



FINAL | May 2024

# Environmental Impact Statement Summary

## **B-21 Beddown Main Operating Base 2 (MOB 2) or Main Operating Base 3 (MOB 3) at Dyess AFB or Whiteman AFB**



This Summary of the *Final Environmental Impact Statement for B-21 Beddown Main Operating Base 2 (MOB 2) or Main Operating Base 3 (MOB 3) at Dyess AFB or Whiteman AFB* (the “Final EIS”) provides an overview of the in-depth analysis of the Proposed Action that is presented in the full Final EIS.

A CD containing the Final EIS as well as this Summary is provided inside the back cover of this Summary. The Final EIS is available at each of the public libraries listed below (for a full list of repositories, including additional libraries underneath associated airspace, please refer to the project website). In addition, an electronic copy of the Final EIS is available online at [www.B21EIS.com](http://www.B21EIS.com).

Abilene Public Library – Main Library  
202 Cedar Street  
Abilene, TX 79601

Boonslick Regional Library  
219 W Third Street  
Sedalia, MO 65301

Anson Public Library  
1137 12th Street  
Anson, TX 79501

Sweet Springs Public Library  
217 Turner Street  
Sweet Springs, MO 65351

Merkel Public Library  
100 Kent  
Merkel, TX 79536

Trails Regional Library  
432 N Holden Street  
Warrensburg, MO 64093

## PRIVACY ADVISORY

This Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is provided in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, the President's Council on Environmental Quality NEPA Regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations 1500–1508), and 32 Code of Federal Regulations 989, Environmental Impact Analysis Process.

The Environmental Impact Analysis Process provides an opportunity for public input on Air Force decision making, allows the public to offer inputs on alternative ways for the Air Force to accomplish what it is proposing, and solicits comments on the Air Force's analysis of environmental effects.

Public commenting allows the Air Force to make better informed decisions. Letters or other written or oral comments provided may be published in the EIS. As required by law, comments provided will be addressed in the EIS and made available to the public. Providing personal information is voluntary. Any personal information provided will be used only to identify a desire to make a statement during the public comment portion of any public meetings or hearings or to fulfill requests for copies of the EIS or associated documents. Private addresses were compiled to develop a mailing list for those requesting copies of the EIS. However, only the names of the individuals making comments and specific comments are disclosed. Personal home addresses and phone numbers are not published in the Final EIS. If you choose to not provide personal identifying information, your comments will be given the same weight and consideration as any other comments submitted.

Information regarding the EIS is available on the website at [www.B21EIS.com](http://www.B21EIS.com).

Please direct any requests for information or other inquiries to:  
Dyess AFB Public Affairs, (325) 696-4820  
7bw.pa.publicaffairs@us.af.mil  
or  
Whiteman AFB Public Affairs, (660) 687-5727  
509bw.publicaffairs@us.af.mil

This page is intentionally blank.

---

## COVER SHEET

**a. Responsible Agency:** Department of the Air Force (DAF)

**b. Cooperating Agencies:** None.

**c. Proposals and Actions:** This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) describes the potential consequences to the human environment from the proposed implementation of the B-21 Main Operating Base (MOB) 2 beddown or MOB 3 beddown at Dyess Air Force Base (AFB) or Whiteman AFB, which would include B-21 Operational Squadrons, a Weapons Instructor Course, an Operational Test and Evaluation Squadron, and a Weapons Generation Facility.

**d. Inquiries:** Information regarding the EIS is available on the website at [www.B21EIS.com](http://www.B21EIS.com). Questions can also be directed to: B-21 EIS Project Manager, AFCEC/CZN, 2261 Hughes Avenue, Suite 155, JBSA Lackland, TX 78236-9853.

**e. Designation:** Final EIS

**f. Abstract:** This EIS has been prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act to analyze the potential environmental consequences of the B-21 MOB 2 and MOB 3 beddown. The Department of Defense is developing a new bomber aircraft, the B-21 "Raider," which will eventually replace existing B-1 and B-2 bomber aircraft. The beddown of the B-21 will take place through a series of three MOBs, referred to as MOB 1, MOB 2, and MOB 3. The B-21 Main Operating Base 1 (MOB 1) Beddown at Dyess AFB, Texas or Ellsworth AFB, South Dakota Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision were completed on June 3, 2021. In this EIS, the DAF is evaluating the proposed MOB 2 and MOB 3 beddowns of the B-21.

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to implement the goals of the National Defense Strategy by modernizing the U.S. bomber fleet capabilities. The B-21 Raider is being developed to carry conventional payloads and to support the nuclear triad by providing a visible and flexible nuclear deterrent capability that will assure allies and partners through the United States' commitment to international treaties. The B-21 will operate under the direction of the DAF Global Strike Command. The B-21 will have both conventional and nuclear roles and will be capable of penetrating and surviving in advanced air defense environments. It is projected to enter service in the 2020s, and the DAF intends to have at least 100 B-21 aircraft built.

This EIS evaluates alternatives that would support deterrence capabilities by basing the B-21 at installations that can support DAF Global Strike Command's MOB 2 and MOB 3 missions and can support training of crewmembers and personnel in the operation and maintenance of the B-21 aircraft in an appropriate geographic location that can provide sufficient airfield, facilities, infrastructure, and airspace to support the B-21 training and operations. Three alternatives are included in the EIS, as discussed in Chapter 2 (Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives), which include the following:

- Dyess AFB Alternative
- Whiteman AFB Alternative (Preferred Alternative), including two subalternatives: North WGF Site Subalternative (Preferred Subalternative) and South WGF Site Subalternative
- No Action Alternative

This EIS analyzes potential impacts associated with airspace, noise, air quality, land use, socioeconomics, environmental justice, biological resources, cultural resources, physical resources, hazardous materials and waste, health and safety, transportation, and utilities and infrastructure. The EIS also identifies potential mitigation measures and best management practices that the DAF could implement to minimize or offset potential adverse impacts.

**g. Total Estimated Cost of EIS:** \$3.5 million

This page is intentionally blank.

