



Frequently Asked Questions for Construction of a Large Vehicle Inspection Station (LVIS) and Access Control Point (ACP) at Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling (JBAB) Environmental Assessment (EA)

Project Specific Questions

What is a large vehicle inspection station (LVIS) and access control point (ACP)?

LVIS and ACP are used by the Department of Defense to inspect individuals entering in personal vehicles to ensure they have proper Department of Defense identification and authority to enter the installation, and to inspect and process any commercial vehicles entering the installation. LVIS and ACP generally include vehicle barriers, an identification check area, inspection areas, a bus stop area, a search area office, gatehouses for both commercial trucks and personal vehicles, and fencing. They can also include a permanent vehicle X-ray unit and a backup generator, as would the one proposed for the First Sterling gate at JBAB.

What is UFC 04-022-01 and why is it important?

The Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) are a series of documents that provide planning, design, construction, sustainment, restoration, and modernization criteria for military and defense agencies. These guidelines ensure that facilities are designed, constructed, and maintained at a consistent and acceptable standard to meet safety, performance, and mission sustainment requirements across all installations. For example, the UFC documents determine the amount of parking to be provided and the types of security measures that should be implemented at an access control point. UFC 04-022-01 specifically pertains to security engineering, including entry control facilities and ACP. The Air Force determined that the existing Firth Sterling Gate is not compliant with the UFC requirements; this indicates that the gate facilities do not provide adequate safety or functionality as determined by UFC 04-022-01 and, thus, could impact JBAB's mission sustainment capabilities in the long term.

Why does the Air Force need a new LVIS and ACP?

The construction of a new, UFC-compliant LVIS and ACP is needed to improve overall safety, security, and traffic flow effectiveness on the installation. The JBAB LVIS is currently located at the South Gate, in the family housing section of the installation. Vehicles routinely back up onto the public areas of South Capitol Street and reroute to the Main Arnold Gate due to overcapacity, causing traffic flow inefficiencies and increasing risk and traffic burdens on public roads. For these reasons, JBAB wishes to move the LVIS to a different ACP. There is no permanent practicable way to process commercial vehicles at the Firth Sterling Gate in its current configuration. A new, LVIS would add commercial vehicle inspection capabilities that would improve installation access, emergency response capability, and installation risk mitigation; and reduce impacts on the local public road network adjacent to JBAB. Bringing the Firth Sterling Gate into compliance with UFC 04-022-01 would also enhance safety and security on the installation.

Where would the new LVIS and ACP be located?

They would be located at the Firth Sterling Gate at JBAB, which is on the north end of the installation, off South Capitol Street. Currently, the Firth Sterling Gate primarily accommodates installation personnel with Department of Defense identification cards and is not open 24 hours.

What types of vehicles would use the LVIS and ACP?

The LVIS and ACP would serve privately owned vehicles (POVs) with Department of Defense identification or with a valid visitor pass, and commercial vehicles for inspection and processing, such as delivery trucks carrying goods and supplies to restock the restaurants and grocery market on the installation.

How would the alternatives affect traffic near the installation?

Concurrent with development of the Draft EA, the Air Force prepared a Transportation Study that is included as an appendix to the Draft EA. The study looked at the anticipated transportation impacts that could occur within the region when considering planned external developments and anticipated growth in the area. The study found that the No Action Alternative would continue to result in traffic backing up onto the local roadways, resulting in minor, adverse impacts. Alternative 1 would result in long-term traffic impacts at several intersections with minor increases in queue length, while other intersections would experience decreases in queue length. No intersections would result in significant impacts or would require mitigation measures. Alternative 1 would result in queues for the POVs that would extend beyond installation roadways and onto public roadways. Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts as Alternative 1, but the POV queues would not extend beyond the installation roadways. Under Alternative 3, if the gate were to close and all traffic diverted to the other two JBAB gates, traffic impacts would be similar to the

No Action Alternative, but would result in queues at three intersections that would require mitigation to offset significant impacts.

Would the proposed alternatives create more noise?

