FILE FOLDER

DESCRIPTION ON TAB:

6240/2

Environmental Impact

Assess.

☐ **Outside/inside of actual folder did not contain hand written information**

☒ **Outside/inside of actual folder did contain hand written information**
***Scanned as next image**

NAVSO 5216/5 (REV. 11-67)
S/N-0104-904-1762 (REV. 11-67)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Memorandum

Ad W
12 July 79

FAC:JLM:mkc
5420/3

DATE: 11 Jul 1979

FROM : Assistant Chief of Staff, Facilities, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, N. C. 28542

TO : Facilities Branch, HQMC (Code LFF-2) (Attn: Mr. Ball)

SUBJ : Candidate Environmental Impact Statement (CEIS)

Encl: (1) CEIS for Armor/Mechanized-Infantry Training Area, Second Marine Division of Jul 1979

1. Enclosure (1) was received from the 2d Marine Division today. An advance copy is forwarded, as requested.

2. The CEIS is being staffed for comments/advisory opinions preceding the MCB Environmental Impace Review Board's latest action.

J. L. MC LAUGHLIN
By direction

Copy to:
→ BMaintO

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS
Marine Corps Air Station
(Helicopter)
New River, Jacksonville
North Carolina 28545

204:PFA:cbm
11000
15 Jun 1979

From: Commanding Officer
To: Commandant of the Marine Corps (Code LFF-2), Headquarters, U. S. Marine Corps, Washington, D. C. 20380
Via: Commanding General, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, N. C. 28542 (AC/S Facilities)

Subj: Environmental Impact Assessment for Non-Appropriated Fund Construction Project P-308, Bowling Center Addition

Ref: (a) CG MCB CLNC ltr PWD:CWB:mtm 11000 dtd 11 May 1979
(b) BO 11000.1 w/Ch 1

Encl: (1) Subject Environmental Impact Assessment

1. In accordance with references (a) and (b), enclosure (1) is herewith submitted in support of subject project.

2. If any additional information is required, please contact LtCol ANGLE, S-4, MCAS(H), New River, telephone 455-6506/6518, or Maj SHOCKLEY, Special Services Officer, MCAS(H), New River, telephone 455-6704.

P. F. ANGLE
By direction

Copy to:
CG, MCB, CLNC (PWO)
CG, MCB, CLNC (MAINT)
SpecServOff, MCAS(H), NR

Original sent
to AC/S Fac (Mr. Coston)

Original sent
to 4th Ftr (Nav. Gun)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

BOWLING CENTER ADDITION, P-308
(Project Title)

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION (HELICOPTER), NEW RIVER

JACKSONVILLE, N. C. 28545
(Military Installation)

12 June 1979
(Date)

Prepared by:

PETER F. ANGLE
LTCOL, MCAS(H), NR, S-4
Facilities, MCAS(H), NR

Approved by:

Assistant Chief of Staff,
Facilities, MCB, CLNC

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Submitting DoD Component: Department of the Navy

Installation: MARINE CORPS AIR STATION (HELICOPTER, NEW RIVER, JACKSONVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA 28545

Project Title: P-308, Bowling Center Addition

Date of Submission: 14 June 1979

1. Introduction

a. Project Description: An addition to the existing building, AS-205, Bowling Center, to increase the number of bowling lanes available for use by MCAS(H), New River patrons. The addition will be compatible with the existing building in architecture and design. It will provide mechanical ventilation, lighting, heating and cooling, insulated build-up roof, and metal deck on steel joists. The necessary utilities will be connected and additional parking spaces will be constructed as required.

b. Existing Site Characteristics: The project will be an addition to an existing building, AS-205, Bowling Center, located on Curtis Road adjacent to AS-204. The existing area is developed to the west, south and north with a parking lot, baseball field, and Curtis Road. To the east is open, flat land which is undeveloped. The soil condition is indicated on the Master Plan for this Activity as being good.

