilici, Department of Conservation & Natural Resources
Gary Derks, Division of Emergency Management
David Mosat, Desert Research Institute
Nancy Boland, Esmeralda County
Denisa Johnston, Fire Marshal
Karen Beckley, State Health Division
Kirk Bauman, Hawthorne Army Depot
Sherry Rupert, Indian Commission
Skip Canfield, AICP, Division of State Lands
Dave Ziegler, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Cory Lytle, Lincoln County
Zip Upham, NAS Fallon
Ed Rybold, NAS Fallon
CPT Brian Brian Hunsaker, Nevada National Guard
Teri Compton, Department of Transportation
Timothy Mueller, Department of Transportation
Bill Thompson, Department of Transportation, Aviation
Steve Siegel, Department of Wildlife, Director's Office
Mark Freese, Department of Wildlife
D. Bradford Hardenbrook, Department of Wildlife, Las Vegas
Robert Martinez, Division of Water Resources
Tod Oppenborn, Nellis Air Force Base
Ms. Deborah MacNeill, Nellis Air Force Base
William Cahillander, Nellis Air Force Base
99ABW, Nellis Air Force Base
Octavious Q. Hill, Nellis Air Force Base
James D. Morefield, Natural Heritage Program
Jennifer Newmark,
Linda Cohn, National Nuclear Security Administration
Jennifer Scardino, Division of State Parks
Mark Harris, PE, Public Utilities Commission
Rebecca Palmer, State Historic Preservation Office
Terry Rubald, Nevada Department of Taxation, Local Government, Centrally Assessed Property
Karen Moessner,
John Murtean, UNR Bureau of Mines
Jon Price, UNR Bureau of Mines
David David, UNR Bureau of Mines
Russ Land, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection
Clearinghouse, zzClearinghouse
From: Brad Handenbrook
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 5:15PM
To: Skip Canfield

Skip Canfield

From: Skip Canfield
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2011 2:30 PM
To: Brad Handenbrook

Nevada State Clearinghouse
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Division of State Lands
901 S. Stewart St., Ste. 3003, Carson City, Nevada 89701-5246
(775) 684-2723 Fax: (775) 684-2721

Transmission Date: 10/31/2011

Department of Wildlife, Las Vegas
Nevada SAI # E2012-070
Project: EA - Nellis - Improvements to Michael O'Callaghan Federal Hospital

Follow the link below to find information concerning the above-mentioned project for your review and comment:
E2012-070

- Please evaluate this project’s effects on your agency’s plans and programs and any other issues that you are aware of that might be pertinent to applicable laws and regulations.

- Please reply directly from this e-mail and attach your comments.

- Please submit your comments no later than Monday, November 28, 2011.

Clearinghouse project archive

Questions? Skip Canfield, Program Manager, (775) 684-2723 or clearinghouse@state.nv.us

___ No comment on this project ___ Proposal supported as written
AGENCY COMMENTS:

Thank you for soliciting comments in how this proposed project has bearing on Nevada's wildlife resources. Unfortunately there is insufficient descriptive information provided to perform an adequate assessment or a source link indicated for attaining this information in a reasonably timely manner. Such descriptive information would be most helpful in developing context for understanding the size and nature of the proposed project relative to improvements to existing structures and appurtenances located on disturbed grounds and the potential of facility expansion located adjacent to or into previously undisturbed wildlife habitat(s) or otherwise functioning habitats of potentially significant standing.

Signature:  D. Bradford Hardenbrook  
Supervisory Habitat Biologist  
NDOW – Southern Region  
Date:  2 November 2011  

Distribution: Alisanne Maffei, Department of Administration  
Sandy Quilici, Department of Conservation & Natural Resources  
Gary Derks, Division of Emergency Management  
David Mount, Desert Research Institute  
Nancy Boland, Esmeralda County  
Denise Johnston, Fire Marshal  
Karen Beckley, State Health Division  
Kirk Bauman, Hawthorne Army Depot  
Sherry Rupert, Indian Commission  
Skip Canfield, AICP, Division of State Lands  
Dave Ziegler, Legislative Counsel Bureau  
Cory Lytle, Lincoln County  
Zip Uptain, NAS Fallon  
Ed Rybold, NAS Fallon  
CPT Brian Brian Hunsaker, Nevada National Guard  
Teri Compton, Department of Transportation  
Timothy Mueller, Department of Transportation  
Bill Thompson, Department of Transportation, Aviation  
Steve Siegel, Department of Wildlife, Director's Office  
Mark Freese, Department of Wildlife  
D. Bradford Hardenbrook, Department of Wildlife, Las Vegas  
Robert Martinez, Division of Water Resources  
Tod Oppenbourn, Nellis Air Force Base  
Ms. Deborah MacNeill, Nellis Air Force Base  
William Cadwallader, Nellis Air Force Base  
99ABW, Nellis Air Force Base  
Octavius Q. Hill, Nellis Air Force Base  
James D. Morefield, Natural Heritage Program  
Jennifer Neumark,  
Linda Cohn, National Nuclear Security Administration  
Jennifer Scanland, Division of State Parks  
Mark Harris, PE, Public Utilities Commission  
Rebecca Palmer, State Historic Preservation Office  
Terry Rubald, Nevada Department of Taxation, Local Government, Centrally Assessed Property  
Karen Moessner,  
John Muntan, UNR Bureau of Mines  
Jon Price, UNR Bureau of Mines  
David David, UNR Bureau of Mines  
Russ Land, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection  
Clearinghouse, zCclearinghouse
Oppenborn, Tod Civ USAF ACC 99 CES/CEAO

From: Brad Hardenbrook [bhrdnbrk@ndow.org]
Sent: Thursday, December 08, 2011 8:14 AM
To: Skip Canfield, Oppenborn, Tod Civ USAF ACC 99 CES/CEAO
Subject: RE: Nevada State Clearinghouse Comments: EA - Nellis - Improvements to Michael O'Callaghan Federal Hospital

Skip & Tod,

Thank you for sending along this information. This helps a great deal. No significant wildlife concerns are anticipated related to this project.