Under Alternatives 1 and 2, short-term impacts would include noise from construction and demolition activities consisting of intermittent, instantaneous sound levels. Construction activities would typically occur on weekdays between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Given the heavily traveled roadways and buildings between the proposed project site and the closest residences, it is not likely that residences would be exposed to noise levels that are uncommon in the existing ambient environment. In the long term, the increase in vehicles during the peak hour was found to be less than one percent and would not contribute to significant noise impacts. The Alternative 3 project site is the same as Alternatives 1 and 2. This alternative would include demolition and only minor fence construction, resulting in similar noise conditions to Alternative 1, but the amount of time people would be exposed to noise would be shorter. Alternative 3 would not result in any significant noise impacts and would reduce traffic in the long term, creating a beneficial impact on the noise environment.

Would there be increased safety risks with any of the alternatives?

Alternatives 1 and 2 propose two different design solutions for the LVIS and ACP at the Firth Sterling Gate. Both alternatives improve safety on the installation by attaining compliance with UFC 04-022-01, and they improve safety in the surrounding public areas by providing additional space for vehicle queuing, which reduces the risk of congestion on public roadways and crashes. The Alternatives 1 and 2 project site is located in a 100-year floodplain, but the design solutions for both alternatives address these conditions by constructing the facilities and flood-susceptible utilities at least 3 feet above the 100-year flood elevation. Alternative 3 includes the closure of the Firth Sterling Gate, and traffic would be diverted to the other two gates at the installation. Commercial vehicle traffic would continue to be processed at the South Gate, which poses safety risks to installation residents and causes significant vehicle queuing on the nearby public roadways. Similar safety risks would be expected under the No Action Alternative.

What would happen at JBAB if none of the alternatives were implemented?

The EA analyzes the potential impacts of a No Action Alternative, under which the proposed construction of the LVIS and ACP at the Firth Sterling Gate would not proceed. The existing inspection station would remain at the South Gate, and Firth Sterling Gate would continue to be noncompliant with UFC 04-022-01, which poses a safety risk to the installation. The current LVIS is located at the South Gate in the family housing section of the installation, and it cannot be improved in its current location without negatively affecting family housing. The impact of not addressing safety includes a greater exposure to crashes and a loss of productivity. Vehicles would continue to back up onto the public areas at the South Gate due to overcapacity, making traffic flow inefficient and placing a burden on public roads.

Would any of the alternatives have negative impacts on water resources?

Impacts on water resources would be similar for both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. Construction activities would not require withdrawals from or discharges to surface water or groundwater. There could be shallow groundwater at the site which would require dewatering, or pumping groundwater from the construction site only during below-grade construction. It is expected that groundwater levels will return to normal once dewatering is complete. The groundwater at the site is potentially contaminated with per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), which would require handling of dewatering materials in accordance with applicable environmental regulations. The project area is approximately 10 acres, and the conceptual designs of Alternatives 1 and 2 would increase impervious surface of the area by roughly 6 acres and 6.2 acres, respectively. Impervious surface can reduce stormwater infiltration to aquifers; however, the proposed loss of infiltration area is relatively small in the context of an already urban and impervious environment. Stormwater management facilities that are incorporated into the Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 designs would ensure that post-development hydrology meets or improves pre-development hydrology, pursuant to Section 438 of the Energy Independence and Security Act.

Executive Order (EO) 11988 requires federal agencies to avoid occupancy and modification of floodplains and to avoid supporting floodplain development to the greatest extent possible; if floodplain development cannot be avoided, new or rehabilitated structures shall be elevated above the base flood level instead of filling in the land. The entire Alternative 1 site is currently within the 100-year floodplain. As a result, the facility and all flood-susceptible utilities would be constructed at least 3 feet above the 100-year floodplain elevation to comply with current requirements for floodplain construction. Because the Firth Sterling Gate is currently located in the 100-year floodplain, Alternatives 1 and 2 would not result in significant changes to the existing floodplain, and impacts would be minor. Due to the location of the gate within the floodplain, there is no practicable alternative for this action. Overall impacts on water resources under Alternatives 1 and 2 would be minor; no significant impacts would occur.

Under Alternative 3, JBAB would close the Firth Sterling Gate to vehicle access and demolish the existing facilities and pavement, thus removing approximately 2 acres of impervious surface and providing minor, beneficial impacts on water resources. Operations under Alternative 3 would not have significant impacts on water resources.