2. Relationship of Proposed Action to Land Use Plans, Policies and Controls for the Affected Area:

	Conforms With	No Plans For Area	Conflicts With
a. Land Use Plans	X		
b. Clear Air Control	X		
c. Federal Water Pollution Control Act	X		

3. The probable Impact of the Proposed Action on the Environment:

a. Assessment of the positive and negative effects of the proposed action as it affects both the national and/or the international environment. The potentially significant effect of this action is that it:

(1) ~~Will~~/will not cause emissions into the atmosphere of toxic or hazardous substances or significant amounts of other pollutants. It will/will not significantly reduce the amount of pollution in the atmosphere?

(2) ~~Will~~/will not cause the creation of excessive noise, when considering the proximity and likely effects of the noise on humans or wildlife?

(3) ~~Will~~/will not introduce toxic or hazardous substances or significant amounts of chemicals, organic substances or solid wastes into bodies of water, on land or otherwise effect water or soil quality?

(4) ~~Will~~/will not significantly alter the rate of sediment deposit or temperature of a body of water?

(5) ~~Will~~/will not require the use of non-renewable energy sources, e.g., fossil fuels, etc., in apparently excessive or disproportionate amounts?

(6) ~~Will~~/will not result in a significant destruction of vegetation, wild or marine life?

(7) ~~Will~~/will not affect, beneficially or adversely, other forms of life or the ecosystems of which they are a part?

(8) ~~Will~~/will not result in contamination or deterioration of food or food sources?

(9) ~~Will~~/will not affect population density and congestion?

(10) ~~Will~~/will not cause a major change in landscape, extensive clearing, paving or excavation?

(11) ~~Will~~/will not affect, beneficially or adversely, neighborhood character (aesthetic qualities) and zoning?

(12) ~~Will~~/will not alter area hydrologic properties?

b. The proposed action will have a potentially significant effect on the following:

ITEM	Favorable	Adverse	No Effect
Traffic	☐	☐	X
Community Facilities	X	☐	X
Schools	☐	☐	X
Waste Treatment Facilities	☐	☐	X
Utilities	☐	☐	X
Land Management	☐	☐	X
Solid Waste Disposal	☐	☐	X
Area Appearance	X	☐	☐
Other (See Attachment _____)			

4. Alternatives to the Proposed Action

☒ There is no feasible alternative.

☐ Only feasible alternative is to take no action. The effects of this alternative are discussed in Attachment _____.

☐ Various alternatives and their effects are discussed in Attachment _____.

5. Any Probable Adverse Environmental Effects Which Cannot Be Avoided Should The Proposal Be Implemented

☒ No adverse effects on the environment are anticipated.

☐ Probable adverse effects are discussed in Attachment _____.

6. Relationship Between Local Short-Term Uses of the Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity

No change in short-term use.

☐ No change in the maintenance and/or enhancement of long-term productivity.

☒ Adverse effects on the environment will occur only during the construction period and these will/will not create permanent or long-lasting adverse effects.

☐ The proposed action will enhance the short-term use of resources by:

- ☐ Abating existing or potential pollution.
- ☐ Enhancing the area appearance.
- ☐ Reducing utility requirements
- ☐ Improvements in operational efficiency.
- ☐ Improvements in habitability of existing facilities.
- ☐ Other: _____

_____.

☒ Long-term productivity will be enhanced by:

- ☒ Abating existing or potential pollution. (Dust)
- ☐ Reducing utility requirements.
- ☒ Improvement in operational efficiency.
- ☐ Other: _____

_____.

7. Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources Which Would Be Involved in the Proposed Action Should It Be Implemented

☒ No significant irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources.

☒ No destruction of identified archeological sites or sites having possible historic or architectural interests.

☒ No effect on known endangered species of wildlife.

[X] No significant change in land use.

[ ] Potentially significant irreversible or irretrievable commitments or resources are discussed in Attachment _____.

[ ] Other: _____

_____

8. Considerations That Offset the Adverse Environmental Effects

a. This course of action as compared to adverse environmental effects of alternatives (Section 4) are discussed in Attachment _____.

b. Cost benefit analysis of proposed action is Attachment _____.

9. Summary

[X] It is concluded that the proposed action will have no significant adverse effects on the environment.

[X] There has not been, nor is there currently, any known controversy concerning the proposed action.