Cheers,

Brad

D. Bradford Hardenbrook
Supervisory Habitat Biologist
Southern Region
Nevada Department of Wildlife
4747 Vegas Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89108
702.486.5127 x3600
702.486.5133 FAX
bhrdnbrk@ndow.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Skip Canfield
Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2011 4:50 PM
To: Brad Hardenbrook
Subject: FW: Nevada State Clearinghouse Comments: EA - Nellis - Improvements to Michael O'Callaghan Federal Hospital

Hi please see below and attachments.

-Skip

-----Original Message-----
From: Oppenborn, Tod Civ USAF ACC 99 CES/CEAO [mailto:Tod.Oppenborn@nellis.af.mil]
Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2011 4:15 PM
To: Skip Canfield
Subject: RE: Nevada State Clearinghouse Comments: EA - Nellis - Improvements to Michael O'Callaghan Federal Hospital

Skip,

In Mr. Brad Hardenbrook (NDOW) submitted a comment stating he didn’t have enough information to formulate a comment on our project. I have attached a short narrative and map that will hopefully fulfill his need and allow him to comment.

Since I don’t have his direct email information would you be so kind to forward it to him.

Thank you
Tod
-----Original Message-----
From: Skip Canfield [mailto:scanfield@lands.nv.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2011 10:56 AM
To: Oppenborn, Tod Civ USAF ACC 99 CES/CEAO
Cc: Skip Canfield
Subject: Nevada State Clearinghouse Comments: EA - Nellis - Improvements to Michael O'Callaghan Federal Hospital

Tod:

The Nevada State Clearinghouse provides the attached comments regarding this proposal.

-Skip

Skip Canfield, Program Manager
Nevada State Clearinghouse
State Land Use Planning Agency

901 South Stewart Street, Suite 5003
Carson City, NV 89701
775-684-2723

www.lands.nv.gov
7.0 Distribution List

Nevada State Clearinghouse
Department of Administration
Division of Budget & Planning
209 East Musser Street, Room 200
Carson City, NV 89701-4298
Request submitted electronically

Ms. Jennifer Olsen
Southern Nevada Regional Planning Commission
240 Water Street, Mail Stop 115
Henderson, NV 89009

Commissioner Susan Brager
Chairperson, Clark County Commission
500 Grand Central Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 89106

City of Las Vegas
Community Development, Planning & Zoning Division
2200 Civic Center Drive, Suite 210
North Las Vegas, NV 89030

Las Vegas Library
Reference Department
833 Las Vegas Boulevard North
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Ms. Deborah C. Stockdale
99 CES/CEA
6020 Beale Ave
Nellis AFB, NV 89191-7007

Nevada State Clearinghouse
Department of Administration
Division of Budget & Planning
209 East Musser Street, Room 200
Carson City, NV 89701-4298
Clearinghouse@budget.state.mn.us

Mesdames, Gentlemen:

The 99th Air Base Wing has prepared a Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) for proposed improvements at the Mike O’Callaghan Federal Hospital (MOFH) medical campus at Nellis AFB, Nevada.

The medical infrastructure and facilities at Nellis AFB cannot meet the growing mission requirements of the USAF Air Combat Command (ACC) and there is a need to provide additional space for the 99th Medical Group (MDG) to accommodate mission growth, provide sufficient space for existing departments, and meet current medical standards of care. This DEA evaluates potential impacts of repairs and renovations to the interior of the existing hospital building, construction of new facilities, and demolition of outdated facilities.

In accordance with 32 CFR 989, the Air Force Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP), and 40 CFR 1500-1508, the Council on Environmental Quality guidelines, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, as amended, Nellis AFB requests that your agency review the assessment of the proposed action. Please send any comments no later than February 10, 2012, to Mr. Tod Oppenborn at the above address or e-mail him at tod.oppenborn@nellis.af.mil. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely

DEBORAH C. STOCKDALE
Chief, Asset Management flight

Attachments:
Draft EA
Draft FONSI

Honor the Warfighter
Ms. Deborah C. Stockdale  
99 CES/CEA  
6020 Beale Ave  
Nellis AFB, NV 89191-7007

Ms. Jennifer Olsen  
Southern Nevada Regional Planning Commission  
240 Water Street, Mail Stop 115  
Henderson, NV 89009

Dear Ms. Olsen,

The 99th Air Base Wing has prepared a Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) for proposed improvements at the Mike O'Callaghan Federal Hospital (MOFH) medical campus at Nellis AFB, Nevada.