What happens if one of the alternatives is within a floodplain?

If the Air Force finds that there is no practicable alternative to implementing a Proposed Action in a floodplain, under EO 11988, a Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA) would be prepared in conjunction with a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). Prior to taking action, the Air Force designs or modifies its action to minimize potential harm to or within the floodplain. For

this action, this includes the construction of the LVIS facility and all flood-susceptible utilities at least 3 feet above the 100-year floodplain elevation. In addition, the Air Force is required to prepare and circulate a notice containing an explanation of why the action is proposed to be located in the floodplain. For this action, the Air Force published a notice on March 17–19, 2023 for early public notice of a proposed activity within the 100-year floodplain at JBAB.

Would any of the alternatives have negative impacts on air quality?

There would be no impacts on air quality under the No Action Alternative since there would be no change to existing conditions. Alternatives 1 and 2 would result in short- and long-term, minor air emissions from construction and facility operations. The short- and long-term air emissions resulting from Alternative 3 would be less than those modeled for Alternatives 1 and 2. Short-term emissions would occur from demolition of the current facilities at the Firth Sterling Gate and the installation of a new fence. No other construction activities or changes in stationary sources such as standby generators are anticipated with Alternative 3.

How can I submit my written comments on the content of the Draft EA?

You may submit your questions or comments by writing an email to NAVFACWASHNEPA1@navy.mil, and include ATTN: LVIS EA in the subject line. You can also submit via U.S. mail to the address provided on the website (<https://www.jbab.jb.mil/JBAB-Units-Agencies/11th-Wing/Mission-Support-Group/Environmental/>). Comments must be submitted by email no later than **11:59 pm EST on February 22, 2024**, or postmarked by that date if mailed, so that we can consider them for the Final EA.

What types of comments are you seeking as part of the Draft EA public comment period?

The Air Force is seeking comments specific to the content of the Draft EA, rather than those that simply state support or opposition to the proposed action and/or alternatives. Specific, focused questions or comments on the proposed action, alternatives, and analysis within the document and the NEPA process will be considered in preparation of the Final EA.

General NEPA Questions

What is NEPA?

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), signed into law on January 1, 1970, sets the national policies and goals for protection and enhancement of the environment, and is a procedural statute for application by all federal agencies. NEPA requires federal agencies to assess the environmental effects of their proposed actions prior to making decisions.

When does NEPA apply?

NEPA applies whenever a proposed activity will occur on federal lands, is funded with federal money, or is sponsored by a federal entity. NEPA's basic policy is to ensure that all branches of government give proper consideration to the environment prior to undertaking any major federal action that significantly affects the environment.

What is the purpose of an Environmental Assessment?

An EA is a concise public document that briefly provides sufficient evidence and analysis of a proposed action to determine whether the action will have significant impacts on the environment. The EA may provide the rationale for a decision on a proposed action. In addition, an EA may be prepared to assist in planning or decision-making, simplify permit approval, or help obtain other necessary legal clearances.

How does the public play a role in the NEPA process?

Public participation is an integral part of NEPA's procedural requirements. The Air Force is seeking public comment on this Draft EA to gain feedback on the alternatives and environmental consequences. The Air Force makes every effort to understand public concerns, accurately record public comments, and allow adequate time for involvement by the affected public.

How will the Air Force use my comment?

At the end of the public comment period, the Air Force reviews all comments received on the Draft EA. If a comment warrants further analysis or discussion in the EA, the Air Force will update the Final EA to consider new information received in or prompted by a comment. Your comment might appear in the appendix of the Final EA, which will be available online for review. Your name and comment will become part of the public record; however, the Air Force will not release your contact information.

What is next, and when would this go into effect?

Following the public comment period, the Air Force will consider all public comments when preparing the Final EA. If the conclusion of the Final EA is that there would be no significant impacts associated with the proposed action, the Air Force will sign a Finding of No Significant Impact, or FONSI, and a Finding of No Practicable Alternative, or FONPA. Following this signature, the Air Force could implement the proposed action. It is anticipated that the Final EA will be finished this spring. The Final EA would be published on the installation website when it is finished, along with the FONSI and FONPA, if warranted.