Fort Wainwright
Disposition of Hangars 2 & 3

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(ERRATUM TO THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT)

FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA

NOVEMBER 2013

IMCOM
SOLDIERS • FAMILIES • CIVILIANS

FINAL
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(ERRATUM TO THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT)

Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3

Fort Wainwright, Alaska

November 2013

This page intentionally left blank.

Printed on recycled paper

Final
Environmental Impact Statement
(Erratum to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement)

Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3

Fort Wainwright, Alaska

APPROVED BY:

Wesley D. Potter
Acting Garrison Manager

31 Oct 2013
Date

This page intentionally left blank.

To the Reader:

This document follows the public comment period, which was held from June 21, 2013, to August 5, 2013, for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 at Fort Wainwright, Alaska. Because public and agency comments on the Draft EIS did not result in the modification of the alternatives or the environmental analysis in the Draft EIS, the full text of the Draft EIS has not been reprinted. Instead, the content of this document is meant to be used in conjunction with the Draft EIS, and these two documents together constitute the Final EIS for the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 at Fort Wainwright, Alaska.

Federal and United States (U.S.) Department of the Army (Army) regulations allow for an abbreviated Final EIS when few changes result from comments on a Draft EIS. The relevant section of these regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] §1503.4 and 32 CFR §651.45 (h)) state that if changes in response to public comments are minor and confined to factual corrections or explanations of why comments do not warrant further agency response, they may be written on errata sheets instead of rewriting, printing, and distributing the entire revised EIS.

The Final EIS provides information regarding the preferred alternative, public involvement and National Historic Preservation Act consultation pursuant to release of the Draft EIS, revisions to the Draft EIS, and Army responses to written and verbal comments received during the public review.

The Final EIS will be distributed to all individuals, agencies, and organizations that received a copy of the Draft EIS, made comments on the Draft EIS, or indicated that they would like to receive a copy of the Final EIS. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency will publish an announcement of receipt of the Notice of Availability for this Final EIS in the *Federal Register*. The Army will observe a 30-day waiting period following the *Federal Register* publication before making a final decision. The Final EIS will be available for public review at the Noel Wien Library in Fairbanks, Alaska, and online at: http://www.wainwright.army.mil/env/NEPA/Current.html.

Questions or requests for additional copies of the Final EIS should be forwarded to:

Direct Mail:

Mr. Matthew Sprau
Directorate of Public Works
Attn: IMFW-PWE (Sprau)
1060 Gaffney Road #4500
Fort Wainwright, AK 99703-4500;

FAX: (907) 361-9867

Email: matthew.h.sprau.civ@mail.mil

For Further Information:

Please contact Ms. Linda Douglass, Public Affairs Office (PAO), IMPC–FWA–PAO (Douglass), 1060 Gaffney Road #5900, Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703–5900; telephone (907) 353–6701, email: linda.douglass@us.army.mil

FINAL

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

DISPOSITION OF HANGARS 2 AND 3

Lead/Responsible Agency:	United States Army Installation Management Command
Title of the Proposed Action:	Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, Alaska
Designation:	Final Environmental Impact Statement
Prepared by:	United States Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska
Cooperating Agency:	None

Abstract:

This Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) analyzes the impacts from demolition of two historic World War II-era hangars at Fort Wainwright, Alaska. The Final EIS also looks at other long-term disposition options and a "no action" alternative. Both buildings have been found to be unsafe for occupancy and have no remaining military purpose. The hangars are contributing resources[1] within the Ladd Field National Historic Landmark and Ladd Air Force Base Cold War Historic District, and their loss would be a significant impact to cultural resources. All other impacts would be less than significant. Mitigation measures are described to minimize adverse impacts on cultural resources. The preferred alternative is demolition of Hangars 2 and 3. The United States Department of the Army (Army) will use the Final EIS to ensure that the environmental information needed for informed decision making is available. The Army will issue a decision, in the form of a Record of Decision, in early 2014.

---

[1] A contributing resource can be a building, site, structure, or object that adds to the historical or traditional cultural associations, historic architectural qualities, or archaeological values for which a historic district or historic property is significant.

This page intentionally left blank.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
ADEC	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
Army	U.S. Department of the Army
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
DOI	Department of the Interior
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
FNSB	Fairbanks North Star Borough
Ladd Field NHL	Ladd Field National Historic Landmark
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NOA	Notice of Availability
NPS	National Park Service
PAO	Public Affairs Office
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
TYHS	Tanana Yukon Historical Society
U.S.	United States
USAG FWA	United States Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS iii

LIST OF APPENDICES vi

1.0 PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE 1-1

2.0 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PURSUANT TO THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT 2-1

- 2.1 Public and Agency Meeting Announcements 2-1
- 2.2 Government to Government Actions 2-2
- 2.3 Public Meeting 2-2
- 2.4 Agency Meeting 2-2
- 2.5 Public and Agency Comments 2-3
  - 2.5.1 Public Comments 2-3
  - 2.5.2 Agency Comments 2-4
- 2.6 National Historic Preservation Act Consultation 2-5

3.0 ERRATA SHEET: REVISIONS TO BE MADE TO THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT 3-1

- 3.1 Introduction 3-1
- 3.2 EIS Text Changes Based on Substantive Concerns 3-1

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A—National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement

Appendix E—Draft EIS Comments and Army Responses

Note: Only appendices containing new or updated information are included in this Final Environmental Impact Statement.

1.0 PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

As identified in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the United States Department of the Army's preferred alternative is Alternative 1, Demolition of Hangars 2 and 3. Demolition would involve removal of the hangars and their supporting infrastructure, including demolition of existing and abandoned utilities not belonging to Doyon Utilities (the utility provider for the installation); demolition of existing privately owned vehicle parking areas, lighting, head bolt outlets, and power source; demolition of the small, open, flammable liquids storage facility that is located between Hangars 2 and 3; and removal of concrete building slabs and foundations. Once demolition of the hangars is complete, concrete would be added to the building and infrastructure footprints to maintain consistency with the adjacent airfield, which is designated as an aircraft parking apron.

This page intentionally left blank.

2.0 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PURSUANT TO THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

2.1 Public and Agency Meeting Announcements

Following the initial scoping process from November 16, 2011, to January 17, 2012, a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared and distributed for public review and comment. In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), the United States (U.S.) Department of the Army (Army) filed the Draft EIS with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and a Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft EIS was published in the *Federal Register* on June 21, 2013 (Volume 78, Number 120). Publication of the NOA began a 46-day public comment period that extended from June 21, 2013, to August 5, 2013. The Army used the public comment period to allow members of the public and federal, state, and local agencies to review the Draft EIS alternatives and analysis.

As part of the public comment process, the U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) held a public meeting and an agency meeting. A notice advertising the public meeting, which was held on July 10, 2013, was published in the *Fairbanks Daily News-Miner* eight times leading up to the meeting with the first publication coinciding with the publication of the NOA in the *Federal Register* on June 21, 2013. The notice was also published on June 22, June 23, June 26, June 30, July 3, July 7, and July 10, 2013. The public meeting notice was also posted on the Fort Wainwright environmental website (http://www.wainwright.army.mil/env/NEPA/Current.html).

The USAG FWA mailed letters on June 18, 2013, to a number of federal, state, and local agencies informing them of the Draft EIS agency meeting to be held on July 11, 2013, providing them a copy of the Draft EIS and soliciting their comments on the Draft EIS. The agencies notified were: the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP); Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC); Alaska Department of Fish and Game; Alaska Department of Natural Resources; Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities; Alaska State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO); the Bureau of Land Management (BLM); BLM Alaska Fire Service; the Department of the Interior (DOI); Fairbanks North Star Borough (FNSB); FNSB Historic Preservation Commission; Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska; the Mayor of the City of Fairbanks; the Mayor of FNSB; the Mayor of the City of North Pole; National Trust for Historic Preservation; National Park Service (NPS); the Tanana Valley State Fair Association; Tanana Yukon Historical Society (TYHS); USEPA; and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

2.2 Government to Government Actions

In addition to federal, state, and local agencies, the USAG FWA sent letters to six federally recognized Alaska Native tribes, inviting them to attend the public meeting and providing them with a copy of the Draft EIS. Letters were mailed on June 18, 2013, to the Village of Dot Lake, Healy Lake Village, Native Village of Tanacross, Native Village of Tetlin, Nenana Native Association, and Northway Village.

2.3 Public Meeting

The USAG FWA held one public meeting on July 10, 2013, in the Jade Room of the Princess Riverside Lodge in Fairbanks, Alaska, from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Sixteen informational banners were set up around the room, and the USAG FWA staff was available to answer questions about the project. An informational handout and public comment form were also handed out to attendees. At 6:30 p.m., the USAG FWA staff gave a presentation to provide an overview of the project, the alternatives analyzed along with those considered but dismissed from further analysis, and the impacts that would result from implementing the alternatives. A court reporter recorded the presentation and another was available to record public comments throughout the meeting. Three people from the public attended and signed in at the meeting.

2.4 Agency Meeting

The USAG FWA held one agency meeting on July 11, 2013, in the Jade Room of the Princess Riverside Lodge, in Fairbanks, Alaska, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. The same informational banners used for the public meeting were set up around the room, and after a short presentation, the USAG FWA staff and agency representatives discussed the alternatives and the potential impacts as analyzed in the Draft EIS. Four representatives from two agencies attended and signed in at the meeting, including staff from the FNSB Department of Community Planning, representing the FNSB Historic Preservation Commission, and representatives from the TYHS. Additionally, three representatives from two agencies participated in the meeting via teleconference, including staff from the Alaska Army National Guard and the NPS.

On July 30, 2013, the FNSB Historic Preservation Commission held a meeting to discuss the Draft EIS for the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 at Fort Wainwright, Alaska, and invited the USAG FWA to attend. Two USAG FWA staff members attended the meeting to only answer questions related to the project; no official comments on the project were received.

2.5 Public and Agency Comments

2.5.1 Public Comments

Public comments on the Draft EIS were received during the public meeting and via email during the public comment period. The general discussion points of the comments received at the public meeting included:

- Support for the demolition of the hangars because they have no useful purpose in the military mission, they are taking up space for current missions, and no funding is available to repair or renovate them.
- Support for the Army to preserve the history of the hangars and be more proactive in the preservation and reuse of the building materials.
- Opposition to the NEPA process in reference to the level of analysis needed and the cost of that analysis.

In addition to the comments received during the public meeting, three additional comment letters were received via email from members of the public. They are summarized below.

All three commenters expressed support for Alternative 1: Demolition of Hangars 2 and 3. One commenter noted that the hangars are unsafe, unusable, and maintaining them would drain Army funds. The commenter also noted that the land space at Fort Wainwright is precious, and the demolition of the hangars would allow future development on the airfield. The second commenter noted that the two hangars have not been in use due to years of arctic conditions and wear and tear, safety concerns, and lack of expensive modifications; this commenter also expressed that military funds should be invested in future developments or combat readiness. The third commenter expressed support for demolishing the hangars because of safety issues.

No other public comments were received by the end of the public comment period on August 5, 2013. All public comments received on the Draft EIS and the Army's responses to those comments are presented in Appendix E.

2.5.2 Agency Comments

Agency comments on the Draft EIS were received during the agency meeting and via letter and email. During the agency meeting, agency representatives provided feedback on the Proposed Action. The general discussion points and substantive comments received at this agency meeting included:

- Demolishing the hangars would be a loss for the historic nature of the Ladd Field National Historic Landmark (Ladd Field NHL) and the community.
- The hangars have architectural importance that should be maintained.
- The Army should preserve the history of the hangars and be more proactive in the preservation and reuse of the building materials. The site has the possibility of being a major environmental impact area and clean up would cost more than rehabilitating the hangars.
- The Army should communicate with other nations (e.g., Russia) to discuss preservation methods.
- Concern was expressed regarding the continuation of the National Historic Landmark designation if the hangars are demolished.

In addition to the comments made and recorded during the agency meeting, five correspondences with comments were received from federal, state, and local agencies. These comments are summarized below with the full correspondences provided in Appendix E.

By separate emails, the BLM Alaska Fire Service and the DOI both indicated that they have no comments on the Draft EIS regarding Hangars 2 and 3. The ADEC also replied via email that it reviewed the environmental contamination sections of the Draft EIS and did not have any concerns.

The FNSB Historic Preservation Commission expressed concern that the Army's preferred alternative for the disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 is demolition and stated it prefers preservation of the remaining buildings that are part of Ladd Field NHL. If buildings contributing to Ladd Field NHL continue to be demolished in the future, the FNSB Historic Preservation Commission recommends the dissolution of Ladd Field NHL. The agency also provided comments regarding procedural matters and perceived inaccuracies presented in the Draft EIS, including noting the Programmatic Agreement for Aviation Stationing at Fort Wainwright includes adhering to the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Properties. The FNSB Historic Preservation Commission also believes a variety of maintenance activities and storage of aircraft can still be conducted, specifically in Hangar 3.

Lastly, the FNSB Historic Preservation Commission recommends the adoption of the following additional mitigation measures:

- Completing extensive photographic documentation of the exterior and interior of the buildings;
- Recycling and reuse, to the extent possible, of the materials;
- Augmenting the existing "Lend-Lease Memorial" in downtown Fairbanks; and
- Conducting a comprehensive review of the remaining hangars at other strategic Lend-Lease locations.

The USEPA expressed its comments regarding the environmental impacts analysis as well as the adequacy of the Draft EIS in meeting procedural and public disclosure requirements of NEPA. The USEPA stated that it appreciates the USAG FWA's effort to consult with potentially affected and interested federally recognized tribes and believes the USAG FWA considered a wide range of alternatives that were appropriately screened to determine the action alternatives for full analysis. The USEPA gave the Draft EIS a rating of EC-1 (Environmental Concerns – Adequate Information). The primary concern continues to be the management of known Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation, and Liability Act, or CERCLA, sites (FTWW-081, CC-FTWW-103, and FTWW-348) and yet to be discovered contamination in the project area, both issues that were clearly identified in the Draft EIS.

No other agency comments were received by the end of the public comment period on August 5, 2013. All agency comments received on the Draft EIS and the Army's responses to those comments are presented in Appendix E.

2.6 National Historic Preservation Act Consultation

As noted above under Section 2.5.2, *Agency Comments*, the FNSB Historic Preservation Commission made several comments on the Draft EIS recommending additional mitigation measures to reduce the potential adverse effects of the Proposed Action on the hangars and the Ladd Field NHL. As part of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 consultation process, the USAG FWA held a NHPA Section 106 consulting party meeting after the Draft EIS public comment period ended on August 20, 2013, to discuss the comments received on the Draft EIS and determine whether any changes to the memorandum of agreement (MOA) were required. Agencies attending the meeting included the ACHP, Alaska SHPO, Eielson Air Force Base, FNSB Historic Preservation Commission,

NPS, and TYHS. As a result of the meeting on August 20, 2013, two additional mitigation measures were agreed upon and included in the Final MOA (Appendix A). For public outreach, the USAG FWA agreed to provide all public outreach documentation and recordation documentation of Hangars 2 and 3 created by the Cultural Resources Office to the FNSB to be used to augment any of its public outreach objectives. Also, during the re-evaluation of the Ladd Field NHL, the USAG FWA agreed to work with the Alaska SHPO and the NPS as subject matter experts on state and national historic properties to obtain new and relevant information on other historic properties associated with the Lend-Lease Operations.

3.0 ERRATA SHEET: REVISIONS TO BE MADE TO THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

3.1 Introduction

This errata sheet documents changes to the text of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 at Fort Wainwright, Alaska, as the result of substantive comments received since the document was released to the public on June 21, 2013. An interdisciplinary team reviewed these comments to identify any substantive comments. Substantive comments were considered to be comments that:

- question, with a reasonable basis, the accuracy of information in the EIS;
- question, with a reasonable basis, the adequacy of environmental analysis;
- present reasonable alternatives other than those presented in the EIS; and
- cause changes or revisions in the proposal.