The medical infrastructure and facilities at Nellis AFB cannot meet the growing mission requirements of the USAF Air Combat Command (ACC) and there is a need to provide additional space for the 99th Medical Group (MDG) to accommodate mission growth, provide sufficient space for existing departments, and meet current medical standards of care. This DEA evaluates potential impacts of repairs and renovations to the interior of the existing hospital building, construction of new facilities, and demolition of outdated facilities.

In accordance with 32 CFR 989, the Air Force Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP), and 40 CFR 1500-1508, the Council on Environmental Quality guidelines, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, as amended, Nellis AFB requests that your agency review the assessment of the proposed action. Please send any comments no later than February 10, 2012, to Mr. Tod Oppenborn at the above address or e-mail him at tod.oppenborn@ nellis.af.mil. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely

[Signature]
DEBORAH C. STOCKDALE  
Chief, Asset Management flight

Attachments:  
Draft EA  
Draft FONSI

Honor the Warfighter
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
99TH CIVIL ENGINEER SQUADRON (ACC)
NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE, NEVADA

Ms. Deborah C. Stockdale
99 CES/CEA
6020 Beale Ave
Nellis AFB, NV 89191-7007

Commissioner Susan Brager
Chairperson, Clark County Commission
500 Grand Central Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 89106

Dear Commissioner Brager,

The 99th Air Base Wing has prepared a Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) for proposed improvements at the Mike O'Callaghan Federal Hospital (MOFH) medical campus at Nellis AFB, Nevada.

The medical infrastructure and facilities at Nellis AFB cannot meet the growing mission requirements of the USAF Air Combat Command (ACC) and there is a need to provide additional space for the 99th Medical Group (MDG) to accommodate mission growth, provide sufficient space for existing departments, and meet current medical standards of care. This DEA evaluates potential impacts of repairs and renovations to the interior of the existing hospital building, construction of new facilities, and demolition of outdated facilities.

In accordance with 32 CFR 989, the Air Force Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP), and 40 CFR 1500-1508, the Council on Environmental Quality guidelines, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, as amended, Nellis AFB requests that your agency review the assessment of the proposed action. Please send any comments no later than February 10, 2012, to Mr. Tod Oppenborn at the above address or e-mail him at tod.oppenborn@nellis.af.mil. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely

DEBORAH C. STOCKDALE
Chief, Asset Management flight

Attachments:
Draft EA
Draft FONSI

Honor the Warfighter
Ms. Deborah C. Stockdale
99 CES/CEA
6020 Beale Ave
Nellis AFB, NV 89191-7007

City of North Las Vegas
Community Development, Planning & Zoning Division
2200 Civic Center Drive, Suite 210
North Las Vegas, NV 89030

Dear Sir or Madam,

The 99th Air Base Wing has prepared a Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) for proposed improvements at the Mike O'Callaghan Federal Hospital (MOFH) medical campus at Nellis AFB, Nevada.

The medical infrastructure and facilities at Nellis AFB cannot meet the growing mission requirements of the USAF Air Combat Command (ACC) and there is a need to provide additional space for the 99th Medical Group (MDG) to accommodate mission growth, provide sufficient space for existing departments, and meet current medical standards of care. This DEA evaluates potential impacts of repairs and renovations to the interior of the existing hospital building, construction of new facilities, and demolition of outdated facilities.

In accordance with 32 CFR 989, the Air Force Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP), and 40 CFR 1500-1508, the Council on Environmental Quality guidelines, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, as amended, Nellis AFB requests that your agency review the assessment of the proposed action. Please send any comments no later than February 10, 2012, to Mr. Tod Oppenborn at the above address or e-mail him at tod.oppenborn@nellis.af.mil. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely

DEBORAH C. STOCKDALE
Chief, Asset Management flight

Attachments:
Draft EA
Draft FONSI

Honor the Warfighter
Ms. Deborah C. Stockdale  
99 CES/CEA  
6020 Beale Ave  
Nellis AFB, NV 89191-7007

Las Vegas Library  
Reference Department  
833 Las Vegas Blvd North  
Las Vegas, NV 89101

Dear Sir or Madam,

The 99th Air Base Wing has prepared a Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) for proposed improvements at the Mike O’Callaghan Federal Hospital (MOFH) medical campus at Nellis AFB, Nevada.

The medical infrastructure and facilities at Nellis AFB cannot meet the growing mission requirements of the USAF Air Combat Command (ACC) and there is a need to provide additional space for the 99th Medical Group (MDG) to accommodate mission growth, provide sufficient space for existing departments, and meet current medical standards of care. This DEA evaluates potential impacts of repairs and renovations to the interior of the existing hospital building, construction of new facilities, and demolition of outdated facilities.