---

**Final**

**Summary of the  
Environmental Impact Statement for  
B-21 Beddown Main Operating Base 2 (MOB 2) or  
Main Operating Base 3 (MOB 3) at  
Dyess AFB or Whiteman AFB**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| S.1. INTRODUCTION .....  | - 1 -       |
| S.2. PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION (EIS CHAPTER 1).....          | - 1 -       |
| S.3. OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES (EIS CHAPTER 2).....         | - 2 -       |
| S.3.1 Proposed Action (EIS Section 2.1).....                                   | - 2 -       |
| S.3.2 No Action Alternative (EIS Section 2.2).....                             | - 2 -       |
| S.3.3 Dyess AFB Alternative (EIS Section 2.3) .....                            | - 2 -       |
| S.3.3.1 Personnel (EIS Section 2.3.2) .....                                    | - 2 -       |
| S.3.3.2 Airfield Operations (EIS Section 2.3.3).....                           | - 2 -       |
| S.3.3.3 Airspace and Range Utilization (EIS Section 2.3.4) .....               | - 3 -       |
| S.3.3.4 Facilities and Infrastructure (EIS Section 2.3.5) .....                | - 3 -       |
| S.3.3.5 Weapons Generation Facility (EIS Section 2.3.6) .....                  | - 3 -       |
| S.3.4 Whiteman AFB Alternative (Preferred Alternative) (EIS Section 2.4) ..... | - 3 -       |
| S.3.4.1 Personnel (EIS Section 2.4.2) .....                                    | - 3 -       |
| S.3.4.2 Airfield Operations (EIS Section 2.4.3).....                           | - 4 -       |
| S.3.4.3 Airspace and Range Utilization (EIS Section 2.4.4) .....               | - 4 -       |
| S.3.4.4 Facilities and Infrastructure (EIS Section 2.4.5) .....                | - 4 -       |
| S.3.4.5 Weapons Generation Facility (EIS Section 2.4.6) .....                  | - 4 -       |
| S.3.5 Mitigation (EIS Section 2.5).....  | - 4 -       |
| S.4. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES (EIS CHAPTER 3).....  | - 5 -       |

---

**LIST OF TABLES**

|  |       |
|--|-------|
| Table S-1. Summary of Environmental Consequences for the MOB 2 or MOB 3 Beddown by Alternative ..... | - 6 - |
|--|-------|

---

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

|       |                                       |
|-------|---------------------------------------|
| AFB   | Air Force Base                        |
| ATCAA | Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace |
| COA   | Course of Action                      |
| DAF   | Department of the Air Force           |
| EIS   | Environmental Impact Statement        |
| MOB   | Main Operating Base                   |
| NEPA  | National Environmental Policy Act     |
| U.S.  | United States                         |
| WGF   | Weapons Generation Facility           |



---

## SUMMARY

### S.1. INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has been prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to analyze the potential environmental consequences of the Department of the Air Force (DAF) proposal to beddown the B-21 Main Operating Base (MOB) 2 or MOB 3 at Dyess Air Force Base (AFB) or Whiteman AFB. The B-21 “Raider,” which is currently being developed by the Department of Defense, will eventually replace existing B-1 and B-2 aircraft.

The beddown of the B-21 will take place through a series of three MOBs, referred to as MOB 1, MOB 2, and MOB 3. The DAF Strategic Basing Process was used to identify Ellsworth AFB, Dyess AFB, and Whiteman AFB as candidates for MOBs. In June 2021, the DAF selected Ellsworth AFB as the MOB 1 location after completing the *B-21 Main Operating Base 1 (MOB 1) Beddown at Dyess AFB, Texas or Ellsworth AFB, South Dakota Environmental Impact Statement* (hereinafter referred to as the “MOB 1 EIS”) (DAF, 2021e). As discussed in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives), the three alternatives considered in this EIS include the Dyess AFB Alternative, the Whiteman AFB Alternative, and the No Action Alternative.

If, following completion of this EIS, one of the two remaining candidate bases is selected for MOB 2, then the final remaining base would become the MOB 3 beddown location. Air operations and personnel numbers for the MOB 3 beddown are not anticipated to exceed those analyzed in this EIS and construction activities are anticipated to be the same for either MOB location. Therefore, the analysis presented in this EIS represents potential impacts associated with either the MOB 2 or MOB 3 beddown actions for either location.

### S.2. PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION (EIS CHAPTER 1)

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to implement the goals of the National Defense Strategy by modernizing the U.S. bomber fleet capabilities. The B-21 Raider is being developed to carry conventional payloads and to support the nuclear triad by providing a visible and flexible nuclear deterrent capability. The B-21, which is projected to enter service in the 2020s, will operate under the direction of the DAF Global Strike Command.

The need for the Proposed Action is to support deterrence capabilities by basing the B-21 at installations that can support the MOB 2 mission. The installation will support training of crewmembers and personnel in the operation and maintenance of the B-21 aircraft in an appropriate geographic location that can provide sufficient airfield, facilities, infrastructure, and airspace to support the B-21 training and operations.

## **S.3. OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES (EIS CHAPTER 2)**

### **S.3.1 Proposed Action (EIS Section 2.1)**

Implementation of the Proposed Action would involve changes in personnel, airfield operations, airspace and range utilization, and facilities and infrastructure at the selected beddown location. In addition to other infrastructure changes required to support the MOB 2 operational functions, a Weapons Generation Facility (WGF) would also be constructed at each B-21 beddown location to provide a safe and secure location for the storage of nuclear munitions. Because mission transition would be gradual, a “snapshot” scenario was developed to represent conditions during the time period when operations and personnel associated with the current mission (i.e., B-1 at Dyess AFB and B-2 at Whiteman AFB) would overlap with incoming B-21 operations and personnel. The “end-state” reflects the point in time when all B-21s are in place and B-1 or B-2 aircraft have been removed. DAF planners evaluated operational readiness and leveraged existing facilities and infrastructure at each base individually, factoring base-specific site constraints, to minimize mission impact, maximize facility reuse, and minimize cost.

### **S.3.2 No Action Alternative (EIS Section 2.2)**

Under the No Action Alternative, the DAF would not beddown the MOB 2 or MOB 3 missions at Dyess AFB or Whiteman AFB. There would be no changes to personnel, airfield operations, airspace and range utilization, facilities and infrastructure at either installation. The B-21 program is a major Department of Defense initiative to ensure that the U.S. nuclear triad is and remains effective. If the No Action Alternative was selected due to unforeseen issues, the DAF would reevaluate their B-21 phasing approach, using the Strategic Basing Process, and implement the basing at another, undetermined location.

### **S.3.3 Dyess AFB Alternative (EIS Section 2.3)**

The Dyess AFB Alternative would establish MOB 2 at Dyess AFB. The B-21 mission would replace the B-1 mission currently being flown at the installation.

#### **S.3.3.1 Personnel (EIS Section 2.3.2)**

There would be an increase of 1,318 individuals at Dyess AFB from 11,862 to 13,180 after all B-21 mission individuals have arrived and all B-1 mission individuals have departed (i.e., the end-state). Under the snapshot scenario, the number of individuals would temporarily increase to 13,609 (i.e., 1,747 more individuals than the No Action Alternative).

#### **S.3.3.2 Airfield Operations (EIS Section 2.3.3)**

The number of airfield operations flown per year would decrease by 2,026 from 48,140 under the No Action Alternative to 46,114 at end-state. Under the snapshot scenario, the number of airfield operations would be 47,887 (i.e., 253 fewer airfield operations than the No Action Alternative).