[ ] Based on this assessment, it is concluded that an Environmental Impact Statement must be prepared prior to implementation of the proposed action.

ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF, FACILITIES
HEADQUARTERS, MARINE CORPS BASE

DATE 790514

TO:

[BASE MAINT O]

PUBLIC WORKS O

COMM-ELECT O

MOTOR TRANSPORT O

DIR, QUARTERS & HOUSING

DIR, BOQ/BSQ

BASE FIRE CHIEF

ATTN: NREA

1. Attached is forwarded for info/action.

2. Please initial, or comment, and return all papers to this office.

3. Your file copy.

"LET'S THINK OF A FEW REASONS
WHY IT CAN BE DONE"

C/S

ROUTINE

****
* U N C L A S S I F I E D *
****

PT 00430 132/1726Z

RTTUUUUU RUCBSGG4089 1321638-UUUU--RUEBDOA.
ZNR UUUUU
R 112019Z MAY 79
FM CINCLANT NORFOLK VA
TO RHEFAPA/COMUSFORBLUE
INFO RULYGBA/CG II MAF
RUCIPBA/CINCAFLANT LANGLEY AFB VA
RUCLHID/CINCARLANT FT MCPHERSON GA
ZEN/CINCLANTFLT NORFOLK VA
RUCIMAA/CINCMAC SCOTT AFB IL
RUCLAKH/COMJUWTFA FT BRAGG NC
RHEEJCG/OJCG SOLID SHIELD 79
RUCIBPA/9AF SHAW AFB SC
RUCLAKA/COP XVIII ABN CORPS FT BRAGG NC
RUEBDOA/CG MCB CAMP LEJEUNE NC
RUCJAAA/USCINCRED MACDILL AFB FL
RULYSHH/LANTNAVFACENGCOM NORFOLK VA
RUCLAKA/CG FT BRAGG NC
BT
UNCLAS//N03000//
SOLID SHIELD 79 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (SS-79 EIA)
A DOD INST 6050.1

PAGE 02 RUCBSGG4089 UNCLAS
B. USF&W SERVICE LTR OF 11 MAY 79
1. AS REQUIRED BY REF A, CINCLANT HAS ASSESSED THE POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF SOLID SHIELD 79. IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE EXERCISE, AS PROPOSED, WILL NOT CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT. THIS DETERMINATION IS BASED ON EXPERIENCE WITH PREVIOUS TYPE EXERCISES IN SIMILAR LOCALES, THE COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT EIA, AND FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MITIGATION MEASURES CONTAINED IN SECTION VIII OF SUBJECT EIA, AS WELL AS APPLICABLE HOST INSTALLATION ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS BY ALCON.
2. BY REF B, THE U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, OFFICE OF ENDANGERED SPECIES ISSUED A BIOLOGICAL OPINION THAT THE EXERCISE, AS PROPOSED, IS NOT LIKELY TO JEOPARDIZE THE CONTINUED EXISTENCE OF THE LISTED SPECIES KNOWN TO INHABIT THE HOST INSTALLATIONS. THIS OPINION IS BASED BOTH ON THE SUBJECT EIA AND FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF APPLICABLE HOST INSTALLATION REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT.
3. THE FOLLOWING IS REQUESTED:
A. COMPONENT COMMANDERS APPOINT AN ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICER FOR THEIR FORCES, TO OBSERVE THE EXERCISE AND COORDINATE ENFORCEMENT OF MITIGATING MEASURES/BASE REGULATIONS WITH APPLICABLE HOST

PAGE 03 RUCBSGG4089 UNCLAS
INSTALLATION COMMANDERS.

****
ROUTINE * U N C L A S S I F I E D *
****

ROUTINE

****
* U N C L A S S I F I E D *
****

B. ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICERS PROVIDE POST EXERCISE "LESSONS LEARNED" REPORT ON ENFORCEMENT OF MITIGATION MEASURES TO CINCLANT (N37) BY 15 JUN 79. INCLUDE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE EXERCISES.