In accordance with 32 CFR 989, the Air Force Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP), and 40 CFR 1500-1508, the Council on Environmental Quality guidelines, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, as amended, Nellis AFB requests that your agency review the assessment of the proposed action. Please send any comments no later than February 10, 2012, to Mr. Tod Oppenborn at the above address or e-mail him at tod oppenborn@nellis.af.mil. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely

DEBORAH C. STOCKDALE  
Chief, Asset Management flight

Attachments:  
Draft EA  
Draft FONSI

Honor the Warfighter
-----Original Message-----
From: Stephanie Garcia-Vause
mailto:Stephanie.Garcia-Vause@cityofhenderson.com
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2012 3:49 AM
To: Nancy A. Lipski
Cc: Doug Rankin; ETmantrout@hcnw.org; Paul Garner; Andrew Powell; Indy Reed; Ayoub.Ayoub@snwa.com; Bob Coffin; Betsy Pretwell; brian.bowler@lvwvd.com; Bristol Ellington; Chris Giunchigliani; chris.meenan@lvwvd.com; cwalkermccarthy.com; Daniel Kesar; Debi Leigh; Don Burnett; dtaylor@dot.state.nv.us; Flinn Fagg; fiorif@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; Gerri Schroder; gfraser@ccrfcd.org; Gina Rossol; hackert@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; JamesM@etsnv.com; Jon Wardlow; JWanillow@dot.state.nv.us; keiba.creare@snwa.com; Rodney Langston; Larry.Tamashiro@lvwvd.com; laura.jacobsen@lvwvd.com; Lisa Reiss; Linda Perri; Lawrence Weekly; Mark Calhoun; Russell Meile; Michael Tass; murphyj@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; Nancy.Hollenback@snwa.com; Ned Thomas; Nora Lared; Nicole W. Rourke; Orlando Sanchez; Patricia A. O'Gara; patty.emery@snwa.com; Paul Andricopulos; phil.speight@lvwvd.com; Lennis Kansel; Ken Gregory; Robert Warnola; rowley@snhdmail.org; Randy Tarr; Stavros Anthony; scb96@aol.com; Sean Rober; tson; Jacob Snow; Steve Wolfson; tlarkin@dot.state.nv.us; Oppenborn, Todd Civ USAR ACC 99 CES/CEAO; Tom Perrigo; Tracy Rountz; Rose Tucker; Tyrone Thompson; vmayes@hcnw.org; Wagner@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; Lewis Wallenmeyer; williamsd@snhdmail.org; woodea@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; woodja@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; XieS@rccsnv.com; Linda E. Young - Trustee; Zane.Marshall@snwa.com
Subject: Re: Mike O'Callaghan Federal Hospital at Nellis AFB

The City of Henderson concurs.

On Jan 17, 2012, at 5:07 PM, "Nancy A. Lipski" <nancya@ClarkCountyNV.gov> wrote:

Clark County concurs as well.
From: Doug Rankin [mailto:drankin@LasVegasNevada.GOV]
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2012 4:57 PM
To: Ramantrout@bcnv.org; Paul Garner
Cc: Andrew.Powell@cityofhenderson.com; Andy Reed;
Ayoub.Ayoub@snwa.com; Bob Coffin; Betsy Fretwell; brian.bowler@lvwvd.com;
Bristol.Ellington@cityofhenderson.com <mailto:Bristol.Ellington@cityofhenderson.com>; Chris Giunchigliani;
chris.meenan@lvwvd.com <mailto:chris.meenan@lvwvd.com>; cwalker@mcca rthy.com; Daniel Kesar; Debra Leigh; Don Burnette;
dtaylor@dot.state.nv.us; Flinn Fagg; ficrif@cityofnorthlasvegas.com;
Gerri.Schroder@cityofhenderson.com; gfraser@ccrfcd.org; Gina Rossol;
haskert@cityofnorthlasvegas.com <mailto:haskert@cityofnorthlasvegas.com>;
JamesM@rctcsvn.com; Jon Wardlaw; JVanHavel@dot.state.nv.us;
keiba.create@snwa.com <mailto:keiba.create@snwa.com>; Rodney Langston;
Larry.Tamashiro@lvwvd.com <mailto:Larry.Tamashiro@lvwvd.com>;
Laura.Jacobsen@lvwvd.com; Lisa.Reiss@cityofhenderson.com; Linda Perri;
Lawrence Weekly; Mark.Calhoun@cityofhenderson.com; Russell Merle;
Michael.Tacca@cityofhenderson.com; marphy@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; Nancy A.
Lipski; Nancy.Hol
lenback@snwa.com; Ned.Thomas@cityofhenderson.com <mailto:Ned.Thomas@cityofhenderson.com>; Nora Lareas; Nicole W. Dourley;
Orlando Sanchez; Patricia A. O’Gara; patty.emery@snwa.com;
Paul.Andricopulos@cityofhenderson.com <mailto:Paul.Andricopulos@cityofhenderson.com>;
phil.spight@lvwvd.com <mailto:phil.spight@lvwvd.com>; Dennis Ransel; Ron Gregory; Robert Warhola;
rowley@snhmail.org <mailto:rowley@snhmail.org>; Randy Tarr; Stavros
Anthony; sob96@aol.com <mailto:sob96@aol.com>;
Sean.Robertson@cityofhenderson.com; Jacob Snow;
Stephanie.Garcia-Vause@cityofhenderson.com; Steve Wolfson;
trankin@dot.state.nv.us; tod.oppenborn@nellis.af.mil <mailto:tod.oppenborn@nellis.af.mil>; Tom Perrigo;
Tracy.Foutz@cityofhenderson.com <mailto:Tracy.Foutz@cityofhenderson.com>;
Rose Tusher; Tyrone Thompson; rmays@bcnv.org <mailto:rmays@bcnv.org>;
WagnerW@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; Lewis Wallenmeyer; williamsd@snhmail.org;
wooda@cityofnorthlasvegas.com <mailto:wooda@cityofnorthlasvegas.com>;
Woodj@cityofnorthlasvegas.com <mailto:Woodj@cityofnorthlasvegas.com>;
XieB@rctcsvn.com; Linda E. Young - Trustee; <mailto:Zane.Marshall@snwa.com>
Zane.Marshall@snwa.com