For ease of reference, changes to the EIS text are noted by section, page number, and line number. Text within a paragraph that has been deleted is shown by a ~~strikeout~~ and added text is <u>underlined</u>. Typographical, spelling, and punctuation errors are not changed unless necessary to make the passage understandable.

3.2 EIS Text Changes Based on Substantive Concerns

All markings and references to draft, in the May 2013 Draft EIS, are no longer applicable.

Page ii, line 12: make the following edits:

> Appendix E—Draft EIS Comments <u>and Army Responses</u> ~~(only to be included in the Final EIS)~~

Page xxi, line 6: make the following edits:

> Appendix E—Draft EIS Comments <u>and Army Responses</u> ~~(only to be included in the Final EIS)~~

Section 3.3.2.2, Alternative 1: Demolition of Hangars 2 and 3, page 3-34, line 2: insert the following sentence after "…and newspapers."

> <u>The USAG FWA would also provide all public outreach documentation and recordation documentation of Hangars 2 and 3 created by the Cultural Resources Office to the FNSB to be</u>

used to augment any of its public outreach objectives within two years of execution of the MOA.

Section 3.3.2.2, Alternative 1: Demolition of Hangars 2 and 3, page 3-34, line 2, first Bullet, line 3: insert the following sentence after "…from previous demolitions and additions."

The USAG FWA would work with the Alaska SHPO and the NPS as subject matter experts on state and national historic properties to obtain new and relevant information on other historic properties associated with the Lend-Lease Operations for the re-evaluation.

Section 3.9.7.1, Cultural Resources, page 3-105, first Bullet, line 6: insert the following sentence after "…and newspapers."

The USAG FWA would also provide all public outreach documentation and recordation documentation of Hangars 2 and 3 created by the Cultural Resources Office to the FNSB to be used to augment any of its public outreach objectives within two years of execution of the MOA.

Section 3.9.7.1, Cultural Resources, page 3-105, second bullet, line 3: insert the following sentence after "…from previous demolitions and additions."

The USAG FWA would work with the Alaska SHPO and the NPS as subject matter experts on state and national historic properties to obtain new and relevant information on other historic properties associated with the Lend-Lease Operations for the re-evaluation.

Section 3.10, Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation, page 3-110, first bullet, line 6: insert the following sentence after "…newspapers."

The USAG FWA would also provide all public outreach documentation and recordation documentation of Hangars 2 and 3 created by the Cultural Resources Office to the FNSB to be used to augment any of its public outreach objectives within two years of execution of the MOA.

Section 3.10, Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation, page 3-110, second bullet, line 3: insert the following sentence after "…from previous demolitions and additions."

The USAG FWA would work with the Alaska SHPO and the NPS as subject matter experts on state and national historic properties to obtain new and relevant information on other historic properties associated with the Lend-Lease Operations for the re-evaluation.

Section 5.0, Distribution List, page 5-3, line 36: insert Bill Brophy after Rod Beuson; **line 38:** insert Alton Curtis and Karl Gohlke after Scott Calder.

Section 5.0, Distribution List, page 5-2, line 17: replace Jennifer Curtis and full contact information with Christine Reichgott, USEPA Region 10, 1200 6th Avenue, Suite 900, Seattle, WA 98101-3140.

Appendix A: National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Agreement: replace the entirety of Appendix A with the attached Appendix A: National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Agreement, which is the final memorandum of agreement.

Appendix E: Draft EIS Comments: replace the entirety of Appendix E with the attached Appendix E: Draft EIS Comments and Army Responses.

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX A: National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement

This page intentionally left blank.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON FORT WAINWRIGHT
1060 GAFFNEY ROAD #6000
FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA 99703-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND THE ALASKA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER AND THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION REGARDING THE DISPOSITION OF HANGARS 2 AND 3

WHEREAS, the United States Department of the Army, acting through the United States Army Garrison Fort Wainwright (USAG FWA), proposes to demolish Hangar 2 (Building 3008) and Hangar 3 (Building 3005),[1] or maintain the status quo with No Action; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA has determined that this is an Undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), 16 U.S.C. § 470(f), and its implementing regulations, 36 C.F.R. § 800; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA initiated consultation with the Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) on 3 October 2011 pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 800; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA defined the Undertaking's Area of Potential Effect (APE) as the Ladd Field National Historic Landmark (Ladd Field NHL) and the Ladd Air Force Base Cold War Historic District (Cold War Historic District) (Attachment A); and

WHEREAS, Hangars 2 and 3 are contributing resources of the Ladd Field NHL and the Cold War Historic District; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA determined that the Undertaking will have an adverse effect on the Ladd Field NHL which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) and Cold War Historic District[2] which is eligible for listing on the National Register; and

WHEREAS, the Ladd Field NHL was designated in 1985 with twenty-six contributing resources,[3] of which six resources have been demolished or destroyed, and with the expected loss of Hangars 2 and 3, eighteen contributing resources will remain; and

---

[1] The Alaska Historic Resource Survey (AHRS) identifier for Hangar 2 is FAI-485, and the identifier of Hangar 3 is FAI-482.
[2] The AHRS identifier for the Ladd Field NHL is FAI-236, and the identifier for the Cold War Historic District is FAI-1288.
[3] Two facilities, Building 2007 and Building 2106 were incorrectly identified as contributing resources in the 1985 nomination. The two facilities are Cold War hangars that were built after Ladd Field NHL's period of significance.

WHEREAS, the National Park Service (NPS) pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 65.1(c) administers the National Historic Landmarks program on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA notified and invited the NPS Alaska Region Office to consult on this Undertaking on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior on 15 November 2011 pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 800.10(c), and the NPS accepted the invitation to consult and sign this Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) as a concurring party; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA notified and invited the Upper Tanana tribes, the Fairbanks North Star Borough (FNSB) Historic Preservation Commission, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and the Tanana-Yukon Historical Society (TYHS) to consult regarding the Undertaking on 15 November 2011 pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 800.3(f) and all but the Upper Tanana tribes accepted the invitation to consult, and FNSB Historic Preservation Commission and TYHS agreed to sign this MOA as concurring parties; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA consulted with the Fort Wainwright Cultural Resources Working Group, a group of interested parties and individuals who meet with the USAG FWA Cultural Resources staff typically twice a year to discuss and provide input on cultural resources projects at Fort Wainwright; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with 36 C.F.R. § 800.6(a)(1), the USAG FWA notified the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) of its adverse effect determination on 15 November 2011 providing the required documentation, and the ACHP chose to participate in accordance with 36 C.F.R. § 800.6(a)(1)(iii); and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA provided the public with information on the Undertaking and an opportunity to consult through the USAG FWA Environmental Website, at a public meeting on 14 December 2011, and through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA sought partnership with other federal and state agencies including the BLM, NPS Alaska Region, Department of Interior National Business Center, Alaska National Guard, and State of Alaska Division of Forestry to rehabilitate or transfer ownership of the hangars on 6 December 2011 and 23 February 2012, and received no interested replies; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA previously proposed demolition of the hangars and agreed to mitigation measures through the executed *Memorandum of Agreement among the U.S. Department of the Army, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding United States Army Alaska Demolition of Buildings in the Ladd Field National Historic Landmark* signed on 23 May 2001; and

WHEREAS, as a result of this previous mitigation for demolition, the Army determined that a reduced amount of mitigation is appropriate to resolve adverse effects of this Undertaking and consulted with the SHPO concerning this determination; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA reaffirms its responsibility to develop the Historic Buildings Assessment Report and update the Historic American Building Survey Level 1 documentation which are both projects that USAG FWA previously agreed to produce to mitigate past adverse effects to Hangars 2 and 3[4]; and

WHEREAS, this MOA only addresses the first step in that process of official re-evaluation of the Ladd Field NHL which is the submittal of the re-evaluation to the NPS Alaska Region; and

WHEREAS, outside of the responsibilities detailed in this MOA, it is the USAG FWA's long-term goal to officially submit the findings of the re-evaluation of the Ladd Field NHL to the National Historic Landmarks Program for approval per 36 CFR § 65.8; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA completed in April 2012 the *Reuse Study of FWA's Hangars 2 and 3* which included six options for reuse and rehabilitation with associated cost estimates as part of the mitigation in the *Programmatic Agreement among the U.S. Department of the Army, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding Aviation Stationing* signed on 28 September 2009; and

WHEREAS, during the early stages of the Section 106 consultation, the USAG FWA considered four possible disposition options: rehabilitation of one or both hangars, demolition of one or both hangars, rehabilitation of one hangar and demolition of one, and no action (i.e. maintaining the status quo) concerning both hangars; and

WHEREAS, on 23 May 2012, the USAG FWA Cultural Resources Manager, NPS Alaska Region Historical Architect, SHPO Architectural Historian, and USAG FWA Structural and Electrical Engineers met at Fort Wainwright for a site visit to discuss the NPS Alaska Region and SHPO suggestions on ways to possibly reduce the rehabilitation costs of Hangars 2 and 3; and

WHEREAS, through further analysis, the USAG FWA found that rehabilitation of one or both hangars was not fiscally viable, and the Section 106 consultation and the NEPA EIS were adjusted accordingly; and

WHEREAS, the USAG FWA reaffirms its desire to be a good steward of the Ladd Field NHL, the Cold War Historic District, and all other historic properties under its care; and

NOW, THEREFORE, the USAG FWA, the SHPO, and the ACHP agree that the Undertaking will be implemented in accordance with the following stipulations in order to take into account the effect of the Undertaking on the historic properties.

---

[4] The Historic American Building Survey Level 1 documentation is mitigation in the *Programmatic Agreement among the U.S. Department of the Army, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding Aviation Stationing*, and per the agreement, the USAG FWA will complete the project in 2013 or early spring 2014. The Historic Buildings Assessment Report is mitigation in the *Memorandum of Agreement among the U.S. Department of the Army, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding the Removal of the Overhangs and Stairwells on Hangars 2 and 3*, and per the agreement, the USAG FWA will complete the project in 2016.

STIPULATIONS

USAG FWA shall ensure that the following measures are carried out:

I. MITIGATION FOR THE DEMOLITION OF HANGARS 2 AND 3

A. Public Outreach.

1. In pursuit of more visibility and appreciation for the Ladd Field NHL, the USAG FWA Cultural Resources staff will be available upon request to present lectures to local Fairbanks groups (military and/or non-military) on Fort Wainwright's World War II history. This availability will be noted on the USAG FWA's Environmental website and emails will be sent out to local groups within one month of the execution of this MOA.

2. The USAG FWA will continue to engage the public through the use of previously developed publications by making information and tools available for teachers and other educators, including the Teaching with Historic Places lesson plan on Ladd Field and its role in World War II.

3. In pursuit of more visibility and appreciation for the Ladd Field NHL, the USAG FWA will submit, at minimum, three articles concerning the historic preservation of Fort Wainwright's Ladd Field NHL to local or state publications, possibly including, but not limited to, local, non-profit and statewide newspapers, websites, various social media, and newsletters within one year of executing this MOA and two articles a year, every year, for a subsequent four years.

4. The USAG FWA will provide all public outreach documentation and recordation documentation of Hangars 2 and 3 created by the Cultural Resources Office to Fairbanks North Star Borough to be used to augment any of their public outreach objectives within two years of execution of this agreement.

5. For five years from the execution of this MOA, the USAG FWA will update and seek input twice a year from consulting parties on these public outreach projects detailed in Stipulation I.A starting six months after the execution of this MOA.

B. Re-evaluation of the Ladd Field NHL.

1. The USAG FWA will complete a re-evaluation of the Ladd Field NHL, through preparation of a revised draft NHL nomination, including an analysis of cumulative effects on the Ladd Field NHL from previous demolitions and additions. The USAG FWA will work with the SHPO and NPS as subject matter experts on state and national historic properties to obtain new and relevant information on other historic properties associated with the Lend-Lease Program for the re-evaluation.

2. Within four years of the demolition of Hangars 2 and 3, a draft of the Ladd Field NHL re-evaluation will be submitted to the consulting parties for a 30-day calendar review. The USAG FWA will consider any comments on the draft received from the consulting parties.

3. The USAG FWA will submit a final version of the re-evaluation to the consulting parties no less than a year after submitting the first draft.

4. The re-evaluation will include submitting the appropriate documentation to the NPS Alaska Region within five years of the demolition of Hangars 2 and 3.

C. Stewardship of the Ladd Field NHL.

1. With the expected loss of Hangars 2 and 3, the USAG FWA will refocus the efforts of its Directorate of Public Works (DPW) staff on effective stewardship through focused and purposeful management of the remaining contributing resources that comprise the Ladd Field NHL.

2. The USAG FWA will utilize existing and currently planned documentation to further historic preservation objectives and goals including, but not limited to, utilizing the already developed Design Guidelines for the Ladd Field NHL, the educational PowerPoint presentations on historic preservation subjects, and the currently planned but not yet developed Historic Buildings Assessment Report.[5]

3. Within one year of completing the Historic Buildings Assessment Report for the Ladd Field NHL, recommendations from the report will be submitted for consideration in the DPW Annual Work Plan[6].

D. Mitigation for the No Action Option for Hangars 2 and 3.

Mitigation for the No Action Option for Hangars 2 and 3 is treated the same as demolition detailed in Stipulations I.A-C except any stipulation's timeframe that is based on demolition will instead be based on the execution of this MOA.

II. SUMMARY REPORT

A. Once a year every spring following the execution of this MOA until it expires or is terminated, the USAG FWA shall provide all consulting parties a summary report via email and mail detailing all work undertaken pursuant to this MOA.

[5] The Historic Buildings Assessment Report will detail maintenance and repair needs for the NHL and Cold War Historic District buildings.
[6] The Annual Work Plan is DPW's yearly list of possible repair and maintenance projects for Fort Wainwright buildings.

B. The summary report shall include progress on the following: demolition progress, public outreach, status of the re-evaluation of the Ladd Field NHL, and stewardship efforts regarding the Ladd Field NHL.

C. In addition, each summary report shall include any scheduling changes proposed, any problems encountered, and any disputes and objections received in the USAG FWA's efforts to carry out the stipulations of this MOA.

D. Upon notification of any summary report, the consulting parties can request, within 30 days, a meeting for further clarification, if needed.

III. POST REVIEW DISCOVERIES

If potential historic properties are discovered or unanticipated effects on historic properties occur, the USAG FWA will implement the discovery plan included as Attachment B of this MOA.

IV. DISPUTE RESOLUTION

A. Should any signatory party to this MOA object at any time to any actions proposed or the manner in which the terms of this MOA are implemented, the USAG FWA will consult with such party to resolve the objection. If the USAG FWA determines that such objection cannot be resolved:

1. The USAG FWA will forward all documentation relevant to the dispute, including the USAG FWA's proposed resolution, to the ACHP. The ACHP will provide the USAG FWA with its advice on the resolution of the objection within 30 calendar days of receiving adequate documentation. Prior to reaching a final decision on the dispute, the USAG FWA will prepare a written response that takes into account any timely advice or comments regarding the dispute from the ACHP and the signatories, and provide them with a copy of this written response. The USAG FWA will then proceed according to its final decision.

2. If the ACHP does not provide its advice regarding the dispute within the 30-calendar day time period, the USAG FWA may make a final decision on the dispute and proceed accordingly. Prior to reaching such a final decision, the USAG FWA will prepare a written response that takes into account any timely comments regarding the dispute from the signatories to the MOA, and provide the signatories and the ACHP with a copy of such written response.