C. ENSURE ALL PARTICIPATING PERSONNEL ARE AWARE OF, AND ATTUNED TO, THE MITIGATION MEASURES DELINEATED IN THE EIA AND APPLICABLE HOST INSTALLATION DIRECTIVES.

BT
#4089

INFO: TRNG
NNNN

/44

MAY 15 1979

	ACTION	INFO	INITIAL
BMO			
ABMO			
MAINT NCO			
SAFETY CHMN			
PROP			
M&R			
OPNS			
ADMIN		S	
TELE			
UTIL			
ENVIRON AFF		✓	[illegible]
SECRETARY			
F&A BRANCH			
UMACS			
MME			

MAY 1 8 1979

	ACTION	INFO	INITIAL
BMO			
ABMO			
MAINT NCO			
SAFETY CHMN			
PROP			
M&R			
OPNS			
ADMIN			
TELE			
UTIL			
ENVIRON AFF		✓	JW
SECRETARY			
F&A BRANCH			
UMACS			
MME			

Twyfah See if Facilities has original

Julian 5/11

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS
Marine Corps Air Station
(Helicopter)
New River, Jacksonville
North Carolina 28545

204:PFA:cbm
11000
10 May 1979

From: Commanding Officer
To: Commandant of the Marine Corps (Code LFF-2), Headquarters, U. S. Marine Corps, Washington, D. C. 20380
Via: Commanding General, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, N. C. 28542 (AC/S Facilities)

Subj: Environmental Impact Assessment for Exigent Minor Construction Project P-412, Addition to Flight Simulator Building, MCAS(H), New River for Device 2F120 CH-53E Operational Flight Trainer

Ref: (a) FONECON btwn Betty J. BLAKE, Fac, MCAS(H), NR, and Major WASSON, LFF-1, HQMC, of 18 Apr 1979
(b) BO 11000.1 w/Ch 1

Encl: (1) Subject Environmental Impact Assessment

1. In accordance with references (a) and (b), enclosure (1) is herewith submitted in support of subject project.

2. If any additional information is required, please contact LtCol ANGLE, S-4, MCAS(H), New River, telephone 455-6506/6518, or the S-3 Officer, MCAS(H), New River, telephone 455-6311/6312.

P. F. ANGLE
By direction

Copy to:
CG, MCB, CLNC (PWO)
CG, MCB, CLNC (MAINT)
S-3 Off, MCAS(H), NR

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

P-412, Addition to Flight Simulator Building, MCAS(H), New River for Device 2F120 CH-53E

(Project Title)

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION (HELICOPTER), NEW RIVER

JACKSONVILLE, N. C. 28545

(Military Installation)

8 May 1979

(Date)

Prepared by:
PETER F. ANGLE
S-4 Officer

Approved by:
R. H. HUCKABY
Assistant Chief of Staff, Facilities

PETER F. ANGLE
Facilities, MCAS(H), NR

R. H. HUCKABY
Assistant Chief of Staff,
Facilities, MCB, CLNC

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Submitting DoD Component: Department of the Navy

Installation: MARINE CORPS AIR STATION (HELICOPTER, NEW RIVER, JACKSONVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA 28545

Project Title: P-412, Addition to Flight Simulator Building

Date of Submission: 8 May 1979

1. Introduction

a. Project Description: An addition to the existing building AS-320 to provide adequate housing for a CH-53E Operational Flight Trainer, Device 2F120, to be installed in July 1980 at MCAS(H), New River. The addition will be compatible with the existing building in architecture and design. It will provide mechanical ventilation, lighting, heating, and cooling, insulated build-up roof, and metal deck on steel joists. The necessary utilities will be connected and additional parking spaces will be constructed as required.

b. Existing Site Characteristics: The project will be an addition to an existing building, AS-320, Flight Simulator Building, located on McAvoy Street adjacent to AS-312. The existing area is developed to the south of AS-320 with parking lots and another training building, AS-312. To the east and north is open flat land which is undeveloped. The soil condition is indicated on the Master Plan for this Activity as being good.