Subject: RE: Mike O’Callaghan Federal Hospital at Nellis AFB

As does the City of Las Vegas. No find of significant impact.
From: Barmantrout@bcnv.org (mailto:Barmantrout@bcnv.org)
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2012 4:38 PM
To: Paul Garner
Cc: Andrew.Powell@cityofhenderson.com; Andy Reed; Ayoub.Ayoub@snwa.com; Bob Coffin; Betsy Fretwell; brian.bowler@lvvwd.com; Bristol.Ellington@cityofhenderson.com; CHERISG@ClarkCountyNV.gov; chris.meenan@lvvwd.com; cwalker@mccarthy.com; dank@ClarkCountyNV.gov; DebLeigh@cityofhenderson.com; dgb@ClarkCountyNV.gov; Doug Rankin; dtaylor@dot.state.nv.us; Flinn Fagg; florif@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; gfraser@ccrfcd.org; gm@ClarkCountyNV.gov; hackert@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; jkw@ClarkCountyNV.gov; JVanHavel@dot.state.nv.us; kibal. creas@snwa.com; LANGSTON@ClarkCountyNV.gov; Larry.Tamashiro@lvvwd.com; laura.jacobson@lvvwd.com; Lisa.Reiss@cityofhenderson.com; Linda Perr; LWeekly@ClarkCountyNV.gov; Mark.Calhoun@cityofhenderson.com; merle@ClarkCountyNV.gov; Michael.Tassi@cityofhenderson.com; murphyj@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; nancya@ClarkCountyNV.gov; Nancy.Hollenback@snwa.com; Nancy.Hollenback@snwa.com; Neda.Thomas@cityofhenderson.com; NoraLares; Nicole W. Rouke; Orlando Sanchez; Patricia A. O’Gara; patty.emery@snwa.com; Paul.Andricopulos@cityofhenderson.com; phil.speight@lvvwd.com; Phil.Speight@lvvwd.com; RANSEL@ClarkCountyNV.gov; RGY@ClarkCountyNV.gov; Robert.Warhola@ccdnv.com; sean.robertson@cityofhenderson.com; Ral_1@lvvwd.com; rowley@snhdmail.org; RTarr@ClarkCountyNV.gov; Stavros Anthony; scb36@aol.com; Sean.Robertson@cityofhenderson.com; Sean.Robertson@cityofhenderson.com; snowj@rtcsnv.com; stephanie.garcia-vause@cityofhenderson.com; steve.Wolfson@lvvwd.com; ted.openborn@nellis.af.mil; Tom Perrigo; Tracy.Fouts@cityofhenderson.com; Tuckerrm@ClarkCountyNV.gov; tuckerRM@ClarkCountyNV.gov; TTYT@ClarkCountyNV.gov; vmayes@bcnv.org; WagnerW@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; WagnerW@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; Wallenmeyer@ClarkCountyNV.gov; Wallenmeyer@ClarkCountyNV.gov; wallenmeyer@ClarkCountyNV.gov; wooda@snhdmail.org; woodja@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; XieB@rtcsnv.com; Linda E. Young - Trustee; Zane.Marshall@snwa.com

Subject: Re: Mike O’Callaghan Federal Hospital at Nellis AFB

Boulder City has no comments to add and agrees with their Finding of No Significant Impact.
From: Paul Gerner <pgerner@interact.ccds.net>
To: <Debi.Leigh@cityofhenderson.com>, <wooda@cityofnorthlasc vegas.com>, <bcoffin@lasvegasnevada.gov>, <cswalker@mccarthy.com>, <CHRI3G@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <Gerr1.Schroder@cityofhenderson.com>, <LWeekly@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <saltchony@lasvegasnevada.gov>, <swolfson@lasvegasnevada.gov>, <sb96@acol.com>, <Wagner@cityofnorthlasc vegas.com>, "Linda E. Young - Trustee"
youngle@interact.ccds.net, <bffretwell@lasvegasnevada.gov>, <Bristol.Ellington@cityofhenderson.com>, <Dormanrout@bcnv.org>, <dbg@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <fiorif@cityofnorthlasc vegas.com>, <hackert@cityofnorthlasc vegas.com>, <snowi@rtsnv.com>, <jkw@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <woodja@cityofnorthlasc vegas.com>,<Wallenmeyer@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <Mark.Calhoun@cityofhenderson.com>, <csanchez@lasvegasnevada.gov>, <Paul.Andricopoulos@cityofhenderson.com>, <phil.spight@lvwvd.com>, <RTen@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <vmeye@bcnv.org>, <Andrew.Powell@cityofhenderson.com>, <areed@LasVegasNevada.GOV>, <Ayoub.Ayoub@snwa.com>, <brian.bowles@lvwvd.com>, <chris.meehan@lvwvd.com>, <!dank@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <RANKEL@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <dtaylor@dot.state.nv.us>, <drrainkin@lasvegasnevada.gov>, <ffagg@LasVegasNevada.GOV>, <gfraser@crfcd.org>, <gm@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <JVanHovel@dot.state.nv.us> , <murphyj@cityofnorthlasc vegas.com>, <keiba.cre@snwa.com>, <Larry.Tamashiro@lvwvd.com>, <laura.jacobson@lvwvd.com>, Linda Perri <lperri@interact.ccds.net>, <Lisa.Reis@cityofhenderson.com>, <JamesM@rtsnv.com>, <Michael.Tassi@cityofhenderson.com>, <nancya@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <Nancy.Hollenbeck@snwa.com>, <Ned.Thomas@cityofhenderson.com>, "Nicole W. Rourke" <nrourke@interact.ccds.net>, <nlares@lasvegasnevada.gov>, "Patricia A. O'Gara" <PAOGara@interact.ccds.net>, <potty.emery@snwa.com>, <Robert.Warchola@ccdav.com>, <LANGSTON@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <RGV@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <tuckerm@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <rowley@snhdmall.org>, <marle@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <Sean.Robertson@cityofhenderson.com>, <Stephanie.Garcia-Vause@cityofhenderson.com>, <tperrigo@lasvegasnevada.gov>,<Tracy.Fouts@cityofhenderson.com>, <traylor@dot.state.nv.us>, <TYT@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <williamsd@snhdmall.org>, <XieB@rtsnv.com>, <Zane.Marshalls@snwa.com>, <Debi.Leigh@cityofhenderson.com>, <towd.openborn@nellis.af.mil>