### **S.3.3.3 Airspace and Range Utilization (EIS Section 2.3.4)**

The number of airspace operations flown per year would be lower at end-state than under the No Action Alternative in training airspace units that would be used regularly by the MOB 2 mission at Dyess AFB. These training airspace units, which include Bronco (3 and 4), Brownwood, Lancer, Lancer Bridge, and Pecos MOAs, as well as the Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspaces (ATCAAs) overlying those MOAs and the Willie-Roscoe ATCAA are shown in EIS Figure 2.3-2. At end-state, the number of operations flown annually in these airspace units would decrease by between 41 and 2,220. Under the snapshot scenario, the number of operations conducted annually in individual airspace units would decrease by as many as 2,010 in all airspace units except the Pecos MOA, where the number would increase by only 2 operations.

### **S.3.3.4 Facilities and Infrastructure (EIS Section 2.3.5)**

Construction of 27 new facilities or facility additions (4.2 million square feet), renovation or repair of 10 facilities (600,000 square feet), and demolition of 10 facilities (300,000 square feet) would be required to support the MOB 2 mission at Dyess AFB. The locations of these facilities are presented in the EIS as generalized construction footprint areas due to operational security concerns. EIS Figure 2.3-3 reflects two Courses of Action (COAs) DAF planners developed for the B-21 beddown at Dyess AFB relative to facility siting. The planned areas of construction depicted in EIS Figure 2.3-4 reflect a hybrid of those COAs and includes both the proposed facility sites as well as areas designated for construction support activities, such as a construction access road and fence, contractor lay down areas, and batch plant (if needed). One potential batch plant, which may or may not be required, might be located off-installation but would be temporary and would not require land acquisition.

### **S.3.3.5 Weapons Generation Facility (EIS Section 2.3.6)**

Several potential WGF locations, which are shown in EIS Figure 2.3-5, were considered for the WGF at Dyess AFB, but only one location was found to be suitable and carried forward for analysis in this EIS. The other potential WGF locations were found to be unsuitable due to a variety of planning factors. In addition to the 50-acre area required for the WGF, a new road (136,097 square feet) would also be constructed, connecting the WGF to the airfield.

## **S.3.4 Whiteman AFB Alternative (Preferred Alternative) (EIS Section 2.4)**

The Whiteman AFB Alternative would establish MOB 2 at Whiteman AFB. The B-21 mission would replace the B-2 mission currently being flown at the installation.

### **S.3.4.1 Personnel (EIS Section 2.4.2)**

There would be an increase of 1,021 individuals at Whiteman AFB from 19,408 to 20,429 after all B-21 mission individuals have arrived and all B-2 mission individuals have departed (i.e., the end-state). Under the snapshot scenario, the number of individuals would temporarily increase to 20,888 (i.e., 1,480 more individuals than the No Action Alternative).

### **S.3.4.2 Airfield Operations (EIS Section 2.4.3)**

The number of airfield operations flown per year would increase by 1,980 from 29,771 under the No Action Alternative to 31,751 at end-state. During the snapshot scenario, the number of airfield operations per year would increase by 2,952 compared to the No Action Alternative, temporarily reaching 32,723 operations.

### **S.3.4.3 Airspace and Range Utilization (EIS Section 2.4.4)**

The number of airspace operations flown per year at end-state would be the same as under the No Action Alternative in training airspace units that would be used regularly by the MOB 2 mission at Whiteman AFB. These airspace units, which are shown in EIS Figure 2.4-2, include Smoky Hill Range (Smoky MOA, Bison MOA and R-3601A/B), Cannon MOA (A and B), and Ada MOA (East and West), including all associated ATCAAs, as well as the Ozark ATCAA (A, B, and C). During the snapshot scenario, the number of airspace operations in each airspace unit would remain the same or temporarily increase slightly by between 2 and 50 operations per year.

### **S.3.4.4 Facilities and Infrastructure (EIS Section 2.4.5)**

Construction of 16 new facilities or facility additions (600,000 square feet), renovation or repair of 26 facilities (1.7 million square feet), and demolition of three facilities (85,000 square feet) would be required to support the MOB 2 mission at Whiteman AFB. The locations of these facilities, which are presented in the EIS as generalized areas due to operational security concerns, are shown in EIS Figure 2.4-3. A single COA was considered for siting of the facilities after several other COAs were rejected because they did not meet planning criteria.

### **S.3.4.5 Weapons Generation Facility (EIS Section 2.4.6)**

Two WGF locations were found to be suitable (see EIS Figure 2.4-4), and both were carried forward for analysis in this EIS as subalternatives. Both subalternatives would require a 50-acre area for the WGF. The North WGF Site Subalternative (Preferred Subalternative) would require the construction of two access roads (177,196 square feet) and the relocation of the existing Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) range, as shown in EIS Figure 2.4-5. Implementation of the South WGF Site Subalternative would also require the construction of up to three access roads (50,885 square feet), one of which would require construction over an Environmental Restoration Program site, as shown in EIS Figure 2.4-6.

## **S.3.5 Mitigation (EIS Section 2.5)**

Resource-specific mitigation measures are described in detail in EIS Table 2.5-1 and are summarized below. The proposed mitigations avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, eliminate, or compensate for impacts associated with the Proposed Action. The effects of the potential mitigations are considered in the assessment of environmental impacts (EIS Chapter 3). The mitigation measures may be implemented in conjunction with the final decision which will be identified in the Record of Decision.

- Noise – No mitigations would be necessary. If substantial changes to the proposed action or its impacts are recognized, the DAF would re-evaluate potential impacts and develop mitigation measures, as needed.

- Socioeconomics – The DAF would work with the local community to assist in any way practicable with planning for support of the increased population.
- Biological Resources – The DAF would avoid tree and shrub clearing during migratory bird nesting season at both installations. At Dyess AFB, the DAF would conduct site-specific surveys and identify areas of potential habitat for the Texas horned lizard. If Texas horned lizards are found, the DAF would initiate relocation. At Whiteman AFB, the DAF would avoid tree clearing during bat maternity and active season.
- Physical Resources – The DAF would implement erosion and sediment control measures; design site draining to manage increased runoff; incorporate stormwater management features; and use erosion controls and engineering planning to reduce impacts at stream crossings at both bases. At Whiteman AFB, the DAF would develop compensatory mitigation if construction in Long Branch Creek is required, and place facilities or structures such that spill control structures would be effective.
- Hazardous Materials and Hazardous and Solid Wastes – For both installations, the DAF would characterize and/or dispose of soils in accordance with DAF policy and guidance and would address any contaminated soils on site or by disposal in an approved landfill. At Whiteman AFB, under the North WGF Subalternative, the DAF would conduct clearance and any mitigative actions required at the existing EOD Range prior to range closure.
- Transportation – At both installations, the DAF would schedule commercial deliveries outside of peak traffic hours; require construction crews to use the commercial gate; and take measures to ensure that emergency response ability is maintained at all times. At Whiteman AFB, the DAF would identify other measures to decrease traffic impacts during relocation of the Arnold Gate.