3. The USAG FWA will be responsible for carrying out all other actions that are not the subject of the dispute.

B. If an objection pertaining to this MOA is raised by a member of the public at any time during implementation of any stipulation in this MOA, the USAG FWA will notify the signatories to this MOA and take into account the objection.

V. AMENDMENT

This MOA may be amended when such an amendment is agreed to in writing by all signatories. The amendment will be effective on the date a copy is signed by all of the signatories and submitted to the ACHP.

VI. TERMINATION

A. If any signatory believes that the terms of this MOA are not being honored or cannot be carried out, or that an amendment to its terms should be made, that signatory will immediately consult with the other signatories to consider and develop amendments to the MOA per Stipulation IV.

B. If this MOA is not amended as provided for in Stipulation IV, the USAG FWA, the SHPO, or the ACHP may propose in writing to terminate this MOA with an explanation of the reasons for termination. If the signatories have found no alternative solution to termination within 30 calendar days after receipt of the written notice, the MOA shall be terminated. If this MOA is terminated and prior to work continuing on the Undertaking, the USAG FWA must either (a) execute a new MOA pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 800.6, or (b) request, take into account, and respond to the comments of the ACHP under 36 C.F.R. § 800.7 and will notify the signatories as to the course of action it will pursue.

VII. ANTI-DEFICIENCY ACT

All requirements set forth in this MOA requiring the expenditure of the USAG FWA funds are expressly subject to the availability of appropriations and the requirements of the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. § 1341). No obligation undertaken by the USAG FWA under the terms of this MOA will require or be interpreted to require a commitment to expend funds not obligated for a particular purpose.

VIII. DURATION

This MOA will become effective upon execution by the signatories and will remain in effect until terminated or twelve years after its execution. If all stipulations are not completed prior to such time, the USAG FWA may consult with the signatories to reconsider the terms of the MOA and amend it in accordance with Stipulation V. Amendment.

EXECUTION of this MOA by the USAG FWA, the SHPO, and the ACHP and implementation of its terms evidence that the USAG FWA has taken into account the effects of this Undertaking on historic properties and afforded the ACHP an opportunity to comment.

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
AND
THE ALASKA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
AND
THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING
THE DISPOSITION OF HANGARS 2 AND 3

Signatories:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
FORT WAINWRIGHT

By: _____
WESLEY D. POTTER
Deputy to the Garrison Commander

Date: 1 Oct 2013

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
AND
THE ALASKA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
AND
THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING
THE DISPOSITION OF HANGARS 2 AND 3

Signatories:

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

By: _____
for JOHN M. FOWLER
Executive Director

Date: October 24, 2013

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
AND
THE ALASKA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
AND
THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING
THE DISPOSITION OF HANGARS 2 AND 3

Signatories:

ALASKA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER

By: Judith E Bittner
JUDITH E. BITTNER
State Historic Preservation Officer

Date: Oct 10, 2013

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
AND
THE ALASKA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
AND
THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
REGARDING
THE DISPOSITION OF HANGARS 2 AND 3

Concurring Parties:

National Park Service

By: _____
SUE E. MASICA
Alaska Regional Director

Date: November 25, 2013

Tanana Yukon Historical Society

By: Elizabeth Clark for Ronald K Inouye.
RON INOUYE
President

Date: Nov 7, 2013

FNSB Commission on Historic Preservation

By: Al Benfiue for
CLAUS-M.NASKE
Chair

Date: 15 Nov 2013

Attachment A

Area of Potential Effect for the Undertaking

Attachment B

POST REVIEW AND UNANTICIPATED DISCOVERIES PLAN

A. In the course of conducting approved activities, the USAG FWA and/or their contractors shall not intentionally or knowingly affect (such as remove, disturb, or cause to be removed or disturbed) any historic properties outside the approved scope of work.

B. In the event that a previously unidentified archaeological site is discovered during the execution of this undertaking, all ground disturbing activity shall immediately cease in the area of the discovery until the USAG FWA archaeologist or other USAG FWA personnel who meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Archeologists* can evaluate the archaeological site. Construction work may continue in the project area outside the archaeological resource area. The USAG FWA shall notify the SHPO and appropriate Alaska Native tribes within 3 business days of discovery. The USAG FWA shall ensure that any archaeological work that may be necessary shall be completed in accordance with the NHPA and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act. The SHPO and/or the Alaska Native tribes, if they so request, may immediately inspect the work site to determine the nature and area of the affected archaeological site. Within 10 business days of the original notification of the discovery, the USAG FWA, in consultation with the SHPO and interested Alaska Native tribes, will determine the National Register eligibility of the resource and will propose action to resolve possible adverse effects to any affected National Register-eligible archaeological sites. Work may resume in affected areas after approval by the USAG FWA Cultural Resources Manager and the SHPO.

C. If human remains are inadvertently discovered; the USAG FWA shall notify the SHPO within 24 hours of discovery. The USAG FWA shall cease all work by their contractors and ensure that the remains are secured from further disturbance or vandalism until after the appropriate law enforcement authorities have ensured that the remains are not related to any crime, and until a plan for treatment has been developed. If the USAG FWA determines that the remains are Native American, the Garrison Commander shall immediately undertake any actions necessary under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, as amended. If the USAG FWA determines that the remains are not Native American, and do not warrant criminal investigation, the USAG FWA shall immediately notify the SHPO and consult with the SHPO to identify descendants or other interested parties, if any. The USAG FWA, in consultation with the SHPO and any interested parties, shall develop a plan for the respectful treatment and disposition of the remains. Work may resume in affected areas after approval by the USAG FWA Cultural Resources Manager and the SHPO.

D. If during the course of the undertaking there are any unforeseen or unanticipated effects to historic properties other than the identification of a previously unknown archaeological site, the USAG FWA shall initiate consultation pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 800.13(b)(3) to resolve the unforeseen effects.

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX E: Draft EIS Comments and Army Responses

This page intentionally left blank.

Table E-1 provides the United States Department of the Army's (Army's) responses to comments received during the public review period for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 at Fort Wainwright, Alaska. All correspondence providing comments during the public comment period for the Draft EIS is provided after the table, along with the transcripts from the public and agency meetings.

Table E-1: Army Responses to Public and Agency Comments on the Draft EIS

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Public_1.1	I strongly endorse Alternative 1, demolition of Hangars #2 and #3. I have experience with the infrastructure of Fort Wainwright dating back to 1964. The hangars are unsafe, unusable, and maintenance is a terrible drain of precious funds. This action is considerably overdue.	Comments noted. Thank you for your input.
Public_1.2	Land space at Fort Wainwright is very precious, especially on Ladd Airfield. Demolition of the old outdated hangars will allow future development on the airfield so vitally needed for combat readiness of our aviation soldiers and support of their war-fighting brethren.	
Public_2.1	I firmly support Alternative #1, Demolition of Hangers #2 & #3; this action is long overdue. Of the four Ft Wainwright WW II hangers, one has already burned to the ground and one (#2) had electrical fire that caused significant damage to the structure. As noted in the study, the two (#2 & #3) hangers are not in use do to years of arctic condition wear and tear, safety concerns and the lack of expensive modifications. These deficiencies have all contributed in compromising structural integrity of both buildings. It is time for the replacement of these hangers.	Comments noted. Thank you for your input.
Public_2.2	I firmly support Alternative #1, Demolition of Hangers #2 & #3; this action is long overdue. While both buildings are not in use they still require an annual maintenance cost of $700,000. With the constriction of military funds, it is important to invest in future developments for combat readiness of our aviation teams and their equipment. The demolition of the outdated hangars must be replaced with modern facilities to house our multimillion dollar aircrafts; aircrafts that support our American Soldiers.	
Public_2.3	Execute Alternative #1 and get Ft Wainwrights' Aviation Brigade into the 21st Century. American Soldiers fighting for America's freedom expect us to resource their ability to train, fight and maintain with most	

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	modern up to date equipment and facilities. One percent of the American population are in the military fighting for the freedom of the remaining 99%. The 1% deserve nothing but the best!	
Public_3	Those hangers were old when I was at Ft. Wainwright in 67-68. We had a gym in an unnumbered hanger that was condemned by the flood in 67. Probably best to take the hangers down before they fall down and damage someone or something. Good Luck.	Comment noted. Thank you for your input.
Public_4	The study cost over one million dollars to do. The American taxpayer has paid over a million dollars to make a decision to take down two hangars that are falling apart that someone in elementary school can probably spend 10 minutes and have it figured out. Another gross waste of American taxpayer funds and it's all being done because of regulations that are out of control.	Comment noted. Thank you for your input.
Public_5	It appears that the hangars have no useful purpose in the military mission for Fort Wainwright and, instead, are taking up space that could be used for the mission in support of what is current. The buildings are draining resources that are badly needed in other positions, and useful other positions. The hangars are going to continue to deteriorate. There are no funds available for repairs, for any type of renovations. So what's going to happen is they are going to deteriorate, become a safety hazard, a health hazard, and are going to cost much more because there's not going to be reuse of the materials if we wait till it falls. Financially, a contractor could come in and reuse that material, which is going to decrease the cost on it. The military shouldn't have to fund this when they have a shortage of funds and we have a strategic mission that is very, very needed.	Comment noted. Thank you for your input. As part of the Proposed Action and to meet the Army's goal of not exceeding 50 percent of C&D materials being disposed of in a landfill, non-hazardous materials would be diverted from landfills to the greatest extent possible by recycling and reusing materials.
Public_6	So I encourage the demolition of Hangars 2 and 3. I would hope that there would be a historical record, possibly 3D videos of the buildings so that historically the atmosphere, the space, the structure can be kept for historical purposes; at the same time, it would not impact the mission that is needed at Fort Wainwright.	Comment noted. Thank you for your input. With regard to documentation of the hangars, a HABS, Level 1, documentation effort, in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation, is scheduled to take place in fall 2013 or spring 2014. HABS, Level 1, documentation includes 1) a full set of measured drawings depicting existing or historic conditions; 2) photographs with large-format negatives of exterior and interior views along with photocopies with large format negatives of select existing drawings or historic views

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		where available; and 3) a written history and description of the resources. In addition to these Secretary of Interior requirements, the USAG FWA will also include video documentation; however, the video documentation will not be three-dimensional.
TYHS_1	Now, architecturally, the importance of the hangars towards today, we shouldn't lose that. We should maintain that.	As noted in the Draft EIS in Section 2.3.3, *Viability Analysis*, rehabilitating the hangars is not economically feasible. However, as part of a stipulation from a prior MOA, a HABS, Level 1, documentation effort, which will include a full set of measured drawings, photographs, and a written history, as well as video documentation, is scheduled to take place in fall 2013 or spring 2014. Through this effort, the architectural nature of the hangars will be documented. See response to the Public-5 comment for a complete description of what HABS, Level 1, documentation entails.
TYHS_2	You know that if those buildings are destroyed, they could have a mitigation of great environmental impact right off the -- we act too soon to develop areas. And one of the problems Fort Wainwright had, for instance, they build a new military housing in an area that was polluted and that is still polluted. Kids shouldn't play out there. So we build first and then have to go back later. This site of those hangars has the possibility of being a major environmental impact area. The clean-up would cost -- I don't know much -- well, more than it would cost to rehabilitate those hangars.	It is noted in the Draft EIS in Section 3.4, *Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Waste*, that there is the potential for contamination due to the hangars' age and historical use. As part of the demolition contract, surveys would be conducted to determine the presence of any hazardous materials. Any hazardous materials found would be properly remediated. Through its various planning processes, the Army has developed preliminary cost estimates for the rehabilitation/reuse of the hangars and for demolition of the hangars. Taking into consideration all aspects of construction and demolition, including potential contamination of materials and the proper disposal of them, the Army estimated the cost of rehabilitation/reuse of each hangar to be approximately $48 million to $60 million while the cost of demolishing the hangars would be approximately $6.3 million combined. See Chapter 2 of the Draft EIS.
NPS_1	And one of the things that really bothers me about NEPA and Section 106 is in the NEPA document there it states that the impact to the NHL with the demolition of the two hangars is a moderate impact. And there really hasn't been anything done yet to say that that's the case. That's something that's still down the road. So it's really kind of a flaw in the	Because a formal re-evaluation of the NHL will not be completed for several years, the USAG FWA used its professional expertise as architectural historians to examine the effects from demolishing the hangars to complete the Draft EIS and to meet NEPA requirements for the analysis. As discussed

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	document to say at this point that that's the potential outcome. Because it could be a severe impact to the NHL, including loss to the NHL.	in Section 3.3.2.2 of the Draft EIS, the USAG FWA recognizes that the loss of the hangars will have an adverse impact on the Ladd Field NHL, although the demolition of the hangars is not expected to impact its designation as an NHL.
FNSB HPC_1	So, that being said, I would like to see a little bit more work done for the mitigation, you know, some actual active preservation that is possibly for reuse of the materials of the buildings. I've seen the estimates of how many dump trucks it's going to take to haul that off to a landfill and in a place where we're located, you know, so far from some useful resources and the cost of resources being what they are and the inherent, you know, unique quality and the nature of those materials, I feel that there's probably still a pretty viable volume of materials that could be reused elsewhere in the community on different projects. They were talking about building a new school, they're talking about -- I mean, it might be really interesting to retain some of those.	As noted in the Draft EIS in Section 3.7, *Sustainability*, on pages 3-60 and 3-63, the Army has to meet federal statutes that require certain amounts of C&D waste be diverted from landfills. Although materials in the hangars contain lead-based paint and asbestos as well as other hazardous materials, non-hazardous materials would be diverted from landfills to the greatest extent possible by recycling and reusing materials in compliance with the Army's goal of not exceeding 50 percent of C&D materials being disposed of in a landfill.
FNSB HPC_2	But if things like that [historic graffiti] were encountered, I mean, I would like to see them maybe documented and, you know, those panels or walls may be, you know, retained for some kind of purpose or something like that, like an actual, you know, physical -- you know, what can we salvage from the building in terms of not just taking photos, but additional photos. I'll have some written comments provided before the deadline definitely indicating, you know, our position and kind of things we've evaluated just for kind of that active preservation. But I think the borough would really like to see those kinds of things focused on just to retain vestiges of the historic nature of those buildings are able to be retained and not just buried.	There is no known graffiti in the hangars. However, as stipulated in a prior MOA, a HABS, Level 1, documentation effort for Hangars 2 and 3 is scheduled to take place in fall 2013 or spring 2014. If any graffiti or other features are found during the HABS, Level 1, effort, they will be preserved through photographic and video documentation. See response to Public_5 comment for a full description of what a HABS, Level 1, documentation effort includes.
FNSB HPC_3	In regards to the Russian side, is anyone aware of any, you know, what's left there? You know, obviously, they probably had maybe not the similar hangars, but they must have had structures. So are you considering that in some of your future work and interpretation to, you know, actually create this similar bridge that -- of communication between the two nations and have the opportunity to, you know, really, you know, connect?	A discussion of properties located in Russia is outside the scope of the EIS. However, re-evaluation of the Ladd Field NHL is a stipulation contained within the NHPA Section 106 MOA for this project. During the NHL re-evaluation process, the USAG FWA will review the documentation to see what information is readily available; however, the USAG FWA cannot do research on buildings (i.e., survey buildings) that are not located on the installation, and the USAG FWA is limited in what primary