2. Relationship of Proposed Action to Land Use Plans, Policies and Controls for the Affected Area:

	Conforms With	No Plans For Area	Conflicts With
a. Land Use Plans	X		
b. Clear Air Control	X		
c. Federal Water Pollution Control Act	X		

3. The probable Impact of the Proposed Action on the Environment:

a. Assessment of the positive and negative effects of the proposed action as it affects both the national and/or the international environment. The potentially significant effect of this action is that it:

(1) ~~Will~~/will not cause emissions into the atmosphere of toxic or hazardous substances or significant amounts of other pollutants. It ~~will~~/will not significantly reduce the amount of pollution in the atmosphere?

(2) ~~Will~~/will not cause the creation of excessive noise, when considering the proximity and likely effects of the noise on humans or wildlife?

(3) ~~Will~~/will not introduce toxic or hazardous substances or significant amounts of chemicals, organic substances or solid wastes into bodies of water, on land or otherwise effect water or soil quality?

(4) ~~Will~~/will not significantly alter the rate of sediment deposit or temperature of a body of water?

(5) ~~Will~~/will not require the use of non-renewable energy sources, e.g., fossil fuels, etc., in apparently excessive or disproportionate amounts?

(6) ~~Will~~/will not result in a significant destruction of vegetation, wild or marine life?

(7) ~~Will~~/will not affect, beneficially or adversely, other forms of life or the ecosystems of which they are a part?

(8) ~~Will~~/will not result in contamination or deterioration of food or food sources?

(9) ~~Will~~/will not affect population density and congestion?

(10) ~~Will~~/will not cause a major change in landscape, extensive clearing, paving or excavation?

(11) ~~Will~~/will not affect, beneficially or adversely, neighborhood character (aesthetic qualities) and zoning?

(12) ~~Will~~/will not alter area hydrologic properties?

b. The proposed action will have a potentially significant effect on the following:

ITEM	Favorable	Adverse	No Effect
Traffic	☐	☐	X
Community Facilities	☐	☐	X
Schools	☐	☐	X
Waste Treatment Facilities	☐	☐	X
Utilities	☐	☐	X
Land Management	☐	☐	X
Solid Waste Disposal	☐	☐	X
Area Appearance	X	☐	☐
Other (See Attachment _____)			

4. Alternatives to the Proposed Action

X There is no feasible alternative.

☐ Only feasible alternative is to take no action. The effects of this alternative are discussed in Attachment_____.

☐ Various alternatives and their effects are discussed in Attachment _____.

5. Any Probable Adverse Environmental Effects Which Cannot Be Avoided Should The Proposal Be Implemented

X No adverse effects on the environment are anticipated.

☐ Probable adverse effects are discussed in Attachment_____.

6. Relationship Between Local Short-Term Uses of the Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity

No change in short-term use.

☐ No change in the maintenance and/or enhancement of long-term productivity.

☒ Adverse effects on the environment will occur only during the construction period and these will/will not create permanent or long-lasting adverse effects.

☐ The proposed action will enhance the short-term use of resources by:

- ☐ Abating existing or potential pollution.
- ☐ Enhancing the area appearance.
- ☐ Reducing utility requirements
- ☐ Improvements in operational efficiency.
- ☐ Improvements in habitability of existing facilities.
- ☐ Other: _____

_____.

☒ Long-term productivity will be enhanced by:

- ☒ Abating existing or potential pollution. (Dust)
- ☐ Reducing utility requirements.
- ☒ Improvement in operational efficiency.
- ☐ Other: _____

_____.

7. Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources Which Would Be Involved in the Proposed Action Should It Be Implemented

☒ No significant irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources.

☒ No destruction of identified archeological sites or sites having possible historic or architectural interests.

☒ No effect on known endangered species of wildlife.

[X] No significant change in land use.

[ ] Potentially significant irreversible or irretrievable commitments or resources are discussed in Attachment _____.

[ ] Other: _____

_____

8. Considerations That Offset the Adverse Environmental Effects N/A

a. This course of action as compared to adverse environmental effects of alternatives (Section 4) are discussed in Attachment _____.

b. Cost benefit analysis of proposed action is Attachment _____.

9. Summary

[X] It is concluded that the proposed action will have no significant adverse effects on the environment.

[X] There has not been, nor is there currently, any known controversy concerning the proposed action.