Potential unavoidable impacts that cannot be mitigated include reduction of regional landfill capacity, generation of hazardous and nonhazardous wastes, and effects to individual biological species at each base.

#### **S.4. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES (EIS CHAPTER 3)**

Table S-1 presents a summary of potential environmental consequences for the MOB 2 or MOB 3 beddown by alternative and environmental resource area.

**Table S-1. Summary of Environmental Consequences for the MOB 2 or MOB 3 Beddown by Alternative**

| Alternative   | Environmental Consequences  |
|---|---|
| <b>Airspace Use and Management</b>                      |   |
| <b>No Action Alternative</b>                            | There would be no changes to operations or airspace use and, therefore, baseline operations would continue as summarized in EIS Table 2.3-2 and EIS Table 2.3-3 (Dyess AFB), and EIS Table 2.4-2 and EIS Table 2.4-3 (Whiteman AFB). Operations in the training airspace for Dyess and Whiteman AFBs include each base’s aircraft, aircraft associated with other nearby installations, and transient aircraft. Airfield operations and airspace utilization at both bases would be comparable to current conditions; therefore, the No Action Alternative would not contribute to air traffic controller workload or congestion in the airspace areas.   |
| <b>Dyess AFB Alternative</b>                            | Airfield operations at Dyess AFB would decrease by 4.2 percent from baseline levels. There would be no significant impacts because flight operations would decrease across all SUA, resulting in less congestion. In addition, the B-21 would tend to use a range of higher altitudes that are currently underutilized.   |
| <b>Whiteman AFB Alternative (Preferred Alternative)</b> | Airfield operations at Whiteman AFB would increase by 6.65 percent from baseline levels. This minor level of increase would not likely impact airspace use, ATC, or scheduling, therefore no significant impacts are anticipated. The total number of annual flight operations at all the training airspace units would remain the same as baseline conditions and, therefore, impacts would be the same as those described for the No Action Alternative.  |
| <b>Noise</b>  |   |
| <b>No Action Alternative</b>                            | <i>Construction:</i> Construction projects associated with the Proposed Action would not occur and would result in no additional noise impacts. Construction projects that are under way or programmed to occur would result in only temporary, minor noise increases.<br><i>Flight Training:</i> There would be no changes to operations at either installation and noise levels would remain at baseline levels. Aircraft noise levels under the Dyess AFB training airspace would range from less than 35 dBA L <sub>dnmr</sub> to 51.9 dBA L <sub>dnmr</sub> and noise levels under the Whiteman AFB training airspace would range from less than 35 dBA L <sub>dnmr</sub> to 42.2 dBA L <sub>dnmr</sub> . There would be no flight training noise impacts because all noise levels are below the 65 dBA DNL noise level at which all land uses are compatible. |
| <b>Dyess AFB Alternative</b>                            | <i>Construction:</i> Facilities and C&D activities would result in temporary, localized increases in noise levels, but the installation and surrounding area is exposed to similar noise under baseline conditions. C&D activities would occur during normal business hours. Impacts would not be significant.<br><i>Flight Training:</i> The acreage and number of residents exposed to off-installation noise levels exceeding 65 dBA DNL would decrease relative to the No Action Alternative. Noise levels beneath the training airspace would decrease or remain the same. Overall, noise impacts would be beneficial or remain the same, and would not be significant.  |
| <b>Whiteman AFB Alternative (Preferred Alternative)</b> | <i>Construction:</i> Consequences would be the same as those described under the Dyess AFB Alternative.<br><i>Flight Training:</i> There would be an increase of 498 acres (18 percent) and 89 (37 percent) residents exposed to off-installation noise levels exceeding 65 dBA DNL relative to the No Action Alternative. Noise levels at points of interest would increase by 0 to 2 dBA DNL, but the highest SEL values typically experienced would not change, therefore impacts would not be significant. Noise levels beneath the training airspace would remain the same, and impacts would not change from the No Action Alternative.   |



Table S-1. Summary of Environmental Consequences for the MOB 2 or MOB 3 Beddown by Alternative

| Alternative   | Environmental Consequences   |
|---|--|
| <b>Air Quality</b>                                      |  |
| <b>No Action Alternative</b>                            | Emissions associated with personnel, airfield operations, airspace and range utilization, and construction activities would not differ from baseline conditions at Dyess or Whiteman AFB. Emissions at both bases are minimal for all criteria pollutants. The activities have been ongoing for many years and have not adversely impacted air quality in the region.  |
| <b>Dyess AFB Alternative</b>                            | Personnel additions, airfield and flight operations, and C&D activities would result in combined annual emissions of all criteria pollutants other than PM <sub>10</sub> that are below indicator thresholds. PM <sub>10</sub> emissions may be reduced by construction BMPs. Emissions from C&D activities would be minor and temporary. GHG emissions are estimated at 7,464 tons per year. There would be no significant impacts to regional air quality.   |
| <b>Whiteman AFB Alternative (Preferred Alternative)</b> | Consequences would be the same as those described under the Dyess AFB Alternative, except for GHG emissions, which are estimated at 32,114 tons per year. Construction BMPs may mitigate some GHG emissions. There would be no significant impacts to regional air quality.  |
| <b>Land Use</b>   |  |
| <b>No Action Alternative</b>                            | <p><i>Construction:</i> There would be no personnel changes or C&amp;D or renovation activities associated with the B-21 beddown at either base. On-base development would continue to adhere to existing land use planning procedures and requirements. Baseline development and infrastructure projects would not change on-base or off-base land use.</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i> There would be no change to existing noise zones or APZs resulting from airfield operations. Incompatible land use adjacent to each base would continue, but impacts would be less than significant due to the relatively small area affected. There would be no changes to land use under the training airspace. Aircraft operations would continue at current levels.</p>  |
| <b>Dyess AFB Alternative</b>                            | <p><i>Construction:</i> All on-base development would be conducted in accordance with installation land use planning procedures and requirements. There would be no change to existing land use designations. Adjacent off-base development resulting from the B-21 beddown would likely occur with consideration of aircraft noise, APZs, height restrictions, and corresponding land use compatibility. No significant impacts are anticipated.</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i> The on-base and off-base noise zones associated with airfield operations would decrease substantially relative to existing conditions, resulting in potentially beneficial impacts. All on-base land use would be compatible with expected noise levels. Noise levels under the training airspace would decrease or remain the same relative to existing conditions. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.</p> |
| <b>Whiteman AFB Alternative (Preferred Alternative)</b> | <p><i>Construction:</i> Consequences would be the same as those described under the Dyess AFB Alternative.</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i> There would be a relatively small increase in on-base and off-base area exposed to aircraft noise relative to existing conditions. On-base land use would remain compatible with expected noise levels. The area of off-base conditionally compatible land use would increase slightly, but there would be no change in the area of incompatible use and significant impacts are not anticipated. Noise levels under the training airspace would remain the same relative to existing conditions.</p>  |