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		research can be conducted at other locales. There are connections to sister city groups from which the USAG FWA can obtain information, and recent research for other locales will be referred to as much as possible. Additionally, the following text is being added to Stipulation I.B.1 of the MOA: "The USAG FWA will work with the SHPO and NPS as subject matter experts on state and national historic properties to obtain new and relevant information on other historic properties associated with the Lend-Lease Program for the re-evaluation."
FNSB HPC_4	And consider it in this re-evaluation or, you know, the HABS re-evaluation or is the HABS re-evaluation going to focus strictly on the built environment to.....	The HABS, Level 1, documentation for Hangars 2 and 3 to be conducted as part of a prior MOA will follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation, and thus would not include information about facilities located in Russia or elsewhere. See the response to the Public-5 comment for what is contained in the HABS, Level 1, documentation. However, this information, to the extent possible, will be included in the re-evaluation of the Ladd Field NHL as stipulated in the NHPA Section 106 MOA for this project. See response to the FNSB-HPC-3 comment.
FNSB HPC_5	The history associated with the buildings. It's not necessarily the quality of this fantastic, unique building. That's the original designation. So it seems like if you're going to stay with that kind of nomination, you know, and in keeping with the original nomination, you know, it could be expanded upon.	See response to the FNSB-HPC-3 comment.
FNSB HPC_6	While we understand the difficult fiscal and engineering constraints imposed by the age and condition of the structures, we feel that the hangars provide immeasurable and irreplaceable historic value to the Ladd Field National Historic Landmark (NHL) and are essential elements of the NHL. We also realize that the NHL has a life of its own. Of the original 26 structures within the NHL at the time of designation (1985), only 18 remain. At the present rate of structural loss within the NHL, there is the possibility that by June 17, 2079, all structures within the NHL would be gone, less than 100 years from the original nomination date. As a preservation Commission, we would prefer the buildings that	As discussed in the Draft EIS Section 2.3.3, *Viability Analysis*, it is not economically feasible to rehabilitate and preserve Hangars 2 and 3. As discussed in the Draft EIS in Section 3.3.2.2 and concluded on page 3-33, while the loss of the hangars would adversely impact the Ladd Field NHL and the Ladd Air Force Base Cold War Historic District, the two districts would still retain their integrity. In addition, as part of the NHPA Section 106 MOA for the project, the USAG FWA would complete a re-evaluation of the Ladd Field NHL with a draft of the re-evaluation provided to the consulting parties

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	once constituted Ladd Field are preserved for future generations and not demolished. If that is not possible, we recommend the dissolution of the Ladd Field NHL.	within four years of the hangars being demolished. To help mitigate further impacts on the NHL, per the MOA, the USAG FWA would refocus the efforts of its Directorate of Public Works staff on effective stewardship through focused and purposeful management of the remaining contributing resources that comprise the Ladd Field NHL.
FNSB HPC_7	Katharine Kerr, National Park Service, indicated in Case Digest, Fall 2009, that "Programmatic Agreement for Aviation Stationing at Fort Wainwright" was executed on September 28, 2009, as a closed case. The review was instigated by a proposed increase in aviation stationing at FWA that would include construction of a number of facilities and increase in soldiers and helicopters. One adverse effect included a potential change-in-use of Hangars 2 and 3. The Programmatic Agreement, therefore, included adhering to the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Properties for adaptive re-use to the maximum extent possible, not demolition or no action, leading to inevitable collapse.	In Stipulation V.D. of the Programmatic Agreement for Aviation Stationing at Fort Wainwright, it states: “Contingent on funding, the CARP will be implemented to provide for the interim preservation of Hangars 2 and 3.” However, funding was not available to implement the CARP, so the condition of the hangars continued to deteriorate. In compliance with Stipulation V.A. of the Programmatic Agreement, the USAG FWA completed a Reuse Study for Hangars 2 and 3 and in compliance with Stipulation V.C. The reuse study was used in the planning stages of this project. However, the Reuse Study used cost estimates from the 2008 CARP that needed to be updated for this project. As described in the Draft EIS in Chapter 2, part of the updates to the costs involved a military construction planning charrette for rehabilitating and reusing one hangar to support an Unmanned Aircraft System mission. As a result of the charrette, it was determined that the cost to rehabilitate and reuse one hangar would actually be approximately $48 million to $60 million, nearly twice the cost estimated in the CARP for rehabilitating and reusing a hangar. Therefore, as described in Section 2.3.2, *Viability Analysis of the Draft EIS*, rehabilitation and reuse of even one hangar was not considered to be economically feasible.
FNSB HPC_8	The "inability to meet the functional requirements as maintenance facilities for modern aircraft" is mentioned at several junctures within the DEIS. The Commission takes exception to that determination relative to Hangar 3, believing a variety of maintenance activities and storage of aircraft could still be conducted within the hangar as it is not necessary to utilize hoists anchored to structural beams to perform maintenance tasks on aircraft.	It is not the inability to utilize hoists that makes the hangars unable to meet the functional requirements as maintenance facilities for modern aircraft; it is their unsafe condition. As discussed in Section 1.1.3 of the DEIS, both Hangars 2 and 3 have been assessed for their structural integrity. The Army found that most of the wooden members in both hangars display weaknesses and the wooden bowstring trusses meet nine of the top eleven reasons why bowstring trusses fail.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		Consequently, these buildings have been condemned and subsequently recorded as “non-functional.” Conducting any type of maintenance or storage activities in the facilities is a serious risk to life, health, and safety of Soldiers and personnel, as well as a serious risk to the equipment that would be stored in them. Section 1.1.3 also describes the most recent definition of functional workspace requirements taken from Army Pamphlet 415-28.
FNSB HPC_9	After review of the proposed mitigation measures for the demolition, we feel that not enough of the historic integrity will be retained through "active preservation" methods. We recommend the adoption of additional mitigation measures as follows: • Extensive photo documentation of the exterior and interior of the buildings. Using high resolution photography, we'd like as much as possible documented about the construction methods and materials, structural design, interior and exterior aesthetics, and any historical graffiti or unique artifacts. Additionally, the documentation should be made available at locations other than Fort Wainwright, such as the Noel Wien Library or an exhibit at the Morris Thompson Cultural Center in Fairbanks. The exhibit would document the history of the hangars and why they were significant at the time of the war effort.	The USAG FWA recommends no additional mitigation to address this request because Hangars 2 and 3 have already been extensively photographed. In 1986, a HABS, Level II, was conducted on both buildings. In 2010, the buildings were resurveyed using the USAG FWA’s standard methodology for surveys of historic buildings. Both surveys included photography. Also, the buildings were extensively photographed during the removal of the overhangs per the MOA and have been periodically photographed by the USAG FWA Cultural Resources staff as part of routine operations. Lastly, this fall or early next spring, a HABS, Level I, will be conducted of both buildings; this is the highest level of documentation using HABS standards and will include photography. However, the USAG FWA will provide recordation documentation to FNSB for use in augmenting their public outreach objectives. Toward this, the following stipulation has been added to I.A. of the MOA for this project: “USAG FWA will provide all public outreach documentation and recordation documentation of Hangars 2 and 3 created by the Cultural Resources Office to Fairbanks North Star Borough to be used to augment any of their public outreach objectives within two years of execution of this agreement.”
FNSB HPC_10	After review of the proposed mitigation measures for the demolition, we feel that not enough of the historic integrity will be retained through "active preservation" methods. We recommend the adoption of additional mitigation measures as follows:	As noted in the Draft EIS in Section 3.7, *Sustainability*, on pages 3-60 and 3-63, the Army has to meet federal statutes that require certain amounts of C&D waste be diverted from landfills. Although materials in the hangars contain-lead based paint and asbestos, as well as other hazardous materials, non-

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	• Recycling and reuse, to the extent possible, of the materials. Most of the demolished materials are currently slated for deposition in the FNSB Solid Waste Landfill. We feel that there is a unique opportunity to make viable materials available for reuse in new construction either on Fort Wainwright or elsewhere in the community. Some of the materials may have intrinsic historic value in addition to the construction value. We suggest the remainder of the debris be disposed of through a recycling provider, to the extent possible, and only the materials that can neither be reused nor recycled then be disposed of in the landfill.	hazardous materials would be diverted from landfills to the greatest extent possible by recycling and reusing materials in compliance with the Army's goal of not exceeding 50 percent of C&D materials being disposed of in a landfill.
FNSB HPC_11	After review of the proposed mitigation measures for the demolition, we feel that not enough of the historic integrity will be retained through "active preservation" methods. We recommend the adoption of additional mitigation measures as follows: • Augment the existing "Lend-Lease Memorial" in Downtown Fairbanks. Using the last of the photos and materials obtained, update the memorial to indicate the disposition of the Hangars and use the new photos to supplement the display.	The following stipulation has been added to I.A. of the MOA for this project: "The USAG FWA will provide all public outreach documentation and recordation documentation of Hangars 2 and 3 created by the Cultural Resources Office to Fairbanks North Star Borough to be used to augment any of their public outreach objectives within two years of execution of this agreement."
FNSB HPC_12	After review of the proposed mitigation measures for the demolition, we feel that not enough of the historic integrity will be retained through "active preservation" methods. We recommend the adoption of additional mitigation measures as follows: • Comprehensive review of the remaining hangars at other strategic lend-lease locations. The Memorandum of Agreement mitigation measure C-("Re-evaluation of the Ladd Field NHL") should incorporate the results of a review of remaining hangars at other lend-lease locations in order to comprehensively evaluate the cumulative effects of any further potential structural losses within the NHL.	The following language has been added to Stipulation I.B.1 of the MOA. "The USAG FWA will work with the SHPO and the NPS as subject matter experts on state and national historic properties to obtain new and relevant information on other historic properties associated with the Lend-Lease Program for the re-evaluation."
EPA_1	We commend the U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG-FWA) for an extremely clear, thorough and user-friendly document. We especially appreciate the inclusion of color maps and diagrams, tabs, an index, and useful appendices in the hard copy. We also recognize the notable effort by USAG-FWA to consult with potentially affected and interested federally-recognized tribes. Finally, we believe the EIS considered a wide range of alternatives and appropriately screened out	Comment noted. Thank you for your input

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	those alternatives not meeting rational criteria to result in the USAG-FWA preferred alternative (Alternative 1).	
EPA_2	We have given the EIS a rating of EC-1(Environmental Concerns-Adequate Information). A description of our rating system is enclosed. Based on review, and as identified in our scoping comments, our primary concern continues to be the management of known CERCLA sites (FTWW-018, CC-FTWW-103, and FTWW-348) as well as yet-to-be-discovered contamination in the project area. The EIS clearly identifies the likelihood of additional contamination surrounding and beneath the hangar project area, as well as beneath other structures being demolished in the project area.	Comment noted. Thank you for your input. The USAG FWA will continue to manage known CERLCA sites in accordance with the institutional controls and appropriate CERCLA ROD. The USAG FWA will also work with the USEPA as necessary as the project moves forward.
EPA_3	We strongly encourage USAG FWA to work closely with our Federal Facilities program (Deb Yamamoto, EPA Region 10 Federal Facilities Site Cleanup Manager, 206-553-7216 or yamamoto.deb@epa.gov) as results of sampling become available and if any changes to institutional controls or the CERCLA Record of Decision are contemplated.	
ADEC_1	I skimmed the environmental contamination section yesterday and didn't have any concerns.	Comment noted. Thank you for your input.

Notes: C&D – construction and demolition, CARP - Condition Assessment and Rehabilitation Plans, CERCLA - Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, EIS – environmental impact statement, EPA – Environmental Protection Agency, FNSB – Fairbanks North Star Borough, HABS – Historic American Buildings Survey, M – million, MOA – Memorandum of Agreement, NPS – National Park Service, NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act, NHL –National Historic Landmark, ROD – record of decision, SHPO – State Historic Preservation Office, U.S. – United States, USAG FWA – United States Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska, USEPA – Environmental Protection Agency.

This page intentionally left blank.

FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

DISPOSITION OF HANGARS 2 AND 3

TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING
Before Lisa Graham and Matthew Sprau
Hearing Moderators

Princess Lodge
Jade Room
Fairbanks, Alaska
July 10, 2013
6:30 o'clock p.m.

P R O C E E D I N G S

COL. RONALD JOHNSON: Okay. So I'm Col. Johnson and I'm the commander at Fort Wainwright, Alaska. So is there anybody here who is a private concerned citizen that has nothing to do with Fort Wainwright, environmental, DPW, anything like that?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Does government count?

COL. RONALD JOHNSON: Okay. Ma'am, so I think you are the lone member of the audience and you're going to get a special treat time. It's all.....

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Oh, everybody knows me already.

COL. RONALD JOHNSON: This is all just for you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I want to talk about the fire.

COL. RONALD JOHNSON: Okay. All right. So I'm going to make my introductory remarks very short and I'm going to let the crew that put the brief together actually talk to you. But this is another of a series of meetings that we've had where we're getting public comment from concerned citizens, reference the NEPA process, Chapter 106 requirements, and this applies to hangars -- historic hangars on Fort Wainwright, Hangars 2 and 3.

And so as we said before, we've gone through all this process of what's -- and we're working toward a final disposition of what's going to happen to those hangars. These two things that I talked about, the NEPA process and Chapter

106, kind of lay out, here's a road map of events that have to occur before you can make a final determination as to what's the disposition. And one of those is you've got to get public comment, you've got to listen to what's going on, you've got to consider a whole bunch of stuff before you make a decision and execute it.

And so they'll talk to you a lot more specifically about what does all that mean, and where we're at, and what alternatives have we looked at, and where are we at in this process, and what's the next step. So there's my introductory remarks and I'll let you guys actually get into the briefing. So thanks. Thanks for coming.

MR. SPRAU: All right. So I was told to tell you that if I'm not loud enough, just do something with your hand and I'll get louder. So how is that? Is that good?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I don't think the mike is on.

MR. SPRAU: Oh, sorry.

MS. GRAHAM: Hold that down. There you go.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We want to see how loud you can get.

MR. SPRAU: I can get loud. Yeah, there you go. All right. How's that? Good? You think so? All right.

So thank you, Col. Johnson. My name is Matt Sprau. I'm the National Environmental Policy Act coordinator at Fort Wainwright and I'd like to welcome you to tonight's public meeting for the disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 Draft

Environmental Impact Statement.

Tonight's meeting is a joint presentation between myself and Ms. Lisa Graham, our cultural resource manager. We'll be talking about two environmental laws. Sorry. The National Environmental Policy Act is what I'll be talking about and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Lisa will be talking about the National Historic Preservation Act, specifically the Section 106 process.

Both processes are important because they require federal agencies to consider the impacts of their actions prior to making decisions. These processes are being conducted concurrently so as to support the sharing of information and assist us in assessing the full scope of the proposed action.

I also wanted to let you know that for your comments to be considered as part of the public record and incorporated into the final EIS, you'll have to submit them to either the court reporter, which is in the back of the room, or filling out one of the comment sheets and leaving it here with us tonight, or taking it home with you and mailing, emailing, or faxing your comments to me. It's important that your comments are submitted in either one of these ways so that they are incorporated into the public record and become part of the -- contribute to the NEPA and Section 106 process.

So the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, requires federal agencies to consider their environmental

impacts of proposed actions prior to making decisions. During the scoping phase of this EIS, we received input from interested members of the public and agencies and with this input, along with internal research by Army staff, we developed this Draft EIS and we created these alternatives for the proposed actions and we were able to assess the impacts of those alternatives on various resource areas.

So this part of the NEPA process, the Draft EIS comment period, allows the members of the public another opportunity for input and to ultimately be involved in the Army's decision-making process. After the presentation, the subject matter experts will be available at the banners to take any questions you may have. Tonight's meeting also fulfills the Section 106 requirements for public input, which Lisa will talk about now.

MS. GRAHAM: Good evening, everyone. My name is Lisa Graham. I'm the cultural resource manager at Fort Wainwright. I help the Army manage historic resources and comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

As Matt said, we're here tonight to fulfill responsibilities for two processes that are very similar. NEPA, or the National Environmental Policy Act, looks at impacts of our undertakings, our projects, on the entire environment, where Section 106 narrows in and looks at impacts on cultural resources. Section 106 of the National Historic

Preservation Act says that federal agencies must consider the effects of their undertakings or projects on historic resources. And in those cases where there's an adverse effect, that federal agency must resolve it through a signed Memorandum of Agreement with consulting parties, usually historic preservation groups. So we work with the National Park Service, the State Historic Preservation Office, and local historical societies.

