



ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Resource Area	Alternative 1: Implement IDP Five-Year Projects	Alternative 2: Alternative Siting for IDP Five-Year Projects
Air Quality	Short-term, minor effects on air quality from demolition and construction activities. Long-term, minor effects from operations and vehicular travel from increased personnel.	Effects would be similar to Alternative 1, but slightly less, since slightly less criteria pollutant emissions would occur during construction. Intensity would still be the same (minor).
Water Resources	Short-term, minor effects on groundwater, surface water, and floodplains from construction activities. Long-term, minor effects on groundwater, surface water, and floodplains from increased impervious surfaces. No effects on wetlands.	Effects would be similar to Alternative 1, but slightly less, since proposed ground disturbance and impervious surfaces would be slightly less. Intensity would still be the same (minor).
Biological Resources	Direct, minor effects on vegetation. Short-term, negligible wildlife effects from construction noise, displacement, and mortality. No long-term effects to wildlife habitat. No significant effects on threatened or endangered species; coordination with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is ongoing.	Effects would be similar to Alternative 1, but slightly less effects on monarch butterfly host plant milkweed.
Cultural Resources	National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) compliance for each project would occur once adequate designs for consultation are available. The Air Force would avoid all historic properties where feasible and conduct archaeological investigations for each project where necessary. The Air Force would seek to avoid, minimize, and mitigate any potential adverse effects to historic properties through consultation with the DC State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).	Effects would be similar to Alternative 1, as the proposed projects are either in the same location as Alternative 1 or if in different locations are still within the same historic districts as Alternative 1. All of the same steps identified under Alternative 1 would be followed.
Infrastructure	Short-term, minor effects to utility infrastructure and services at JBAB during construction due to intermittent disruptions. Long-term, minor, adverse effects due to increased demand on infrastructure. Long-term, beneficial effects on electrical reliability at JBAB.	Effects would be similar to Alternative 1.
Noise	Short-term, minor effects from construction activities. Long-term, minor effects from increase in traffic. Noise levels would not be uncommon within the existing noisy/very noisy urban environment.	Effects would be similar to Alternative 1.
Transportation	Short-term, adverse effects on truck access and traffic during construction. Minimal long-term effects on the pedestrian, bicycle, and transit networks. Long-term, adverse effects on traffic due to additional volume of vehicles. Three intersections would require mitigation to offset anticipated traffic effects. With mitigation, no significant effects.	Short-term, adverse effects to sidewalks, truck access, and traffic during construction. Minimal long-term effects on the pedestrian, bicycle, and transit networks. Long-term, adverse effects on traffic due to additional volume of vehicles. Four intersections would require mitigation to offset anticipated traffic effects. With mitigation, no significant effects.

Resource Area	Alternative 1: Implement IDP Five-Year Projects	Alternative 2: Alternative Siting for IDP Five-Year Projects
Hazardous Materials and Waste	Short-term, minor, adverse effects during demolition and construction. Long-term, negligible, beneficial effects from reduced amounts of hazardous materials.	Effects would be similar to Alternative 1.

No Action Alternative: Potential environmental effects under the No Action Alternative would be the same as existing conditions. There would be no change to the baseline scenario and no significant effects.

Alternative 1 better consolidates base functions compared to Alternative 2 for several reasons:

- 1. Minimized Disruptions** – Placing the National Capital Region (NCR) Center of Excellence in Giesboro Park under Alternative 1 avoids additional demolitions and retains more operational capacity. Alternative 2, by contrast, places this facility at the Blanchard Barracks site, requiring the demolition of four additional buildings, increasing disruptions and logistical challenges.
- 2. Medical Facility Centralization** – Alternative 1 fully consolidates JBAB’s medical services by constructing a new 316th Medical Squadron (MDS) Clinic on McChord Street within the core town center, ensuring proximity to other community facilities. Alternative 2 only partially consolidates medical services through renovations and additions, maintaining a fragmented layout.
- 3. Education and Youth Support Integration** – Alternative 1 places the Child Development Center (CDC) next to the JBAB Charter School, consolidating youth services in one area for improved accessibility and efficiency. Alternative 2 sites the CDC separately, reducing the benefits of co-locating educational and childcare facilities.
- 4. Optimized Land Use** – Alternative 1 ensures efficient placement of the Defense Information System Agency (DISA) Facility and MDS Clinic, aligning them with JBAB’s broader mission and minimizing inefficiencies. Alternative 2’s dispersed layout reduces co-location benefits.

Overall, Alternative 1 offers a more strategic and functional consolidation of base operations, enhancing efficiency while reducing disruptions and demolitions.