**Table S-1. Summary of Environmental Consequences for the MOB 2 or MOB 3 Beddown by Alternative**

| Alternative   | Environmental Consequences  |
|---|---|
| <b>Socioeconomics</b>                                   |   |
| <b>No Action Alternative</b>                            | <p><i>Construction:</i> There would be no personnel changes, C&amp;D, or renovation activities at Dyess AFB or Whiteman AFB, and no corresponding change to the economy, employment, or income in the region. Baseline conditions for housing and schools would continue as summarized in EIS Table 3.6-7 and EIS Table 3.6-8 (Dyess AFB), and EIS Table 3.6-15 and EIS Table 3.6-16 (Whiteman AFB).</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i> Aircraft operations would remain the same as baseline conditions and the number of off-base residents exposed to noise levels above 65 dBA DNL would therefore be unchanged. Noise levels under the training airspace associated with each base would be less than 55 dBA DNL, which the EPA considers to be the threshold at which potential effects to public health and welfare occur.</p>   |
| <b>Dyess AFB Alternative</b>                            | <p><i>Construction:</i> C&amp;D and renovation activities would result in positive direct, indirect, and induced economic impacts (primarily construction spending). However, construction-related impacts would only last for the duration of the activities and would not be significant.</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i> The increase in military and civilian personnel and dependents associated with the B-21 beddown would have a positive, long-term economic impact in the ROI, including indirect and induced employment. Benefits would primarily occur in housing, education, and various public services. The number of off-base residents within noise levels of 65 dBA DNL or greater would decrease compared to the No Action Alternative. Noise levels under the training airspace would decrease or stay the same, remaining well below the EPA level of 55 dBA DNL.</p> |
| <b>Whiteman AFB Alternative (Preferred Alternative)</b> | <p><i>Construction:</i> Consequences would be the same as those described under the Dyess AFB Alternative.</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i> The increase in military and civilian personnel and dependents associated with the B-21 beddown would have a positive, long-term economic impact in the ROI, including indirect and induced employment. Benefits would primarily occur in housing, education, and various public services. There would be a small increase in the number of off-base residents within noise levels of 65 dBA DNL or greater compared to the No Action Alternative; however, this increase would not result in significant impacts. Noise levels under the training airspace would stay the same, remaining well below the EPA level of 55 dBA DNL.</p>  |
| <b>Environmental Justice</b>                            |   |
| <b>No Action Alternative</b>                            | <p><i>Construction:</i> C&amp;D and maintenance activities would continue as part of normal operations and development at each base. Construction noise would not affect environmental justice or sensitive populations because all activities would likely occur within installation boundaries and noise would be intermittent and temporary.</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i> The number of off-base environmental justice and sensitive population residents exposed to aircraft noise levels above 65 dBA DNL would remain the same. The number of residents exposed is provided in EIS Table 3.7-3 and EIS Table 3.7-4 (Dyess AFB) and EIS Table 3.7-5 and EIS Table 3.7-6 (Whiteman AFB).</p>  |



**Table S-1. Summary of Environmental Consequences for the MOB 2 or MOB 3 Beddown by Alternative**

| Alternative   | Environmental Consequences   |
|---|--|
| <b>Dyess AFB Alternative</b>                            | <p><i>Construction:</i> No significant impacts to environmental justice or sensitive populations would occur because all C&amp;D and renovation activities would occur within installation boundaries and noise would be intermittent and temporary.</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i> The number of residents exposed to aircraft noise levels greater than 65 dBA DNL, including minority, low-income, youth, and elderly residents, would decrease relative to the No Action Alternative (EIS Table 3.7-7 to EIS Table 3.7-10). Therefore, no significant impacts would occur because there would be positive impacts to environmental justice and sensitive populations.</p>  |
| <b>Whiteman AFB Alternative (Preferred Alternative)</b> | <p><i>Construction:</i> Consequences would be the same as those described under the Dyess AFB Alternative.</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i> The number of residents exposed to aircraft noise levels greater than 65 dBA DNL, including minority, low-income, youth, and elderly residents, would increase relative to the No Action Alternative (EIS Table 3.7-15 to EIS Table 3.7-18). Exposure would be associated with the 65–69 and 70–74 dBA DNL noise contours. Impacts to environmental justice and sensitive populations would not be significant because the increase in affected residents would be a low percentage of the existing population and no adverse health effects would occur to residents within newly exposed areas.</p>  |
| <b>Biological Resources</b>                             |  |
| <b>No Action Alternative</b>                            | <p><i>Facilities and Infrastructure:</i> There would be no C&amp;D or renovation activities associated with the B-21 beddown. On-base biological resources would continue to be managed through the installations' INRMP and BASH program.</p> <p><i>Airfield Operations:</i> Baseline airfield operations would not result in significant impacts to biological resources because there would be no change in noise and on-base resources would continue to be managed through the installations' INRMP and BASH program.</p> <p><i>Airspace and Range Utilization:</i> Airspace use under current operational parameters would continue and would not result in changes in impacts to biological resources under the training airspace.</p>  |
| <b>Dyess AFB Alternative</b>                            | <p><i>Facilities and Infrastructure:</i> C&amp;D and renovation activities would occur primarily within previously developed, turf, or landscaped areas. Undeveloped lands would be impacted permanently, but the affected area is small compared to similar habitats available nearby. Construction noise would be localized and short term and would only occur during daylight hours. Construction areas are in a military industrial land use with frequent elevated noise levels. Impacts to wildlife from construction noise would be temporary. No federally listed species or federally designated critical habitat occur at Dyess AFB. Implementation of proposed mitigation measures for migratory birds and state-listed threatened Texas horned lizard would reduce the potential for adverse effects to these species. Therefore, no significant impacts are expected.</p> <p><i>Airfield Operations:</i> Airfield operations and associated noise would decrease from the No Action Alternative, reducing the potential for BASH incidents and adverse noise effects on wildlife, including special status species. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur. Adherence to the existing BASH program and Depredation Permit conditions would further minimize the risk of bird/wildlife</p> |