We've developed this Memorandum of Agreement as we were developing the EIS, so you will find a draft version of it in Appendix A of the EIS.

MR. SPRAU: So the purpose of tonight's meeting is to give you an update on the project and present the analysis on potential environmental impacts of the proposed alternatives, but most importantly it's an opportunity for us to listen to your concerns and to receive your comments regarding the Draft EIS.

The comments you submit during this Draft EIS comment period will help the decision-maker, Col. Johnson, the Garrison Commander at Fort Wainwright, make a decision, an informed decision that best supports the Army's mission in Alaska, meets health and safety requirements, and supports historic preservation goals. So thank you for joining us tonight.

For tonight's meeting, we'll describe the Ladd Field history, we'll discuss the existing conditions of Hangars 2 and

3 and the need for a future management strategy. We'll present the alternatives considered, summarize the analysis of the alternatives, and to provide you an update of where we are and where we're going.

MS. GRAHAM: But the project area that we're discussing tonight is the main cantonment of Fort Wainwright. Within the main cantonment, the area that most of our buildings are located, we have two historic districts. The first one is a district that is significant because of the way it contributes to the Cold War in our understanding of that event. The second district, and in this case is probably a little more important, is our Ladd Field National Historic Landmark, which is significant for its association with World War II.

The area that you see surrounded in the red line is actually the boundary of the National Historic Landmark and you can see Hangars 2 and 3 in the southwestern corner of the National Historic Landmark. Ladd Field, which is the historic name of Fort Wainwright, was founded in 1939 and became operational in 1940 as the home of the Cold Weather Test Detachment. The Army Air Corps needed a place to test airplanes and the associated equipment in a subarctic environment and they chose Fairbanks, Alaska. But soon after Ladd Field was established, we had the beginnings of World War II and Ladd Field gained a very important mission. It became the transfer point of the Northwest Staging Route.

We had an agreement with the Soviet Union, along with other allies, to supply them with equipment to help in their efforts against the Germans and the other active powers in Europe during World War II. From 1942 to 1945, we transferred almost 8,000 planes here in Fairbanks at Ladd Field. They were flown up by American pilots and at Ladd Field given to Soviet pilots to fly and launch the Russian war front.

In 1985, recognizing this important history that happened here at Ladd Field and in Fairbanks, the National Park Service designated Ladd Field a National Historic Landmark. National Historic Landmarks are the most significant properties that we have in the nation. They're those properties that connect us to our collective history. There's only about 2,500 in the United States.

Hangars 2 and 3 are two of about 20 contributing resources to the Ladd Field National Historic Landmark District. They are very significant because most of the buildings were built right prior to the war in support of that Cold Weather Test Detachment. Hangars 2 and 3 are one of the very few buildings that we have that were built directly in support of the war effort. They were built in 1943 and 1944. They have a distinct barrel roof design that you can see as you drive along Gaffney toward the airfield. During World War II, they were maintenance facilities and also acted as a terminal for commercial flying. During the Cold War they housed fighter

intercept squadrons and the photos that you see here, the top photo is a distant historic photo of one of the hangars, and then in the bottom corner we have an interior shot that shows F82 aircraft during the Cold War, and then we have a photograph of the hangars actually being built where you're able to see the trusses in the roof system.

The Army has three types of construction: temporary, semi-permanent, and permanent. And Hangars 2 and 3 were built in a semi-permanent construction, so they had some longevity, but not as long as what you would consider permanent construction. We have documentation from the 1970s that shows that the Army assumed that these buildings would become unusable by the 1980s and would need a large-scale renovation to continue to be used. That didn't happen and we only had small-scale repairs along the way, and so the buildings would start to deteriorate over time, and today many of the systems, the heating, the fire suppression, the electrical systems are out of date.

In 2011, we also had a fire in Hangar 2. The buildings now are in a condition where they're unable to be used and they no longer meet the function that we require of an aircraft maintenance facility.

Now that I've given you a little bit of the history of the hangars in their current condition, I'll turn it over back to Matt to tell you about the purpose and need of this action.

MR. SPRAU: So because of the conditions that Lisa just described to you, the need arose to determine and implement a management strategy that addresses the following objectives: The course of action chosen needs to resolve life, health, and safety concerns, address fiscal constraints, consider land use requirements, and ensure statutory compliance.

To accomplish this, we looked at a variety of alternatives that ranged from re-use to demolition to maintaining status quo or our no-action alternative. We also needed to determine if an alternative was considered reasonable and so for this we developed a viability analysis that vets the alternatives against four screening criteria. And those are the action must directly address the disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, it must be compatible with the current and future military mission at Fort Wainwright, it must not be prohibitively expensive, and it must have a reasonably foreseeable funding source or a mechanism for obtaining applicable and timely funding. And so for an alternative to be considered reasonable and legally viable, it had to meet all four of these screening criteria.

And the alternatives that we considered for this Draft EIS were applicable for either or both of the hangars and they are demolition, rehabilitation, removal and reconstruction on Fort Wainwright to support a resumption, closed layaway, transfer of ownership to non-Army entity, federal, state, or

private commercial, or to maintain the status quo, which is our no-action alternative.

The re-use options that we analyzed to support the various alternatives are an unmanned aircraft system maintenance hangar, an AVCATT simulator training facility, a fixed simulator training facility, a physical fitness center, an Arctic readiness center, general purpose warm storage, a youth center, a museum, and a roller rink. And so we took the alternatives with the various re-use options and vetted them through the viability analysis and after careful consideration, we eliminated all but two of the alternatives because the alternative was either prohibitively expensive, wasn't compatible with the current or future military mission at Fort Wainwright, or both.

So the viability analysis produced two alternatives which we considered reasonable and legally viable, which we carried forward for full analysis. And those are Alternative 1, the demolition of Hangars 2 and 3 and supporting infrastructure, which is our preferred alternative, and the no-action alternative, which is a requirement of NEPA, but also acts as a baseline which allows us to assess an alternative's impacts.

So next we analyzed the environmental impacts of the two alternatives considered reasonable and those are summarized here in this table. The impacts range from short-term minor to

long-term beneficial, to moderate, to severe, with the severe or the significant impact occurring on cultural resources with the physical loss of the hangars either through demolition or the no-action alternative. And we also conducted a cumulative impacts assessment with past, current, and future actions that are shown here in the table. So since the impacts for the air quality, safety, transportation, sustainability, environmental justice, and protection of children were not significant, they received a lower level analysis which means that because their likely impacts were small or could be mitigated, it was unlikely that they would contribute cumulatively either directly or indirectly. And since the cultural resources had a significant impact and hazardous materials/hazardous waste had the potential to significantly contribute directly or indirectly, these received a level 2 analysis, which means that we applied more in-depth criteria in evaluating these resource areas.

For cultural resource analysis, we anticipate a moderate impact to World War II resources in Alaska for both alternatives. And for the hazardous materials/hazardous waste resource area, we anticipate a short-term minor, long-term beneficial with the implementation of Alternative 1, the demolition or a minor and not significant impact from implementation of the no-action alternative in regards to the materials used and created to accomplish the proposed action.

MS. GRAHAM: As I mentioned earlier with Section 106, when you have an adverse effect, you have to resolve that through a Memorandum of Agreement. In this case, we were looking at demolition and the no-action alternative and in consultation with those historic preservation groups I mentioned earlier, we came up with a three-tiered approach. First, we looked at public outreach.

With the importance and significance of Ladd Field, it's integral to our understanding of this history to get that information out to the public and to get information from the public about Ladd Field.

So we are making our staff more available for local lectures and doing more publications in local newspapers and things like web sites and Facebook, and just getting the information out about the important history of Ladd Field.

The second part of that is doing a re-evaluation of our National Historic Landmark. The first evaluation was done in the 1980s and we have a lot of new information since that time. So we need to do this re-evaluation to really understand the landmark and where we need to go in the future. It helps us out with the third tier of the approach: stewardship within our National Historic Landmark.

With the potential loss of these buildings, we need to refocus on the elements of the landmark that we have available and look at maintenance and prolonged upkeep of these buildings

and really focus our efforts on north posts and buildings like Hangar 1 and those are very important to our understanding of what happened here at Ladd Field during World War II.

MR. SPRAU: All right. So this slide shows the timeline for the EIS and Section 106 processes. And so we're currently in the middle of the Draft EIS comment period which will end on August 5th. We anticipate having a finalized Memorandum of Agreement in the fall, publishing the Final EIS in early winter 2013, and issuing the Record of Decision in February of 2014.

So, once again, the main purpose of the meeting tonight is to gain your input. In order to ensure that your comments are incorporated into the Final EIS, please provide your comments to either the court reporter, fill out a comment form and leave it with us here tonight, or mail it to me, e-mail or fax your comments.

And if you haven't grabbed one yet, we have CDs and hard copies of documents in the back for you to keep, and also more information can be found on the Fort Wainwright Environmental web page. And so comments should be postmarked by August 5th, 2013 in order to be incorporated into the Final EIS.

And so this concludes the presentation tonight and the subject matter experts will now be available at the banners to take any questions that you may have. So thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.

(Off record)

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

* * * *

PUBLIC COMMENT

ANONYMOUS: The study cost over one million dollars to do. The American taxpayer has paid over a million dollars to make a decision to take down two hangars that are falling apart that someone in elementary school can probably spend 10 minutes and have it figured out. Another gross waste of American taxpayer funds and it's all being done because of regulations that are out of control.

MS. ALTHEA ST. MARTIN: This is Althea St. Martin, in Fairbanks, Alaska, commenting on the EIS on Hangars 2 and 3 at Fort Wainwright. It appears that the hangars have no useful purpose in the military mission for Fort Wainwright and, instead, are taking up space that could be used for the mission in support of what is current.

The buildings are draining resources that are badly needed in other positions, and useful other positions. The hangars are going to continue to deteriorate. There are no funds available for repairs, for any type of renovations. So what's going to happen is they are going to deteriorate, become a safety hazard, a health hazard, and are going to cost much more because there's not going to be reuse of the materials if we wait till it falls.

Financially, a contractor could come in and reuse that material, which is going to decrease the cost on it. The military shouldn't have to fund this when they have a shortage

of funds and we have a strategic mission that is very, very needed.

So I encourage the demolition of Hangars 2 and 3. I would hope that there would be a historical record, possibly 3D videos of the buildings so that historically the atmosphere, the space, the structure can be kept for historical purposes; at the same time, it would not impact the mission that is needed at Fort Wainwright.

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
) ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Elizabeth D'Amour, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska, residing at Fairbanks, Alaska, and Court Reporter for Liz D'Amour & Associates, Inc., do hereby certify:

That the annexed and foregoing FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA, DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT ON THE DISPOSITION OF HANGARS 2 AND 3, TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC MEETING was taken before me on the 10th day of July 2013, beginning at the hour of 6:35 p.m., at the Princess Hotel, Jade Room, Fairbanks, Alaska;

That this hearing, as heretofore annexed, is a true and correct transcription of the proceedings, taken by me electronically and thereafter transcribed by me;

That the hearing has been retained by me for the purpose of filing the same with MR. MATTHEW SPRAU, 1060 Gaffney Road, #4500, Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-4500.

That I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I financially interested in this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal this 23rd day of July 2013.

_____
Elizabeth D'Amour
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My commission expires: 12/28/14

S E A L

From:	Bill Brophy
To:	Bill Brophy; Sprau, Matthew H CTR (US)
Cc:	Bill Brophy; Johnson, Ronald M COL USARMY (US); Meeks, Michael T CIV (US)
Subject:	RE: Disposition of Hangar #2 and #3 Fort Wainwright, Alaska
Date:	Tuesday, June 25, 2013 8:42:37 AM

Correction: First paragraph should read: hangar #2 and #3.

My apology.

Bill Brophy

From: Bill Brophy
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2013 8:42 AM
To: 'matthew.h.sprau.ctr@mail.mil'
Cc: Bill Brophy ; Ron Col Johnson (ronald.johnson@us.army.mil); Mike Meeks (michael.t.meeks4.civ@mail.mil)
Subject: Disposition of Hangar #2 and #3 Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Bill Brophy

301 Snowy Owl Lane

Fairbanks, AK 99712

(907) 457-0232

Mr. Matthew Sprau

Director of Public Works

Attn: IMFW-PWE (Sprau)

1060 Gaffney Road #4500

Fort Wainwright, AK 99703-4500

Sent by email: 25 June 2013

Dear Mr. Sprau, Mr. Mike Meeks, and Col Ron Johnson, 25 June 2013

I strongly endorse Alternative 1, demolition of Hangars #1 and #2. I have experience with the infrastructure of Fort Wainwright dating back to 1964. The hangars are unsafe, unusable, and maintenance is a terrible drain of precious funds. This action is considerably overdue.

Land space at Fort Wainwright is very precious, especially on Ladd Airfield. Demolition of the old outdated hangars will allow future development on the airfield so vitally needed for combat readiness of our aviation soldiers and support of their war-fighting brethren.

Expedite the Draft EIS process and move into the 21st Century. Execute Alternative #1. Our soldiers expect us to resource their ability to train and fight.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email so that I know my remarks are entered into comments for the DEIS. Thanks.

With best regards,

Bill

Bill Brophy

US Army, retired

NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY: This message may contain privileged or confidential information and is intended for the addressee only. If you are not the named addressee you should not review, disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. If you received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and delete this errant message. Finally, the recipient should check this e-mail and any attachments for the presence of viruses. Usibelli Coal Mine Inc. accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. Thank you.

From:	Karl Gohlke
To:	Sprau, Matthew H CTR (US)
Cc:	Bill Vivlamore
Subject:	FWW Hgrs 2 & 3 Demo
Date:	Tuesday, June 25, 2013 2:57:12 PM

Mr. Matthew Sprau

Directorate of Public Works

Attn: IMFW-PWE

1060 Gaffney Road #4500

Ft Wainwright, Alaska 99703-4500

Dear Mr. Sprau,

I firmly support Alternative #1, Demolition of Hangers #2 & #3; this action is long overdue. Of the four Ft Wainwright WW II hangers, one has already burned to the ground and one (#2) had electrical fire that caused significant damage to the structure. As noted in the study, the two (#2 & #3) hangers are not in use do to years of arctic condition wear and tear, safety concerns and the lack of expensive modifications. These deficiencies have all contributed in compromising structural integrity of both buildings. It is time for the replacement of these hangers.

While both buildings are not in use they still require an annual maintenance cost of $700,000. With the constriction of military funds, it is important to invest in future developments for combat readiness of our aviation teams and their equipment. The demolition of the outdated hangars must be replaced with modern facilities to house our multimillion dollar aircrafts; aircrafts that support our American Soldiers.

Execute Alternative #1 and get Ft Wainwrights' Aviation Brigade into the 21st Century. American Soldiers fighting for America's freedom expect us to resource their ability to train, fight and maintain with most modern up to date equipment and facilities. One percent of the American population are in the military fighting for the freedom of the remaining 99%. The 1% deserve nothing but the best!

Please acknowledge receipt of this email to confirm my remarks were received.

Sincerely,

Karl I Gohlke

Karl I. Gohlke

Outside Sales

Frontier Supply Company

981 Van Horn Rd.

Fairbanks, AK. 99701

Tel 907-374-3500

Fax 907-374-3570

Cell 907-378-5615

FPS logo

From:	Alton CURTIS
To:	Sprau, Matthew H CTR (US)
Subject:	Hangers 2/3
Date:	Monday, June 24, 2013 1:15:49 PM

Mr. Sprau: Those hangers were old when I was at Ft. Wainwright in 67-68. We had a gym in an unnumbered hanger that was condemned by the flood in 67. Probably best to take the hangers down before they fall down and damage someone or something. Good Luck. Alton Curtis, 05323265.