Date: 01/17/2012 04:22 PM
Subject: Re: Mike O'Callaghan Federal Hospital at Nellis AFB

I concur in the FONSI. JPEG
Debi Leigh <Debi.Leigh@cityofhenderson.com> <
Mike O’Callaghan Federal Medical Center Campus Master Plan Improvements Environmental Assessment

mailto:Debi.Leigh@cityofhenderson.com> > on Tuesday, January 17, 2012 at 11:27 AM -0800 wrote:

Dear SNRPC member,

Nellis AFB has requested that SNRPC review the assessment of the proposed improvements at the Mike O’Callaghan Federal Hospital medical campus at Nellis AFB.

Please see the attached letter and Draft Environmental Assessment of the project. If you have any questions or comments please send them to <mailto: tod.oppenborn@nellis.af.mil> tod.oppenborn@nellis.af.mil no later than February 10, 2012.

Thank you.

Debi Leigh
Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition
240 Water Street MS 115, Henderson, NV 89009-5050
(702) 267-1530 7 (702) 267-1501
<http://www.snrpc.org/>
-----Original Message-----
From: Lewis Wallenmeyer [mailto:Wallenmeyer@clarkcounty_nv.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2012 7:59 AM
To: Nancy A. Lipski: 'Doug Rankin'; Harmantrout@bcnv.org; Paul Gerner
Cc: Andrew.Fowell@cityofhenderson.com; Andy Reed; Ayoub.Ayoub@snwa.com; Bob
Coffin; Betsy Fretwell; brian.bowler@lvwv.com;
Bristol.Ellington@cityofhenderson.com; Chris Giunchigliani;
chris.meehan@lvwv.com; cwalker@mccarthy.com; Daniel Kazar; Debra Leigh; Don
Burnette; dtaylor@dot.state.nv.us; Flinn Fagg; florin@cityofnorthlasvegas.com;
Gerri.Schroder@cityofhenderson.com; gfraser@scrfd.org; Gina Rossol;
hackert@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; JamesM@rtcnv.com; Jon Wardlaw;
JVanHavel@dot.state.nv.us; keiba.creer@snwa.com; Rodney Langston;
Larry.Tamashiro@lvwv.com; laura.jacobsen@lvwv.com;
Lana.Reiss@cityofhenderson.com; Linda Forli; LasVegas Weekly;
Mark.Calhoun@cityofhenderson.com; Russell Merle;
Michael.Fay@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; Nancy.Hollenback@snwa.com; Ned.Thomas@cityofhenderson.com; Nora Larsen; Nicole
W. Rourke; Orlando Sanchez; Patricia A. O’Gara; patty.emery@snwa.com;
Paul.Andricopulos@cityofhenderson.com; phil.speight@lvwv.com; Dennis Ransel;
Ron Gregory; Robert Warhola; rowley@snhmail.org; Randy Tarr; Stavros Anthony;
scb@aoi.com; Sean.Robertson@cityofhenderson.com; Jacob Snow;
Stephanie.Garcia-Vause@cityofhenderson.com; Steve Wolfson;
tclark@dot.state.nv.us; Oppegard, Tod CIV USAF ACC JFO C/O Tom Ferraro;
Tracy.Fouts@cityofhenderson.com; Rose Tucker; Tyrone Thompson;
vmay@bcnv.org; Wagner.K@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; williams.m@snhmail.org;
woodg@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; woodj@cityofnorthlasvegas.com;
XieB@rtcnv.com; Linda E. Young – Trustee; Jane.Marshall@snwa.com
Subject: RE: Mike O’Callaghan Federal Hospital at Nellis AFB

Clark County Air Quality also concurs with the FONSI.