**Table S-1. Summary of Environmental Consequences for the MOB 2 or MOB 3 Beddown by Alternative**

| Alternative  | Environmental Consequences   |
|--|--|
|  | <p>aircraft strikes to negligible levels. No federally listed species or designated critical habitat have been documented on the installation. As such, there would be no effect to ESA-listed species or critical habitat.</p> <p><i>Airspace and Range Utilization:</i> Aircraft operations would decrease from baseline conditions across all proposed training airspace units, potentially decreasing the potential for bird–aircraft strikes. Noise levels within and under the training airspace would remain the same or decrease relative to the No Action Alternative. As a result, there would be no significant impacts due to the reduced potential for adverse noise effects to noise sensitive wildlife, migratory birds (including BCC), and bald or golden eagles within the training airspace. There would be no effect on federally listed species or critical habitat under the training airspace.</p>  |
| <p><b>Whiteman AFB Alternative (Preferred Alternative)</b></p> | <p><i>Facilities and Infrastructure:</i> C&amp;D and renovation activities would occur within previously developed, turf, or landscaped areas, except for the WGF sites. Impacts to vegetation and wildlife may result from land clearing and construction in the proposed North and South WGF areas. Wildlife would be permanently displaced by new construction. While no federally listed species have been documented at Whiteman AFB, potential suitable habitat for four federally listed bat species is present within the North and South WGF areas. Mitigation measures would reduce the potential for impacts to these species. Wildlife may be temporarily disturbed from increased noise and human activity, but noise would be localized and short term, and would only occur during daylight hours. Construction areas are in a military industrial land use area with frequent elevated noise levels. There would be no effect on federal and state-listed species and no significant impacts to biological resources.</p> <p><i>Airfield Operations:</i> Airfield operations would increase from the No Action Alternative but this would not result in a noticeable increase in bird/wildlife aircraft strike encounters. Adherence to the existing BASH program and Depredation Permit conditions would minimize the risk of strikes to negligible levels. Aircraft noise levels would increase by 1 or 2 dBA DNL. Maximum noise levels would be 68 dBA DNL and the highest SEL values typically experienced would not change compared to the No Action Alternative. Impacts to wildlife in newly exposed areas would likely be short term and infrequent and would not significantly affect overall populations. There would be no effect on ESA-listed species or critical habitats.</p> <p><i>Airspace and Range Utilization:</i> Aircraft operations and associated noise levels within the training airspace would remain the same relative to the No Action Alternative. Therefore, impacts would be the same as those under existing conditions. Since there is no increased risk of aircraft strikes and noise levels would not change compared to baseline conditions, there would be no significant impacts to wildlife, special status species, migratory birds (including BCC), or bald or golden eagles. There would be no effect to ESA-listed species and critical habitat under the training airspace.</p> |
| <p><b>Cultural Resources</b></p>                               |  |
| <p><b>No Action Alternative</b></p>                            | <p><i>Construction:</i> No historic properties would be affected, and the bases would continue to manage cultural resources in accordance with SOPs as stated in base-specific ICRMPs.</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i> Aircraft operations in the training airspace would continue in accordance with existing procedures and activity levels. Since noise levels are below 65 dBA L<sub>dnmr</sub> under existing conditions, impacts to cultural resources would not be anticipated.</p>  |
| <p><b>Dyess AFB Alternative</b></p>                            | <p><i>Construction:</i> Construction would not adversely affect any historic properties at Dyess AFB. While new facilities and infrastructure may be within view of some historic properties, the effects would be minimal because the historic resources exist within an active</p>   |

**Table S-1. Summary of Environmental Consequences for the MOB 2 or MOB 3 Beddown by Alternative**

| Alternative   | Environmental Consequences   |
|---|--|
|   | <p>base composed of historic and non-historic facilities and impacts would not be significant. The Area of Potential Effects includes all disturbance limits of the B-21 MOB 2 beddown. The DAF completed NHPA Section 106 (54 United States Code 306108) consultation with the Texas SHPO and Texas Historical Commission who concurred with DAF's finding of No Adverse Effects to above-ground resources.</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i> Noise levels received by historic properties due to airfield operations would be less than current levels. Noise in the training airspace would be the same or less than the No Action Alternative, and no adverse impacts would be expected. Since the B-21 is projected to fly higher than the B-1, the visibility of the aircraft from historic properties below training airspaces would decrease. As a result, there would be no significant impacts.</p>   |
| <b>Whiteman AFB Alternative (Preferred Alternative)</b> | <p><i>Construction:</i> C&amp;D and renovation activities would occur near historic properties, although none would be directly affected. No historic properties are located at the alternative WGF sites. While new facilities and infrastructure may be within view of some historic properties, the effects would be minimal because the historic resources exist within an active base composed of historic and non-historic facilities and impacts would not be significant. The Area of Potential Effects includes all disturbance limits of the B-21 MOB 2 beddown. The DAF completed NHPA Section 106 (54 United States Code 306108) consultation with the Missouri SHPO. Under Section 110 of the NHPA, Whiteman AFB would be required to minimize harm to Oscar-01 as an NHL, if future mission plans required alteration or destruction.</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i> Consequences would be the same as those described under the No Action Alternative because noise levels would not change under the training airspace.</p>                  |
| <b>Physical Resources</b>                               |  |
| <b>No Action Alternative</b>                            | <p><i>Construction:</i> C&amp;D and maintenance would continue as part of baseline development and infrastructure projects. These activities may affect physical resources but the potential for impacts would be decreased by sediment and erosion control requirements in each base's SWPPP and SPCC Plan, and construction general permit requirements if construction involves areas greater than 1 acre. Erosion control measures would likely be implemented during off-base construction.</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i> Normal airfield operations at each base may affect physical resources by inadvertent releases of hazardous chemicals and from leaking fuel storage tanks. However, measures contained in each base's SWPPP and SPCC Plan to protect soils and surface waters would be implemented, and impacts would not be significant.</p>   |
| <b>Dyess AFB Alternative</b>                            | <p><i>Construction:</i> There would be low potential for soil erosion from land disturbance during construction due to flat topography. Erosion potential would be further reduced by controls implemented by the CES Environmental Group, including measures for a new crossing of North Diversion Ditch. Coverage under the TCEQ construction general permit (TXR150000) would be required for land disturbances greater than 1 acre. Adherence to provisions in the construction general permit will be required, including development of a site-specific SWPPP that describes BMPs for erosion and sediment control. The SWPPP will specify BMPs for discharges of stormwater from construction activities and construction support activities (e.g., borrow pits, staging areas, and material storage areas). The DAF will ensure that NPDES requirements are met during execution of construction projects and will coordinate with TCEQ as needed. If land disturbed by construction will be revegetated, the correct seed mix identified by the</p> |