PUBLIC COMMENT

ANONYMOUS: The study cost over one million dollars to do. The American taxpayer has paid over a million dollars to make a decision to take down two hangars that are falling apart that someone in elementary school can probably spend 10 minutes and have it figured out. Another gross waste of American taxpayer funds and it's all being done because of regulations that are out of control.

MS. ALTHEA ST. MARTIN: This is Althea St. Martin, in Fairbanks, Alaska, commenting on the EIS on Hangars 2 and 3 at Fort Wainwright. It appears that the hangars have no useful purpose in the military mission for Fort Wainwright and, instead, are taking up space that could be used for the mission in support of what is current.

The buildings are draining resources that are badly needed in other positions, and useful other positions. The hangars are going to continue to deteriorate. There are no funds available for repairs, for any type of renovations. So what's going to happen is they are going to deteriorate, become a safety hazard, a health hazard, and are going to cost much more because there's not going to be reuse of the materials if we wait till it falls.

Financially, a contractor could come in and reuse that material, which is going to decrease the cost on it. The military shouldn't have to fund this when they have a shortage

of funds and we have a strategic mission that is very, very needed.

So I encourage the demolition of Hangars 2 and 3. I would hope that there would be a historical record, possibly 3D videos of the buildings so that historically the atmosphere, the space, the structure can be kept for historical purposes; at the same time, it would not impact the mission that is needed at Fort Wainwright.

This page intentionally left blank.

FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

DISPOSITION OF HANGARS 2 AND 3

TRANSCRIPT OF AGENCY MEETING
Before Lisa Graham and Matthew Sprau
Hearing Moderators

Princess Lodge
Jade Room
Fairbanks, Alaska
July 11, 2013
10:00 a.m.

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. WESLEY POTTER: Good morning, everyone. On behalf of Col. Johnson, I'd like to welcome everyone here for today's session, a very important session. And also I'd like to thank everybody here for taking time of their -- your schedules to participate in this process.

We have a very interesting presentation to go through and a couple of things that I'd ask of everyone is, you know, do participate. We've assembled an excellent team of functional experts here. Do leverage their expertise both during the presentation, during Q and A, and afterwards just throughout the room if you have any questions.

Second thing I'd ask is that they will explain the process as far as documenting your comments or concerns, you know. It's very important that we capture that information. So please pay attention to that when they talk about that part of the process.

Again, thank you for your participation. I look forward to your input and your comments as we work through this. Thanks.

MR. SPRAU: All right. Thank you, Mr. Potter. Just first off, if I'm not loud enough, please let me know. I tend to speak a little quieter, so I'll try to get into the microphone so you can hear me.

My name is Matt Sprau. I'm the National Environmental

Policy Act coordinator at Fort Wainwright. I'd like to welcome you to today's agency meeting for the disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

So today's meeting will be a joint presentation between myself and Ms. Lisa Graham, our cultural resource manager at Fort Wainwright. We'll be covering two environmental laws. I'll be talking about the National Environmental Policy Act and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Lisa will be covering the National Historic Preservation Act, specifically the Section 106 process. Both processes are important because they require federal agencies to consider the impacts of their actions prior to implementing those actions. And the processes have been -- are being conducted concurrently in order to assist us in sharing information and be able to assess the full scope of the project.

We have a court reporter here with us today who will be capturing everything that's said, any comments, any concerns, so that your input is incorporated into the Final EIS and the Section 106 processes.

So the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, requires federal agencies to consider the environmental impacts of their actions prior to making decisions to implement those actions. During the scoping phase of the EIS, we received input from interested agencies and members of the public and with this input and internal research by Army staff, we were

able to create the scope of the Draft EIS, create alternatives for the proposed action, and analyze the impacts of those alternatives on various resource areas.

This part of the NEPA process, the Draft EIS comment period, allows the public and agencies another opportunity for input so that they're ultimately involved in the Army's decision-making process. After the presentation today, we'll open it up for questions or comments concerning the Draft EIS and the Section 106 process. Tonight's meeting also fulfills the public requirement input for Section 106, which Lisa will talk about.

MS. GRAHAM: Good morning, everyone. As Matt said, my name is Lisa Graham. I'm the cultural resource manager at Fort Wainwright. I help the Army manage historic properties and comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Also as Matt said, we're here today to fulfill our responsibilities to two processes that are very similar. But where NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, takes that broad view looking at impacts to the entire environment, Section 106 narrows in and looks at the impact to cultural resources. Section 106 says the federal agency must consider the effects of its undertakings on historic properties. In those rare cases where there's an adverse effect, the federal agency must resolve it through a signed Memorandum of

Agreement, an agreement that they consult on with a number of local state and national historic preservation groups, many of whom are here tonight [sic]. And so what you'll hear in this presentation is very similar to what we've talked about through those consultation meetings. And being that we have been conducting Section 106 concurrently with the development of the EIS, we have a Draft Memorandum of Agreement in Appendix A of the EIS for your review.

MR. SPRAU: So the purpose of tonight's [sic] meeting is to give you an update on the project and present the analysis of the potential environmental impacts from the alternatives that were considered for the Draft EIS. But most importantly, it's another opportunity for us to listen to your concerns and to receive your comments regarding the Draft EIS and the Draft Memorandum of Agreement.

The comments you submit during the Draft EIS comment period will ultimately help the decision-maker, Col. Johnson, the Garrison Commander at Fort Wainwright, make an informed decision that best supports the Army's mission in Alaska, supports historic preservation goals, and meets health and safety requirements. So thank you for joining us today, and thank you for your input throughout the whole process.

For today's meeting, we'll go over the Ladd Field history, we'll discuss the existing conditions of Hangars 2 and 3 and the need for a future management strategy. We'll present

the alternatives considered, summarize the analysis and the potential environmental impacts of those alternatives, and we'll give you a time line of where we're at and where we're going.

MS. GRAHAM: The project area that we're discussing tonight is the Fort Wainwright main post where most of the buildings are. Within the main post, or cantonment, we have two historic districts, a district that is significant for its association with the Cold War and then another district that has a bit more significance, it's our Ladd Field National Historic Landmark, and it's significant for its association with World War II.

You can see the National Historic Landmark here with the red line as a boundary. And for folks on the phone, we're on slide 7. And also you can see Hangars 2 and 3 in the southwestern corner of the map. Ladd Field was established in 1931 and became -- or 1939 and became operational in 1940 as the home for the Cold Weather Test Detachment. The Army Air Corps needed a place to test their planes and the associated equipment in a subarctic environment and they chose Fairbanks. But soon after the establishment of Ladd Field, World War II began and Ladd Field gained a new, very significant mission. They became the transfer point for the Lend-Lease Operations in the Northwest Staging Route.

So the United States had an agreement with the Soviet

Union, along with other ally nations, to supply them with material in support of their war efforts. So from 1942 to 1945, we supplied the Soviet Union with almost 8,000 planes here at Ladd Field. American pilots would fly those planes up through Canada to Ladd Field, to a waiting Soviet pilot who would fly them on to the Soviet war front.

Recognizing this historic significance, in 1985, the National Park Service made Ladd Field a National Historic Landmark. Landmarks are the most significant and historic resources that we have in the nation. They connect us as a people to our collective history, and there's only about 2,500 in the nation.

Hangars 2 and 3 are two of the contributing resources to the Ladd Field National Historic Landmark; two of about 20 buildings and structures. They are very significant because most of the buildings that make up the landmark were actually built in support of that Cold Weather Test Detachment. And it's one of the few hangars, both of these, that were built during the war to support the war effort. Hangars 2 and 3 were built in 1943 and 1944. They have barreled roofs that are very distinctive. You can see them as you drive down Gaffney toward the airfield.

During World War II, they were maintenance facilities. They also acted as a terminal for commercial flights, and during the Cold War they housed fighter intercept squadrons.

The photos that you see here, and for the folks on the phone, we're on slide 10, include a distance photo of an historic view of one of the hangars; an interior photograph that shows F82 aircraft inside one of the hangars; and also a photograph of both Hangars 2 and 3 being built, so you're able to see the trusses in the roof system.

The Army has three types of construction: temporary, semi-permanent, and permanent. Hangars 2 and 3 were built as semi-permanent construction, so they had a decent longevity over a number of decades, but they weren't built to last as long as your general permanent builds. We have documentation from the 1970s that shows at the Army expected that Hangars 2 and 3 would become unusable by the early 1980s and that they would need a large-scale renovation to continue to be used. That large-scale renovation did not happen; it was small-scale repairs over time. So what we ended up with today is many of the systems failing within the building, including the heating, the fire suppression, and the electrical system. In 2011, we had a fire in Hangar 2, which added to that overall deterioration of the building. So today we find that these buildings are unfit for current military functions and they're unsafe for occupancy.

So now that you have a little bit of the history of these buildings and their current condition, I'll turn it back over to Matt to tell you about the purpose and need of this

undertaking.

MR. SPRAU: We're on slide 12, for those on the phone. Because of the current state of the hangars that Lisa just described, the need arose to determine and implement a management strategy for these hangars that addresses the following objectives. So to develop and implement a course of action that resolves life, health, and safety concerns, addresses fiscal constraints, considers land use requirements, and ensures the statutory compliance.

To accomplish this, we looked at a variety of alternatives that ranged from re-use to demolition to maintaining status quo or our no-action alternative. We also needed to determine if an alternative is considered reasonable and so for this we developed this viability analysis that vets the alternatives against four screening criteria. And so the screening criteria are: the action must directly address the disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, it must be compatible with the current and future military mission at Fort Wainwright, it must not be prohibitively expensive, and it must have a reasonably foreseeable funding source or a mechanism for obtaining applicable and timely funding. And so for an alternative to be considered reasonable and legally viable, it had to meet all four of these screening criteria.

So the alternatives that were considered as part of this Draft EIS were for either or both of the hangars. So they

were the demolition, rehabilitation, the removal and reconstruction of the hangars on Fort Wainwright to support a reuse option, closed layaway, transfer of ownership to non-Army entities, federal, state, or private commercial, and to maintain the status quo or our no-action alternative.

The re-use options that were analyzed to support these various alternatives were an unmanned aircraft system maintenance hangar, an AVCATT simulator training facility, a fixed simulator training facility, physical fitness center, an Arctic readiness center, general purpose warm storage facility, a youth center, a museum, and a roller rink. And so we took the alternatives with the various re-use options and we vetted them through this viability analysis and after careful consideration, we eliminated all but two alternatives because they were either prohibitively expensive, could not meet the current and future military mission at Fort Wainwright, or both.

So the viability analysis produced two alternatives that were considered reasonable and legally viable. We're on slide 16. These alternatives are the Alternative 1, the demolition of Hangars 2 and 3 and supporting infrastructure, which is our preferred alternative, and the no-action alternative, which is a requirement of NEPA, but also acts as a baseline for allowing us to assess an alternative's impacts from a proposed action.

Next we analyzed the environmental impacts of the two alternatives considered reasonable on various resource areas, which are summarized here in this table on slide 17. So the impacts range from short-term minor, long-term beneficial, to moderate, to severe. The severe or the significant impact occurs on cultural resources with the physical loss of the hangars either through demolition or implementation of the no-action alternative. And so we also conducted a cumulative impacts assessment of the alternatives with past, current, and future military actions and actions that are occurring off-post, which you can see here in the table on slide 18 that help us assess the overall impacts of the alternatives. And so since the impacts for air quality, safety, transportation, sustainability, environmental justice, and protection of children were not significant, they received a lower level analysis which means that because the likely impacts are small or could be mitigated, it was unlikely that they would contribute significant direct or indirect cumulative impacts. And since the cultural resources resulted in the significant impact and hazardous waste/hazardous materials resulted in the potential for significantly contributing direct or indirect impacts, these received a level 2 analysis, so a higher-level analysis applying more in-depth criteria to assess the cumulative impacts.

From this what we came up with was that moderate

impacts to World War II resources in Alaska could be expected from implementation of both alternatives and the short-term minor, long-term beneficial, and minor impacts could be expected for materials used and created to accomplish the proposed action with the implementation of both alternatives for hazardous materials/hazardous waste.

MS. GRAHAM: We're on slide 19. As I mentioned earlier with Section 106, when you have an adverse effect, you must develop a Memorandum of Agreement to resolve that adverse effect. In this case, we have a three-tiered approach. We first start with public outreach. The history and significance of a Ladd Field is incredibly important, but that doesn't mean much if it's not known by the local community and those people that can actually help with the preservation and the understanding of this important resource. So as part of this Memorandum of Agreement, our cultural resource staff will be made available to local groups for lectures and we're developing publications for local newspapers and web sites, and different media outlets.

The second tier of the approach is a re-evaluation of the National Historic Landmark. It was nominated as a landmark in the mid eighties and since that time we have a lot of new information on it, and this will actually help in the third tier, a refocus on the north post and the NHL together. With the possible demolition or the no-action alternative resulting

in possible loss of the hangars, we need to refocus our efforts on the remaining elements within the NHL. And that's a recommitment by the Army for stewardship of these resources.

MR. SPRAU: Okay. We're on slide 20. So this slide shows the EIS and the Section 106 time line. We're currently in the Draft EIS comment period, or roughly the middle of a comment period, which ends on August 5th. We anticipate finalizing the Memorandum of Agreement this fall, publishing the Final Environmental Impact Statement this December, and issuing the Record of Decision by February of 2014.

We're on slide 21. So, once again, the main purpose of today's meeting is to gain your input and receive your comments. So the court reporter is here with us today to record any input that you may have and also, if you would like to you, you can leave comments using the comment form which is here with us tonight, leave it here or submit comments to me either mailed, e-mailed, or fax.

And so I think the majority of everybody here with us tonight [sic] has a copy of the EIS, but just in case you need more copies or don't have one, you can pick one up here with us or let me know and I'll get more copies to you. Also more information can be found on the Fort Wainwright Environmental Division web page and we just found out that the web page is down right now, so it should be up fairly soon, but if you go to it and you get an "access denied" don't worry about it.

Just contact me; I'll get you any information that you may need.

But in order for your comments to be incorporated into the Final EIS, please get them to me by August 5th or postmarked by August 5th, 2013.

And so this concludes today's presentation. We're going to open it up for questions, comments that you may have. If -- when you do make a comment, if you don't mind giving your name and position, who you work for so that we can capture it with the court reporter. And thank you very much for joining us today.

So with that, any questions or comments?

MS. COOK: This has not specifically to do with the hangars. Elizabeth Cook, Tanana-Yukon Historical Society.

Lisa, you speak about the possible re-evaluation of the Ladd NHL and speak about, quote, a lot of new information. What are you referring to?

MS. GRAHAM: Well, we know that Building 2077 in the original nomination showed as a World War II building. It's not; it's a Cold War building. And another building in the north post that was a World War II building, but didn't show up as one, plus there's about three or four buildings that we need to -- that we have new information on that will be part of that process.

And also just from the 1980s, the whole concept of

landscape, we actually had a person working with us this summer that deals with historic landscape, and so she's helping us with that process. The original nomination is incredibly short. You know, it's about four or five pages. They attempted to do revision in 2001. There was a lot of information gained through that, but was never made official. And so we can take that information from 2001. We can take the information that we gain as professionals just in the last 30 years and work through that.

As we've talked in the consulting parties, a possibility is that the boundary would move up from Montgomery Road to the airfield because there would not be any World War II resources south of the airfield.

MS. COOK: Thank you.