Lewis

Lewis Wallenmeyer, Director
Department of Air Quality & Environmental Management
500 S Grand Central Parkway
Box 555210
Las Vegas, NV 89155-5210
(702) 455-1600
From: Nancy A. Lipski
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2012 5:07 PM
To: 'Doug Rankin'; EARmantrout@bcnv.org; Paul Gerner
Cc: Andrew.Powell@cityofhenderson.com; Andy Reed; Ayoub.Ayoub@snwa.com; Bob Coffin; betsy fretwel; brian.bowler@lvvwd.com; Bristol.Ellington@cityofhenderson.com; Chris Giunchigliani; chris.meean@lvvwd.com; ewalker@moesathy.com; Daniel Kesar; Debra Leigh; Don Burnette; dtbaylor@dot.state.nv.us; Flinn Fagg; fiorif@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; Gerri.Schroder@cityofhenderson.com; gfraser@crfcd.org; Gina Rossol; hackert@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; JamesM@rtcsnv.com; Jon Wardlaw; JVanHavel@dot.state.nv.us; keiba.cray@snwa.com; Rodney Langston; Larry.Tamashiro@lvvwd.com; laura.jacobsen@lvvwd.com; Lisa.Reiss@cityofhenderson.com; Linda Perri; Lawrence Weekly; Mark.Calhoun@cityofhenderson.com; Russell Merle; Michael.Tassi@cityofhenderson.com; murphyj@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; Nancy.Hollenback@snwa.com; Ned.Thomas@cityofhenderson.com; Nora Laree; Nicole W. Rourke; Orlando Sanchez; Patricia A. O’Gara; patty.emery@snwa.com; Paul.Andricopoulos@cityofhenderson.com; phil.speight@lvvwd.com; Dennis Ransel; Ron Gregory; Robert Warhola; rowley@snhdmail.org; Randy Tarr; Stavros Anthony; sb96@aol.com; Sean.Robertson@cityofhenderson.com; Jacob Snow; Stephanie.Garcia-Vause@cityofhenderson.com; Steve Wolfson; tlarkin@dot.state.nv.us; tod.cpenborn@nellis.af.mil; Tom Perrigo; Tracy.Foust@cityofhenderson.com; kose Tucker; Tyrone Thompson; vmayes@bcnv.org; WagnerW@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; Lewis Wallenmeyer; williames@snhdmail.org; woodja@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; woodja@cityofnorthlasvegas.com; XieB@rtnsnv.com; Linda E. Young - Trustee; Jane.Marshall@snwa.com
Subject: RE: Mike O’Callaghan Federal Hospital at Nellis AFB

Clark County concurs as well.
As does the City of Las Vegas...No find of significant impact.

Doug Rankin, AICP

Planning Manager

City of Las Vegas

333 N. Rancho Drive at Bonanza Rd.

229-5408
Boulder City has no comments to add and agrees with their Finding of No Significant Impact.

Brok Armantrout, Director
Community Development Department
City of Boulder City, Nevada
P.O. Box 61350
Boulder City, NV 89006-1350
702.293.9282
barmantrout@bcnv.org
From: Paul Gerner <pgerner@interact.ccsd.net>
To: <Debi.Leigh@cityofhenderson.com>, <boconnor@lasvegasnevada.gov>, <cwalker@mccarthy.com>, <CHRISG@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <Geri.Schroeder@cityofhenderson.com>, <LWeekly@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <santhony@lasvegasnevada.gov>, <swolfson@lasvegasnevada.gov>, <scb96@aol.com>, <WagnerW@cityofnorthlasvegas.com>, "Linda E. Young - Trustee" <youngl@interact.ccsd.net>, <bretwall@lasvegasnevada.gov>, <Bristol.Ellington@cityofhenderson.com>, <barmantrou@bcnv.org>, <dgde@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <ficrif@cityofnorthlasvegas.com>, <hockert@cityofnorthlasvegas.com>, <snowj@rtcsnv.com>, <jkw@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <woodeja@cityofnorthlasvegas.com>, <Wallenmeyer@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <Mark.Calhoun@cityofhenderson.com>, <csanchez@lasvegasnevada.gov>, <Paul.Andricopulos@cityofhenderson.com>, <phil.speight@lvwwd.com>, <RTarr@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <umayes@bcnv.org>, <Andrew.Powell@cityofhenderson.com>, <areed@LasVegasNevada.GOV>, <Ayoub.Ayoub@snwa.com>, <brian.bowler3@lvwwd.com>, <chris.meenan@lvwwd.com>, <dank@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <RANSEL@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <dtaylor@dot.state.nv.us>, <drankin@lasvegasnevada.gov>, <ffagg@LasVegasNevada.GOV>, <gfraser@ccrfcd.org>, <mgm@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <JVanHavel@dot.state.nv.us>, <murphyj@cityofnorthlasvegas.com>, <keiba.crear@snwa.com>, <Larry.Tamashiro@lvwwd.com>, <Louise.jacobson@lvwwd.com>, <Linda.Perri@cityofhenderson.com>, <Lisa.Reiss@cityofhenderson.com>, <JamesM@rtcsnv.com>, <Michael.Tassi@cityofhenderson.com>, <nancya@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <Nancy.Wallenmeyer@snwa.com>, "Ned.Thomas@cityofhenderson.com", "Nicole W. Rourke" <nrouke@interact.ccsd.net>, <nlares@lasvegasnevada.gov>, "Patricia A. O'Gara" <PAGara@interact.ccsd.net>, <patty.emery@snwa.com>, <Robert.Wahrhola@ccdanv.com>, <LANGSTON@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <RGY@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <tuckerrm@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <rcrowley@snhdmail.org>, <merle@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <Sean.Robertson@cityofhenderson.com>, <Stephanie.Garcia-Vause@cityofhenderson.com>, <tperrigo@lasvegasnevada.gov>, <Tracy.Fouts@cityofhenderson.com>, <clarke@dot.state.nv.us>, <TVM@ClarkCountyNV.gov>, <williamsd@snhdmail.org>, <XieB@rtcsnv.com>, <Zane.Marshall@snwa.com>, <Debi.Leigh@rtcsnv.com>, <tcodt.openborn@nellis.af.mil>
Date: 01/17/2012 04:22 PM
Subject: Re: Mike O’Callaghan Federal Hospital at Nellis AFB