**Table S-1. Summary of Environmental Consequences for the MOB 2 or MOB 3 Beddown by Alternative**

| Alternative  | Environmental Consequences  |
|--|---|
|  | <p>local NRCS office will be used. Increased runoff associated with impervious surfaces would be managed through stormwater conveyances. Stormwater management controls would be implemented in accordance with requirements in Section 438 of the Energy Independence and Security Act.</p> <p>Because 100- and 500-year floodplains are present in some construction areas, facility siting would comply with floodplain management rules in EO 11988 and EO 13690. The affected floodplain areas consist of land that has been previously developed, and therefore redevelopment would not change hydrologic characteristics. Since Dyess AFB does not have land for establishing the B-21 facilities without working in the floodplain, a Finding of No Practicable Alternative would be included in the Record of Decision.</p> <p>Additional POL use and storage would be subject to requirements of the base SPCC Plan. BMPs and spill prevention practices in the Dyess AFB SWPPP and SPCC plan would prevent significant impacts on ground water.</p> <p>Increased personnel associated with the beddown would not adversely affect potable water supply on base or in the Abilene area, and would not overburden the base’s stormwater system.</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i> Water resources could potentially be impacted by inadvertent releases of hazardous chemicals during airfield operations and from leaking fuel storage tanks. The volume of fuels and hazardous chemicals used, and volume of hazardous waste generated, are not expected to change, therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated. The DAF would continue to implement hazardous material and hazardous waste management actions, and spill prevention and response plans described in the SWPPP and SPCC Plan.</p>   |
| <p><b>Whiteman AFB Alternative (Preferred Alternative)</b></p> | <p><i>Construction:</i> There would be low to moderate potential for soil erosion from land disturbance in most areas due to flat topography, but there are small areas of steep topography with moderate to high erosion potential. Construction contractors would operate under an MDNR construction land-disturbance state operating permit for construction sites exceeding one acre. The main requirement of the MDNR land-disturbance permit is development of a site-specific SWPPP that describes BMPs to minimize soil erosion and prevent sediments and pollutants from leaving the site. The SWPPP will specify BMPs for discharges of stormwater from construction activities and construction support activities (e.g., borrow pits, staging areas, and material storage areas). The DAF will ensure that NPDES requirements are met during execution of construction projects and will coordinate with MDNR as needed. If land disturbed by construction will be revegetated, the correct seed mix identified by the local NRCS office will be used. Base personnel would monitor sites to ensure stormwater BMPs and permit requirements are implemented. Erosion controls would likely be required for the Long Branch Creek crossing.</p> <p>Increased runoff would be addressed through design of stormwater conveyances. Stormwater management controls would be implemented in accordance with requirements in Section 438 of the Energy Independence and Security Act.</p> <p>Some planned areas of construction and a roadway for the South WGF Site contain jurisdictional WOTUS. The DAF received an approved JD from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on November 2, 2023, verifying the jurisdictional status of WOTUS potentially impacted by B-21 beddown activities. Facilities could be designed to avoid impacts to jurisdictional WOTUS in some</p> |

**Table S-1. Summary of Environmental Consequences for the MOB 2 or MOB 3 Beddown by Alternative**

| Alternative   | Environmental Consequences  |
|---|---|
|   | <p>cases. However, if jurisdictional WOTUS cannot be avoided, the DAF would apply for a CWA Section 404 permit with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.</p> <p>None of the construction areas occur in or near the floodplain except for a small area in the southeastern corner of the North WGF Site. To ensure compliance with EO 11988/EO 13690, the DAF would take all feasible measures to either avoid disturbing the zone or to limit development in the zone to structures that would cause minimal impacts. If this alternative is selected, the DAF would include a Finding of No Practicable Alternative in the Record of Decision.</p> <p>B-21 operations would not result in impacts to water quality if personnel adhere to requirements in the SWPPP, SPCC Plan, and Hazardous Material Management and Hazardous Waste Disposal Programs. The potential for impacts on surface waters resulting from adding a road crossing at Long Branch Creek near the South WGF Site would be minimized through site construction planning and engineering practices.</p> <p>Additional POL use and storage would be subject to the base SPCC Plan. BMPs and spill prevention practices in the Whiteman AFB SWPPP and SPCC plan would prevent significant impacts on ground water.</p> <p>Increased personnel associated with the B-21 beddown would not adversely affect potable water supply and would not overburden the base's stormwater system.</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i> Consequences would be the same as those described under the Dyess AFB Alternative.</p> |
| <b>Hazardous Materials and Hazardous and Solid Wastes</b> |   |
| <b>No Action Alternative</b>                              | Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no change in the storage or use of hazardous materials or the generation of solid or hazardous wastes. Ongoing activities related to the management of ERP sites would continue.  |
| <b>Dyess AFB Alternative</b>                              | Hazardous Materials Management – No significant impacts related to hazardous materials or petroleum products would occur with implementation of established management procedures.  |
| <b>Whiteman AFB Alternative (Preferred Alternative)</b>   | <p>Toxic Substances and Hazardous Wastes – Management of ACM and LBP would be accomplished in accordance with all regulatory requirements. Hazardous and nonhazardous waste generated from aircraft maintenance would also be managed according to established procedures. No change to permits, hazardous waste generator status, or management procedures would be required and no adverse environmental impacts are anticipated.</p> <p>ERP Sites – Development on or near any ERP or PFAS sites would be coordinated with the state regulatory agency and other relevant stakeholders, as applicable. No significant impacts related to ERP issues are anticipated.</p> <p>Solid Waste – MSW and C&amp;D debris would not result in significant impacts to landfill capacity. Implementation of appropriate waste recycling, diversion, and management measures would further minimize any potential impacts.</p>   |
| <b>Health and Safety</b>                                  |   |
| <b>No Action Alternative</b>                              | <i>Construction:</i> Under the No Action Alternative, ground operations and construction activities would continue to be conducted using the same safety processes and procedures as under current conditions. All actions would be accomplished by technically   |