MS. GRAHAM: You're welcome.

MS. BLAHUTA: Well, you know, I hate the 106 process because I know I'm always on the losing side. I'm Renee Blahuta. I'm also with the Tanana-Yukon Historical Society. What we're looking here is about two dif -- totally different impacts. One is the hangars itself that are contributing to the National Landmark, but have high significance all standing by itself. It's -- as far as to my knowledge, these two hangars are the last remaining two hangars are the last remaining two hangars. All others were whittled away from Canada to Alaska. The last one that we lost was a hangar in

Eielson.

MS. GRAHAM: I agree, we're at a really dire state when it comes to World War II hangars.

MS. BLAHUTA: So.....

MS. GRAHAM: I know there's a couple left in the state, but they're in terrible condition.

MS. BLAHUTA: No, no, no. No, no, no. There's -- they're hit by floods, by fires, by demolition. There.....

AUDIENCE MEMBER: And lots of maintenance.

MS. BLAHUTA: There is.....

MS. GRAHAM: Yes.

MS. BLAHUTA: Yes. Very much so. So we have to look at those hangars as being important all by themselves. And we have -- nationwide, we have wooden hangars from World War I that are in the national register. They're their prized possession.

Now, architecturally, the importance of the hangars towards today, we shouldn't lose that. We should maintain that. And I had to postpone a meeting with the heirs of the -- Jenny Wood individual and she would have been here today talking about it because she was one amongst many women that ferried those planes to Alaska. And people say that.....

MS. GRAHAM: Was that Nancy?

MS. BLAHUTA: What?

MS. GRAHAM: Was that -- her first name is Nancy?

MS. BLAHUTA: Jenny Wood.

MS. GRAHAM: I have not met her.

MS. BLAHUTA: Well, she's dead.

MS. GRAHAM: Oh, okay.

MS. BLAHUTA: She's dead, so you'll never.....

MS. GRAHAM: I'm sorry, who's the lady that you were going to bring?

MS. BLAHUTA: She would be here today.....

MS. GRAHAM: Oh, I apologize. I misunderstood.

MS. BLAHUTA: If she still were alive, she would be here today. And we're losing people from the greatest generation day by day and in Alaska as well as all over the nation. And so we have less support now -- knowledgeable support here for the hangars, for Ladd Field, for the base because they died out.

MS. GRAHAM: Yeah. Well, Natalie and I had an amazing opportunity to meet one of the women that was one that had ferried planes and we met one of the women that was a nurse at Ladd Field in 1941.

MS. BLAHUTA: There wasn't anybody.....

MS. GRAHAM: It was great.

MS. BLAHUTA: .....in this community here that was not involved.

MS. GRAHAM: Uh-huh.

MS. BLAHUTA: Either they worked here or they had

enlisted or they came here. So there is so much that took place here. What happened here, your airlines got their first start here ferrying people back and forth.

So it's -- this space is very, very important, but I'd like to have the hangars looked at different as just what they contribute to our knowledge here. As far as the whole base is concerned, Ladd Field Historic Landmark, of course, those hangars are the corner on this side of the post. And until the base was closed, the people that came here, that brought their families here because they were here as young men, or women, and they came here and that's the first things they saw was those hangars and this is -- they all would come down and they see those hangars.

MS. GRAHAM: And that's the thing that we recognize, is that this is a significant loss. It's a significant loss to.....

MS. BLAHUTA: It.....

MS. GRAHAM: .....our National Historic Landmark.

MS. BLAHUTA: It's more significant than you may realize yourself because the landmark itself has been whittled away and there's the numbers in here.

MS. GRAHAM: Uh-huh.

MS. BLAHUTA: And they will be whittled away in the future.

MS. GRAHAM: And that's what we hope to at least, you

know, try to prevent them from.....

MS. BLAHUTA: Yeah, I know what you hope to do. It doesn't always happen that way. So we need a much -- you have a lot of written records. You write -- you just completed a textbook for schools.

MS. GRAHAM: The lesson plan?

MS. BLAHUTA: Lesson plan. That's great. But who's going to listen to it or use it? You know, all the teachers are very, very busy. So -- and, you know, it doesn't quite do it. We're such a visual orientated society. We need to see and feel to believe. It's really strange, last week I had a young woman visiting and her grandmother survived the concentration camp in Austria, and it was nothing, you know, it was just her grandmother talking until she went and saw the concentration camp. And that brought it home to her.

It's amazing, but we have to have those visuals that impact. And this place here, like most of Alaska, or Fairbanks for sure, was temporary, you know, and it became permanent, and that's a challenge. But we're here temporary, too, and we make an impact.

So I think it's well worth looking back. We have studied those hangars for more years that I can remember. I think it was at least 13 years or more. Report after report after report and things could have been done then and, you know, funding comes out of a different pocket and so it's just

more work. I think it's worth looking at it and give it some thought.

Which reminds me, Lend-Lease, those soldiers here had their hands full training the Russian aviators. The Russian aviators were highly educated. They probably considered Alaska just another Siberia, and Siberia was a penal colony. So there's lots of different aspects.

One more thing, how many of you, if any, have seen some of those planes? The Lend-Lease planes?

MS. GRAHAM: I think we've seen some from that time period.

MS. BLAHUTA: Uh-huh.

MS. GRAHAM: But I don't know if I've actually seen the Lend-Lease planes.

MS. BLAHUTA: Well, I have been bombed by one (indiscernible - laughing).

MS. GRAHAM: So you had a very personal memory of those.

MS. BLAHUTA: Very much so. So it was important.

MS. GRAHAM: And I thank you so much for your remarks.

MS. BLAHUTA: You're welcome.

MR. SPRAU: Lisa, can you just say her name again for the record.

MS. GRAHAM: It's Renee Blahuta.

MR. HILL: Well, if I may, I'm Jae Hill. I'm the

deputy planning director for the borough. I understand that this is a loss for the historic nature of the district and for our community and this is part of the nucleus that helped our community grow to what it is today. And so for that it's a little sad, but it's understandable that, you know, times change and things will fall down eventually whether we help them or not.

So, that being said, I would like to see a little bit more work done for the mitigation, you know, some actual active preservation that is possibly for reuse of the materials of the buildings. I've seen the estimates of how many dump trucks it's going to take to haul that off to a landfill and in a place where we're located, you know, so far from some useful resources and the cost of resources being what they are and the inherent, you know, unique quality and the nature of those materials, I feel that there's probably still a pretty viable volume of materials that could be reused elsewhere in the community on different projects. They were talking about building a new school, they're talking about -- I mean, it might be really interesting to retain some of those.

Additionally, I know I've seen photos of some historic graffiti from -- I think it's in Hangar 1.

MS. GRAHAM: It's in 1.

MR. HILL: There's nothing in 2 or 3?

MS. GRAHAM: Not that I've ever seen.

MR. HILL: Okay. But if things like that were encountered, I mean, I would like to see them maybe documented and, you know, those panels or walls may be, you know, retained for some kind of purpose or something like that, like an actual, you know, physical -- you know, what can we salvage from the building in terms of not just taking photos, but additional photos.

I'll have some written comments provided before the deadline definitely indicating, you know, our position and kind of the things we've evaluated just for kind of that active preservation. But I think that the borough would really like to see those kind of things focused on just to retain what last vestiges of the historic nature of those buildings are able to be retained and not just buried.

MS. BLAHUTA: You know that if those buildings are destroyed, they could have a mitigation of great environmental impact right off the -- we act too soon to develop areas. And one of the problems Fort Wainwright had, for instance, they build a new military housing in an area that was polluted and that is still polluted. Kids shouldn't play out there.

So we build first and then have to go back later. This site of those hangars has the possibility of being a major environmental impact area. The clean-up would cost -- I don't know much -- well, more than it would cost to rehabilitate those hangars.

MS. GRAHAM: One thing we're also doing, and we're hoping to have it done this fall, is a revision of the HABS that was conducted in the eighties. So that's going to be a good process to see if we see any of those cultural aspects of the building, like graffiti, something like that. Because we're going to go through one last time and.....

MR. HILL: Before demolition?

MS. GRAHAM: Uh-huh. Yeah.

MR. HILL: Okay.

MS. BLAHUTA: The first time I walked in the hangar, it was some -- quite some years ago, I got goose bumps. It was fantastic.

MS. GRAHAM: Uh-huh.

MS. BLAHUTA: The hangars are just absolutely gorgeous on the inside. The office area had a metal desk. Talking about it, I could see the pin-up girls on the background. It was just my imagination, okay, took over and it really -- like I said, I got goose bumps because it was so fabulous and significant. The construction, the atmosphere, it really told a story all by itself.

MR. HILL: And I agree with your comment, you know, that you need to be able to see that history and be able to touch it, to show it to people and whatnot.

MS. BLAHUTA: Oh, absolutely.

MR. HILL: I know when I was a child and I was living

over in Germany during the Cold War and we would, you know, vacation at the Nazi palaces that had been turned into the MWR hotels. And so we would go stay in these hotels that had, you know, seen so much history. They've all been torn down now. They're all gone. There's -- all of that entire era of history is just missing now. It's a tragedy that you can't see it.

MS. BLAHUTA: Yeah. And we have -- you know, we here are judged for our lack of cultural heritage. We are what many people consider as a disposable society. We just build something and then chunk it and build new. I think that this era has passed and it's important for the United States as a whole to value its heritage.

MS. MARX: I have an aside question for you.

MS. GRAHAM: Oh, I apologize, you're.....

MS. MARX: Oh, Kathi Marx, Fairbanks North Star Borough. In regards to the Russian side, is anyone aware of any, you know, what's left there? You know, obviously, they probably had maybe not the similar hangars, but they must have had structures. I mean.....

MS. GRAHAM: I know that they did the same thing. They built runways and had hangars along the route and I've seen pictures of their runways being built, that they were building out in the middle of Siberia. I don't know about their resources that are still there, but I know that the Russian communities are -- do celebrate that history. We worked with a

sister city group that's here in Fairbanks and there's a sister city in Russia and we do a joint celebration. We did one commemorating the Lend-Lease Operations last winter some time. It was really cold went there.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: November.

MS. MARX: Uh-huh. So are you considering that in some of your future work and interpretation to, you know, actually create this similar bridge that -- of communication between the two nations and have the opportunity to, you know, really, you know, connect?

MS. GRAHAM: Yeah, it's something that -- actually the lesson plan that Renee mentioned was this project that we worked with, with the sister city. We're looking at developing something with Russian school children and children here in Fairbanks. I guess they've done a few things the last few years with that.

So I think that's a great opening for us to start talking to people that are over in Russia and looking at what they have and try to work together.

MS. MARX: And consider it in this re-evaluation or, you know, the HABS re-evaluation or is the HABS re-evaluation going to focus strictly on the built environment to.....

MS. GRAHAM: Yes, usually we just would HABS in with the NHL, the nomination, that's going to be focusing on the built environment.

MS. MARX: Yeah.

MS. GRAHAM: But that history.....

MS. MARX: Because it originally was the cultural -- the reason that -- you know, the designation was a cultural designation. You know, it.....

MS. GRAHAM: It's the -- yeah, it's the history of the.....

MS. MARX: The history associated with the buildings. It's not necessarily the quality of this fantastic, unique building. That's the original designation. So it seems like if you're going to stay with that kind of nomination, you know, and in keeping with the original nomination, you know, it could be expanded upon.

MS. GRAHAM: And then something we've also looked into is looking into the facilities that were built in Canada.

MS. MARX: Yeah.

MS. GRAHAM: We put a grant in to look at those facilities and look at what's left.....

MS. MARX: What's -- yeah, exactly.

MS. GRAHAM: .....but the American government is not big on funding.....

MS. MARX: No.

MS. GRAHAM: .....us going to another nation. But I think there are opportunities.....

MS. MARX: But I just thought maybe through

associations, at least kind of make sure that -- you know, that was its original purpose, not -- it wasn't insular.

MS. GRAHAM: And we talked to those preservation professionals that are in Russia and it came to that.

Do we have any comments or questions from the folks that we have on the phone?

LIEUTENANT NUTT: This is Lieutenant Nutt. I don't have any at this time. Thank you, though, for asking.

MS. CLEMMONS: This is Janet. I don't know if there are any questions. We couldn't quite hear everything that comes into the record, but if there are any questions about the NHL designation that maybe we could answer.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. So for the folks in the room, the National Park Service oversees all National Historic Landmarks and so they were saying if there are any questions about that original designation, that they could answer those questions.

MR. LEWIS: Lisa, this is Darryl. I'm with the Park Service in Anchorage. And one of the things that really bothers me about NEPA and Section 106 is in the NEPA document there it states that the impact to the NHL with the demolition of the two hangars is a moderate impact. And there really hasn't been anything done yet to say that that's the case. That's something that's still down the road.

So it's really kind of a flaw in the document to say at this point that that's the potential outcome. Because it could

be a severe impact to the NHL, including loss to the NHL.

MR. SPRAU: Hey, Darryl -- so, Darryl, this is Matt Sprau, the NEPA coordinator. And this actually kind of addresses Renee's comment earlier, too, is that for the Draft EIS for this one, we actually ended up with two impacts for cultural resources which is not unique -- I'm sorry, which is unique in the NEPA world.

So we have the fixed -- the significant impact occurs from the physical loss of the hangars through the implementation of both and then we actually looked at the loss of the hangars and the overall integrity of the NHL to convey its historical significance and how that affects it.

And so that's where our moderate impact came out. So we actually have two.....

MR. LEWIS: You're cutting out there.

MR. SPRAU: Okay. So we actually have two impacts. Is this better?

MR. LEWIS: Yeah, that's better. Thank you.

MR. SPRAU: So we actually have two impacts to the cultural resources section which is unique for NEPA. And I guess as I mentioned, so the physical loss of the hangars is a significant impact because you're tearing down these historical structures, but then the -- you look at the overall -- how does the tearing down of these structures affect the overall historical significance of Ladd Field. And so that's where we

discussed this with Lisa and our cultural resources staff to determine what type of impact that is.

And I don't know if Lisa could describe it better than I can so.....

MS. GRAHAM: Sure. And, Darryl, what we did is -- and I agree that the formal revision, that's years down the road. And we heard from the advisory council that it could take upwards of five or six years from start to finish once we even -- we have a re-evaluation together as a packet. And so what we did was we utilized the expertise that we have as architectural historians and did our best analysis of what we see within the National Historic Landmark and what we see as professionals looking at all of the aspects of integrity and the significance of the landmark.

And so as professionals, we do believe that the landmark will still retain enough integrity to be a National Historic Landmark, but it will be.....

MR. LEWIS: You're cutting out again, Lisa.

MS. GRAHAM: As professionals, we do believe that the National Historic Landmark will retain enough of those seven aspects of integrity to have that integrity and significance. And -- but at the same token, we recognize that with the loss of the hangars, all of that is being impacted, but we do not believe it's to such a degree that the NHL will lose its designation of a landmark. But we also understand that that

is -- the official process is years down the road.

MR. LEWIS: Do you have that, that you could include in the Draft EIS just to kind of help inform the EIS?

MS. GRAHAM: Yeah, it's actually in Section 2 -- 3, I thought.

MR. SPRAU: Three.

MS. GRAHAM: Yeah, it's in Section 3. And what I can do is after this meeting e-mail you the pages with that -- that that information is in. It's in the Affected Environment section.

MS. BLAHUTA: You're still an optimist.

MR. LEWIS: Okay. I just -- I'm not trying to be difficult. I'm just trying to understand where you guys are coming from to come up with the moderate impact to the NHL because it's -- like you said, you know, we're still working on the MOA for this and we haven't really got there yet.