I concur in the FONSI. JPG
8.0 List of Preparers and Contributors

8.1 Preparers

This Environmental Assessment was prepared under contract with Altus Architectural Studios, Inc. in partnership with Kenneth Hahn Architects and Short Elliott Hendrickson, Inc.

The following individuals prepared the document:

Kelly A. Henry, Sr. Scientist, principal author
Short Elliott Hendrickson, Inc.
3535 Vadnais Center Drive
St. Paul, MN 55110
651.490.2146
khenry@sehinc.com

Jennifer Bring, Senior Cultural Resources Planner
106 Group, LLC
370 Selby Ave Ste 206
St. Paul, MN 55012
651.290.0977
jennybring@106group.com

Michael Hamilton, AIA, Project Manager
Altus Architectural Studios, Inc.
12925 West Dodge Road
Omaha, NE 68154
402.334.2422
mhamilton@altusstudios.com

Stephen R. Smith, AIA, LEED AP, Editorial review
Kenneth Hahn Architects
1343 South 75th Street
Omaha, NE 68124-1610
402.391.2111
steve@kharch.com

8.2 Contributors

Ms. Lynn Haarkau, 99CES/CEAO, Chief, Asset Optimization, Nellis AFB, NV

Mr. Tod Oppenborn, 99CES/CEAO, NEPA Manager, Nellis AFB, NV

Mr. Keith Myhrer, 99 CES/CEAN, Senior Archaeologist, Nellis AFB, NV

Mr. Cory L. Aldean, CHFM, 99MDG, Facility Manager, Mike O’Callaghan Federal Medical Center Campus, Nellis AFB, NV

Mr. Derek S. Findlay, 1st Lt, USAF, BSC, Health Facilities Division, AFMSA/SG8F, San Antonio, TX
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Appendix A

Proposed MOFMC Renovation Plan
CRITICAL ADJACENCIES
Critical Adjacencies
Basement

LOGISTICS

BACK-OF-HOUSE
(DFAC/LOGISTICS/E & T/IMIT)

ADMIN
(Medical & Patient - Continues to 1st Flr)
Critical Adjacencies

2nd Floor

- SURGERY CLINCS
- SURGERY CENTER
- DIALYSIS/ RESPIRATORY THERAPY
- COMMAND- IM/IT
- DENTAL

SGOS & IPTS/CC Backfills VA Space
O.R. Elevators
E.R. Elevator
Public Elevators
Public Elevator

Vacated VA

6 offices move/ convert to DTR’s
With 4 @ Creech= 50 DTR’s
Critical Adjacencies
3rd Floor

NURSING UNITS
(Access to 2nd Flr Surgery and 1st Flr ED)

COMPREHENSIVE OB SERVICES
(Primary Care on 1st Flr)

Women’s Health Clinic
Incl Mammo & U.S.
RELOCATION LOGIC

FY 12+  POST VA

PRE-DECISIONAL
Education/Training/ Simulation Center
3- 600 sq ft classrooms w/Operable partitions

DFAC/ Nutritional Medicine

DML/FM
-Relocated

Logistics

Topa / Medical Management

Readiness

MDSS

RMO

IM/IT

Morgue

Maintenance

*Colors are for graphical clarity only

NO/ LIGHT- LEVEL I

MEDIUM- LEVEL II

HEAVY- LEVEL III

*Colors are for graphical clarity only
THIRD FLOOR - EXISTING

AF Med/ Surgical ~13,800 sq ft (VA Med/ Surgical) ~10,900 sq ft (VA Clinic)
~11,300 sq ft (VA)

No changes
Appendix B

SHPO Concurrence Letter
January 3, 2001

Lieutenant Colonel Arvil E. White III
Commander, 99th Civil Engineer Squadron
U.S. Air Force
6020 Beale Avenue
Nellis AFB NV 89191-7260

RE: Proposed Expansion in Area II (Weapons and Munitions Storage Area) and Area III, Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas Valley, Clark County (Report Number: NAFB-00-04).

Dear Lieutenant Colonel White:

The Nevada State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) reviewed the cultural resources inventory for the proposed undertaking. The SHPO concurs with the U.S. Department of the Air Force’s determination that the following site is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under any of the Secretary’s criteria:

26Ck6075.

This cultural resource inventory report was completed following an intensive archaeological and historic inventory of the project area. No historic properties were found within the area of potential effect (APE) for the subject undertaking. As a result, the SHPO concurs with the U.S. Department of the Air Force’s determination that no historic properties will be affected by the undertaking.

If you have any questions concerning this correspondence, please feel free to call Rebecca Lynn Palmer at (775) 684-3443 or by e-mail at rlpalmer@clan.lib.nv.us.

Sincerely,

Alice M. Baldrica, Deputy
State Historic Preservation Officer