**Table S-1. Summary of Environmental Consequences for the MOB 2 or MOB 3 Beddown by Alternative**

| Alternative  | Environmental Consequences   |
|--|--|
|  | <p>qualified personnel and would be conducted in accordance with applicable DAF safety requirements, approved technical data, OSHA and AFOSH standards; consequently, no significant impacts would occur.</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i> Under the No Action Alternative, the installations would continue current operations using existing aircraft. Established procedures would continue for flight safety, mishap prevention and response, and weapons safety.</p>  |
| <p><b>Dyess AFB Alternative</b></p> <p><b>Whiteman AFB Alternative (Preferred Alternative)</b></p> | <p><i>Construction:</i></p> <p>Explosives Safety – Proposed structures within existing QD arcs would undergo an explosive safety review to ensure occupancy and land uses would be compatible. As required, the installation may implement compensatory measures. Additionally, the WGF would be purpose-built to ensure that nuclear material and conventional explosives would be stored separately. Building design and dedicated explosive safety and fire suppression systems, would eliminate any risk to the public and potential impacts would not be significant. Existing explosive safety plans would be updated accordingly. Explosives safety requirements of AFMAN 91-201 would be met.</p> <p>Construction Safety – Ground operations and construction activities would continue to be conducted using the same safety processes and procedures as under existing conditions. All actions would be accomplished by technically qualified personnel and would be conducted in accordance with applicable DAF safety requirements, approved technical data, and OSHA and AFOSH standards.</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i></p> <p>Flight Safety – Because the B-21 would be a new aircraft, historical mishap rates are not available; however, current aircraft flight safety policies and procedures are designed to ensure the potential for aircraft mishaps is reduced to the lowest possible level. These safety policies and procedures would continue, and impacts would not be significant. Dyess AFB has been operating the B-1 aircraft for over 30 years, and there have been three Class A mishaps associated with Dyess AFB aircraft. There have been two flight-related Class A mishaps and one ground fire accident associated with B-2 bomber aircraft associated with Whiteman AFB. If a mishap were to occur, the DAF would implement established emergency response procedures.</p> |
| <b>Transportation</b>  |  |
| <p><b>No Action Alternative</b></p>  | <p><i>Construction:</i> Baseline development and infrastructure projects could potentially cause reduced travel speeds, road-shoulder closures, and lane closures. However, the effects would be short-term and would affect relatively small portions of the base. There would be no long-term impacts to the on-base or off-base transportation system. Transportation projects not associated with the B-21 beddown or baseline development and infrastructure projects would continue with a project-specific environmental review. Traffic operations on and outside the bases would continue as under existing conditions.</p> <p>The on-base road system at Dyess AFB would continue to function adequately, with the exception of a few intersections. Traffic adjacent to the base would continue to function adequately at times, but substantial congestion would likely occur on some roads</p>  |



**Table S-1. Summary of Environmental Consequences for the MOB 2 or MOB 3 Beddown by Alternative**

| Alternative   | Environmental Consequences  |
|---|---|
|   | <p>during peak hours. The on-base road system at Whiteman AFB would continue to function adequately, with little traffic congestion. Traffic adjacent to the base would generally continue to function adequately, but congestion would likely occur at times.</p> <p>Although off-base transportation service levels would be low at some times and locations, activities at Dyess AFB and Whiteman AFB would have little effect on operations, and impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i> Existing airfield operations would not affect transportation on Dyess AFB or Whiteman AFB, or at adjacent off-base areas. Airspace and range utilization would not affect traffic operations under the training airspace associated with either base.</p>   |
| <b>Dyess AFB Alternative</b>                            | <p><i>Construction:</i> Increased personnel associated with the B-21 beddown would result in increased on-base and off-base traffic operations. Higher on-base traffic volume would likely increase traffic congestion and decrease road segment or intersection service levels and could cause some road segments to operate near capacity. Increased off-base vehicle operation would add to existing congestion, particularly during peak commute hours and in areas of concentrated operation. Additional personnel would potentially cause a significant increase in congestion and queuing near installation gates.</p> <p>C&amp;D and renovation projects could potentially cause traffic congestion and reduced service levels, particularly during peak hours. Unaffected roads could potentially accommodate rerouted traffic, and LOS would not likely be affected substantially on most parts of the base. Delivery and removal of materials and debris, and base access by construction crews, would cause an increase in off-base traffic. However, the number of vehicles involved would be small, and activities could occur throughout the workday. Impacts would not be significant because they would be temporary and would cease with completion of the projects.</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i> Airfield operations would not affect transportation on Dyess AFB or at adjacent off-base areas. Airspace and range utilization would not affect traffic operations under the training airspace.</p> |
| <b>Whiteman AFB Alternative (Preferred Alternative)</b> | <p><i>Construction:</i> Impacts would be similar to those discussed for Dyess AFB. Increased personnel would result in increased on-base and off-base traffic operations that could contribute to traffic congestion and decreased LOS, particularly during peak commute hours and in areas of concentrated operation. Additional personnel could potentially cause an increase in congestion and queuing near installation gates.</p> <p>C&amp;D and renovation projects could cause traffic congestion and reduced LOS, particularly during peak hours. Commercial traffic associated with facility and infrastructure projects would also cause an increase in off-base traffic. However, the number of vehicles involved would be small, and activities could occur throughout the workday. No significant impacts are anticipated because effects would be temporary and would cease with completion of the projects.</p> <p><i>Flight Training:</i> Consequences would be the same as those described under the Dyess AFB Alternative.</p>  |
| <b>Utilities and Infrastructure</b>                     |   |
| <b>No Action Alternative</b>                            | <p>Utility usage would continue below permitted/allowed capacity limits at both Dyess AFB and Whiteman AFB. Electrical system repairs and upgrades to the Charlie substation at Dyess AFB would further increase capacity. Similarly, construction of the 10 MW combined heat and power plant at Whiteman AFB would provide additional capacity.</p>  |

**Table S-1. Summary of Environmental Consequences for the MOB 2 or MOB 3 Beddown by Alternative**

| Alternative   | Environmental Consequences   |
|---|--|
| <b>Dyess AFB Alternative</b><br><b>Whiteman AFB Alternative (Preferred Alternative)</b> | While utility usage under both the Dyess AFB Alternative and the Whiteman AFB Alternative are expected to slightly increase, these increases would not be significant because they would not exceed any permitted/allowed usage capacity limits and the remaining capacities are sufficient for future growth. |

ACM = asbestos-containing materials; AFB = Air Force Base; AFOSH = Air Force Operational and Environmental Safety, Fire Protection, and Health; AFMAN = Air Force Manual; APZ = accident potential zone; APZ = accident potential zone; ATC = Air Traffic Control; BASH = Bird/Wildlife-Aircraft Strike Hazard; BCC = Birds of Conservation Concern; BMP = best management practice; C&D = construction and demolition; CES = Civil Engineering Squadron; CWA = Clean Water Act; DAF = Department of the Air Force; dBA = A-weighted decibels; DNL = day-night average sound level; EO = Executive Order; EPA = Environmental Protection Agency; ERP = Environmental Restoration Program; ESA = Endangered Species Act; GHG = greenhouse gas; ICRMP = Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan; INRMP = Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan; JD = jurisdictional determination; LBP = lead-based paint; LOS = level of service; MDNR = Missouri Department of Natural Resources; MOA = Military Operating Area; MOB = Main Operating Base; MSW = municipal solid waste; MW = megawatt; NHL = National Historic Landmark; NHPA = National Historic Preservation Act; NPDES = National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System; NRCS = United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service; OSHA = Occupational Safety and Health Administration; PFAS = per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances; PM<sub>10</sub> = particulate matter with a diameter of less than or equal to 10 microns; POL = petroleum, oil, and lubricant; QD = quantity-distance; ROI = region of influence; SEL = sound exposure level; SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer; SPCC = Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures; SUA = Special Use Airspace; SWPPP = Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan; TCEQ = Texas Commission on Environmental Quality; WGF = Weapons Generation Facility; WOTUS = waters of the United States