MS. GRAHAM: And what we did was really take the expertise that we had available and the information we had available to assess the situation as what you would do in the Environmental Impact Statement and look at all the information available. And the truth is that, as you look at the NHL, the Army is committed to keeping the NHL and we would be the ones pushing this evaluation forward. The people that are writing the re-evaluation are the people that are in the ring now and so there really isn't -- from our point of view, there isn't

any chance of us losing that NHL nomination. We're very committed to keeping our landmark.

LIEUTENANT NUTT: Okay. Thanks, Lisa.

MR. SPRAU: Thank you.

MS. GRAHAM: That's for the comment and the question, Darryl.

MR. SPRAU: Any other questions or concerns or comments? Well, thank you very much, everybody, for joining us today. It's been a long process, but combining both of these processes has been a really good experience for myself, I know for Lisa and our cultural resources department, and it's really great working with you and your inputs. Thank you very much.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you.

(Off record)

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

* * * *

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
) ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Elizabeth D'Amour, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska, residing at Fairbanks, Alaska, and Court Reporter for Liz D'Amour & Associates, Inc., do hereby certify:

That the annexed and foregoing FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA, DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT ON THE DISPOSITION OF HANGARS 2 AND 3, TRANSCRIPT OF AGENCY MEETING was taken before me on the 11th day of July 2013, beginning at the hour of 10:00 a.m., at the Princess Hotel, Jade Room, Fairbanks, Alaska;

That this hearing, as heretofore annexed, is a true and correct transcription of the proceedings, taken by me electronically and thereafter transcribed by me;

That the hearing has been retained by me for the purpose of filing the same with MR. MATTHEW SPRAU, 1060 Gaffney Road, #4500, Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-4500.

That I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I financially interested in this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal this 23rd day of July 2013.

_____
Elizabeth D'Amour
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My commission expires: 12/28/14

S E A L

From:	Caillouet, Debra J (DEC)
To:	Sprau, Matthew H CTR (US)
Cc:	Malen, Joseph S CIV (US)
Subject:	RE: EIS for Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, AK: Invite to Draft EIS Agency Meeting (UNCLASSIFIED)
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2013 11:03:10 AM

I skimmed the environmental contamination section yesterday and didn't have any concerns. I will be on leave on July 11 and there is no one else able to participate. If there are specific questions that I might be able to answer, you can give them my information.

Deb Caillouet
Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
Division of Spill Prevention and Response
Contaminated Sites/Federal Facilities
555 Cordova
Anchorage AK 99501

907-269-0298
-----Original Message-----
From: Sprau, Matthew H CTR (US) [mailto:matthew.h.sprau.ctr@mail.mil]
Sent: Friday, June 21, 2013 10:56 AM
To: Caillouet, Debra J (DEC)
Subject: EIS for Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, AK: Invite to Draft EIS Agency Meeting (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE

Ms. Caillouet,

The US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) has prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) addressing the potential impacts associated with the proposed facility disposition options for Hangars 2 and 3 on the Main Post of Fort Wainwright. Hangars 2 and 3 are contributing resources to the Ladd Field National Historic Landmark (NHL) and Ladd Air Force Base Cold War Historic District (Cold War Historic District). Because the hangars are contributing resources to the Ladd Field NHL and Cold War Historic District their loss would be a significant impact to cultural resources. All other impacts would be less than significant.

Your agency's participation in a meeting to be held on Thursday July 11, 2013 in Fairbanks regarding the Draft EIS is requested. Meeting details are listed in the attached invitation, as well as information on the public meeting.

A copy of the Draft EIS has been sent to you via mail service. The document can also be viewed and downloaded from:
http://www.wainwright.army.mil/env/NEPA/Current.html

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Very Respectfully,
Matt

Matthew H. Sprau
CSU-CEMML
NEPA Coordinator

U.S. Army Garrison
Fort Wainwright, Alaska
Ph: (907)361-9688
Fax: (907)361-9867

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE

From:	Slaughter, Kent
To:	Sprau, Matthew H CTR (US)
Cc:	dmackey@blm.gov
Subject:	Re: FW: EIS for Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, AK: Invite to Draft EIS Agency Meeting (UNCLASSIFIED)
Date:	Monday, June 24, 2013 1:06:58 PM

Mr. Sprau,

The BLM Alaska Fire Service has no comment on the DEIS regarding Hangers 2 and 3.

Thank you for requesting our participation.

Kent Slaughter
Manager
BLM Alaska Fire Service
Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703
907 356-5505

On Fri, Jun 21, 2013 at 2:51 PM, Sprau, Matthew H CTR (US) <matthew.h.sprau.ctr@mail.mil> wrote:

> Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
> Caveats: NONE
>
> Mr. Slaught,
>
> The email below was intended for Mary Lynch but it was bounced back. I just learned that she is no longer with BLM-AFS so I'm hoping you can transmit the letter and invitation to the person who has taken over her responsibilities.
>
> Thank you,
> Matt
>
> Matthew H. Sprau
> CSU-CEMML
> NEPA Coordinator
> U.S. Army Garrison
> Fort Wainwright, Alaska
> Ph: (907)361-9688
> Fax: (907)361-9867
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Sprau, Matthew H CTR (US)
> Sent: Friday, June 21, 2013 10:18 AM
> To: 'mlynch@blm.gov'
> Subject: EIS for Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, AK: Invite to Draft EIS Agency Meeting (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE

Ms. Lynch,

The US Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG FWA) has prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) addressing the potential impacts associated with the proposed facility disposition options for Hangars 2 and 3 on the Main Post of Fort Wainwright. Hangars 2 and 3 are contributing resources to the Ladd Field National Historic Landmark (NHL) and Ladd Air Force Base Cold War Historic District (Cold War Historic District). Because the hangars are contributing resources to the Ladd Field NHL and Cold War Historic District their loss would be a significant impact to cultural resources. All other impacts would be less than significant.

Your agency's participation in a meeting to be held on Thursday July 11, 2013 in Fairbanks regarding the Draft EIS is requested. Meeting details are listed in the attached invitation, as well as information on the public meeting.

A copy of the Draft EIS has been sent to you via mail service. The document can also be viewed and downloaded from:
http://www.wainwright.army.mil/env/NEPA/Current.html

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Very Respectfully,
Matt

Matthew H. Sprau
CSU-CEMML
NEPA Coordinator
U.S. Army Garrison
Fort Wainwright, Alaska
Ph: (907)361-9688
Fax: (907)361-9867

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE

From:	Bergmann, Pamela
To:	Sprau, Matthew H CTR (US)
Cc:	Grace Cochon
Subject:	ER 13/0447 - U.S. Department of the Interior comments on DEIS for the Disposition of Hangers 2 and 3 at Fort Wainwright.
Date:	Monday, August 05, 2013 2:45:49 PM
Attachments:	ER13-0447 Disposition of Hangers DEIS_DOI Comments.pdf

---

Mr. Sprau--

Our comments on the subject document are attached. I would appreciate you confirming receipt of this correspondence.

Thank you.

Pamela

- -

Pamela Bergmann
Regional Environmental Officer - Alaska
U.S. Department of the Interior
1689 C Street, Room 119
Anchorage, Alaska 99501-52126
907-271-5011 (work phone)
907-227-3783 (work cell)
pamela_bergmann@ios.doi.gov

United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
1689 C Street, Room 119
Anchorage, Alaska 99501-5126

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL, NO HARD COPY TO FOLLOW

9043.1
ER 13/0447
PEP/ANC

August 5, 2013

Matthew Sprau
Directorate of Public Works
Attention: IMFW-PWE (Sprau)
1060 Gaffney Road #4500
Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-4500

Subject: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Disposition of Hangers 2 and 3 at Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Dear Mr. Sprau:

The U.S. Department of the Interior has reviewed the subject document. We have no comments to offer at this time.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this DEIS.

Sincerely,

Pamela Bergmann

Pamela Bergmann
Regional Environmental Officer - Alaska

From:	Kathy Marx
To:	Sprau, Matthew H CTR (US)
Cc:	Jae Hill; Bernardo Hernandez; Mary Bork
Subject:	Commission on Historic Preservation Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 DEIS Comments
Date:	Friday, August 02, 2013 1:51:24 PM
Attachments:	LaddFieldNHLDEISComment_2013_0805.pdf

Hi Matt,

Attached are the Commission's comments. Thanks Matt.

Kathy Marx

Planner III - Long Range Planning

FNSB Community Planning

907-459-7406

FAIRBANKS NORTH STAR BOROUGH

809 Pioneer Road ☆ P.O. Box 71267 ☆ Fairbanks, Alaska 99707-1267 (907) 459-1260 ☆ FAX (907) 459-1255

MEMORANDUM

TO: Matthew H. Sprau, CSU-CEMML, NEPA Coordinator
US ARMY GARRISON, FORT WAINWRIGHT ALASKA

FROM: COMMISSION ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

DATE: August 5, 2013

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Disposition on Hangars 2 And 3, Fort Wainwright Alaska – Comment

---

The Fairbanks North Star Borough (FNSB) Commission on Historic Preservation would like to express its concern that the preferred alternative for the disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 on Fort Wainwright is demolition. While we understand the difficult fiscal and engineering constraints imposed by the age and condition of the structures, we feel that the hangars provide immeasurable and irreplaceable historic value to the Ladd Field National Historic Landmark (NHL) and are essential elements of the NHL. We also realize that the NHL has a life of its own. Of the original 26 structures within the NHL at the time of designation (1985), only 18 remain. At the present rate of structural loss within the NHL, there is the possibility that by June 17, 2079, all structures within the NHL would be gone, less than 100 years from the original nomination date. As a preservation Commission, we would prefer the buildings that once constituted Ladd Field are preserved for future generations and not demolished. If that is not possible, we recommend the dissolution of the Ladd Field NHL.

Upon technical review of the DEIS, the Commission would like to provide the following comments regarding procedural matters and perceived inaccuracies as presented in the document:

A. Katharine Kerr, National Park Service, indicated in *Case Digest, Fall 2009*, that "Programmatic Agreement for Aviation Stationing at Fort Wainwright" was executed on September 28, 2009, as a closed case. The review was instigated by a proposed increase in aviation stationing at FWW that would include construction of a number of facilities and increase in soldiers and helicopters. One adverse effect included a potential change-in-use of Hangars 2 and 3. The Programmatic Agreement, therefore, included adhering to the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Properties for adaptive re-use to the maximum extent possible, not demolition or no action, leading to inevitable collapse.

B. The "inability to meet the functional requirements as maintenance facilities for modern aircraft" is mentioned at several junctures within the DEIS. The Commission takes exception to that determination relative to Hangar 3, believing a variety of maintenance activities and storage of aircraft could still be conducted within the hangar as it is not necessary to utilize hoists anchored to structural beams to perform maintenance tasks on aircraft.

After review of the proposed mitigation measures for the demolition, we feel that not enough of the historic integrity will be retained through "active preservation" methods. We recommend the adoption of additional mitigation measures as follows:

- Extensive photo documentation of the exterior and interior of the buildings. Using high resolution photography, we'd like as much as possible documented about the construction methods and materials, structural design, interior and exterior aesthetics, and any historical graffiti or unique artifacts. Additionally, the documentation should be made available at locations other than Fort Wainwright, such as the Noel Wien Library or an exhibit at the Morris Thompson Cultural Center in Fairbanks. The exhibit would document the history of the hangars and why they were significant at the time of the war effort.

- Recycling and reuse, to the extent possible, of the materials. Most of the demolished materials are currently slated for deposition in the FNSB Solid Waste Landfill. We feel that there is a unique opportunity to make viable materials available for reuse in new construction either on Fort Wainwright or elsewhere in the community. Some of the materials may have intrinsic historic value in addition to the construction value. We suggest the remainder of the debris be disposed of through a recycling provider, to the extent possible, and only the materials that can neither be reused nor recycled then be disposed of in the landfill.

- Augment the existing "Lend-Lease Memorial" in Downtown Fairbanks. Using the last of the photos and materials obtained, update the memorial to indicate the disposition of the Hangars and use the new photos to supplement the display.

- Comprehensive review of the remaining hangars at other strategic lend-lease locations. The Memorandum of Agreement mitigation measure C – ("Re-evaluation of the Ladd Field NHL") – should incorporate the results of a review of remaining hangars at other lend-lease locations in order to comprehensively evaluate the cumulative effects of any further potential structural losses within the NHL.

The FNSB appreciates the opportunity to respond to the DEIS and the continued cooperation towards the retention and preservation of the community's vital historic resources.

Claus-M. Naske, Ph.D.

Claus M. Naske, Chair Date
FNSB Commission on Historic Preservation

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 10
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900
Seattle, WA 98101-3140

OFFICE OF
ECOSYSTEMS,
TRIBAL AND PUBLIC
AFFAIRS

August 1, 2013

Matthew Sprau, Directorate of Public Works
Attention: IMFW-PWE (Sprau)
1060 Gaffney Road #4500
Fort Wainwright, Alaska 99703-4500

Re: EPA comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, Alaska, EPA Project # 11-4133-DOD.

Dear Mr. Sprau:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3, Fort Wainwright, Alaska (CEQ #20130173). We have reviewed the EIS in accordance with our responsibilities under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and the National Environmental Policy Act. Section 309 specifically directs the EPA to review and comment in writing on the environmental impacts associated with all major federal actions as well as the adequacy of the EIS in meeting procedural and public disclosure requirements of NEPA.

We commend the U.S. Army Garrison Fort Wainwright, Alaska (USAG-FWA) for an extremely clear, thorough and user-friendly document. We especially appreciate the inclusion of color maps and diagrams, tabs, an index, and useful appendices in the hard copy. We also recognize the notable effort by USAG-FWA to consult with potentially affected and interested federally-recognized tribes. Finally, we believe the EIS considered a wide range of alternatives and appropriately screened out those alternatives not meeting rational criteria to result in the USAG-FWA preferred alternative (Alternative 1).

We have given the EIS a rating of EC-1(Environmental Concerns-Adequate Information). A description of our rating system is enclosed. Based on review, and as identified in our scoping comments, our primary concern continues to be the management of known CERCLA sites (FTWW-018, CC-FTWW-103, and FTWW-348) as well as yet-to-be-discovered contamination in the project area. The EIS clearly identifies the likelihood of additional contamination surrounding and beneath the hangar project area, as well as beneath other structures being demolished in the project area. We strongly encourage USAG-FWA to work closely with our Federal Facilities program (Deb Yamamoto, EPA Region 10 Federal Facilities Site Cleanup Manager, 206-553-7216 or yamamoto.deb@epa.gov) as results of sampling become available and if any changes to institutional controls or the CERCLA Record of Decision are contemplated.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to offer comments on the Draft EIS and look forward to working with you on the final EIS to address the CERCLA-related issues we have identified. Please contact me at

(206) 553-1601 or by electronic mail at reichgott.christine@epa.gov, or you may contact Jennifer Curtis of my staff in Anchorage at (907) 271-6324 or curtis.jennifer@epa.gov with any questions you have regarding our comments.

Sincerely,

Christine B. Reichgott, Manager
Environmental Review and Sediments Management Unit

Enclosure

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Rating System for
Draft Environmental Impact Statements
Definitions and Follow-Up Action*

Environmental Impact of the Action

LO – Lack of Objections

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

EC – Environmental Concerns

EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce these impacts.

EO – Environmental Objections

EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no-action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EU – Environmentally Unsatisfactory

EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potential unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

Adequacy of the Impact Statement

Category 1 – Adequate

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis of data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

Category 2 – Insufficient Information

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

Category 3 – Inadequate

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act and or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

* From EPA Manual 1640 Policy and Procedures for the Review of Federal Actions Impacting the Environment. February, 1987.

This page intentionally left blank.

Fort Wainwright
Disposition of Hangars 2 & 3

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(ERRATUM TO THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT)

FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA

NOVEMBER 2013

IMCOM