[ ] Based on this assessment, it is concluded that an Environmental Impact Statement must be prepared prior to implementation of the proposed action.

BASE MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT
Marine Corps Base
Camp Lejeune, North Carolina 28542

MAIN/JIW/th
6240/2
22 May 1979

From: Base Maintenance Officer
To: Assistant Chief of Staff, Facilities

Subj: Environmental Impact Assessment for Exigent Minor Construction Project P-412, Addition to Flight Simulator Building, MCAS(H), New River for Device 2F120 CH-53E Operational Flight Trainer: comments concerning

1. Subject environmental impact assessment has been reviewed and it is recommended that the Environmental Impact Review Board officially process same.

T. R. BAISLEY

MAIN/JIW/th
6240/2
15 May 1979

Base Maintenance Officer

Assistant Chief of Staff, Facilities

Addition-Enlisted Club-French Creek Area and Military Construction Project P-183, Environmental Impact Assessments; comments concerning

1. Subject environmental impact assessments have been reviewed and it is recommended that the Environmental Impact Review Board officially process same.

T. R. BAISLEY

EUO
11 May

PWD:CWB:mtm
11000
MAY 11 1979

From: Commanding General
To: Commanding Officer, Marine Corps Air Station (Helicopter), New River, Jacksonville, North Carolina

Subj: Environmental Impact Assessment, request for

Ref: (a) BO 11000.1

Encl: (1) Environmental Impact Assessment (Sample)

1. It is requested that an environmental impact assessment (EIA) be prepared in accordance with reference (a) for MCON Construction Project P-308, Bowling Center, and returned no later than 1 July 1979 for review by the Environmental Impact Review Board. A sample EIA is attached as enclosure (1).

2. If there are questions or you require further assistance, please contact Mr. Wooten, Natural Resources and Environmental Affairs Division, Base Maintenance, on extension 5003.

C. A. TACK
By direction

Copy to: (w/o encl)
AC/S FAC
BMO

MAY 14 1979

	ACTION	INFO	INITIAL
BMO			
ABMO		✓	
MAINT NCO			
SAFETY CHMN			
PROP			
M&R			
OPNS			
ADMIN		S	
TELE			
UTIL			
ENVIRON AFF		✓	
SECRETARY			
F&A BRANCH			
UMACS			
MME			

PWD:CWB:mmm
11000

MAY 11 1979

From: Commanding General
To: Commanding General, 2D Force Service Support Group

Subj: Environmental Impact Assessment; request for

Ref: (a) BO 11000.1

Encl: (1) Environmental Impact Assessment (Sample)

1. It is requested that an environmental impact assessment (EIA) be prepared in accordance with reference (a) for MCON Construction Project P-031, Battalion Headquarters, French Creek Area, and returned no later than 1 July 1979 for review by the Environmental Impact Review Board. A sample EIA is attached as enclosure (1).

2. If there are questions or you require further assistance, please contact Mr. Wooten, Natural Resources and Environmental Affairs Division, Base Maintenance, on extension 5003.

C. A. TACK
By direction

Copy to: (W/O Encl)
AC/S, Fac
BMO

JDW
11 May

PWD:CWB:mmm
11000

MAY 11 1979

From: Commanding General
To: Commanding General, Second Marine Division

Subj: Environmental Impact Assessment, request for

Ref: (a) BO 11000.1

Encl: (1) Environmental Impact Assessment (Sample)

1. It is requested that an environmental impact assessment (EIA) be prepared in accordance with reference (a) for MCON Construction Project P-625, Bachelor Enlisted Quarters, and returned no later than 1 July 1979 for review by the Environmental Impact Review Board. A sample EIA is attached as enclosure (1).

2. If there are questions or you require further assistance, please contact Mr. Wooten, Natural Resources and Environmental Affairs Division, Base Maintenance, on extension 5003.

C. A. TACK
By direction

Copy to: (w/o encl)
AC/S FAC
BMO

RdW
11 mar

PWD:CWB:mmm
11000

MAY 11 1979

From: Commanding General
To: Commanding General, Second Marine Division

Subj: Environmental Impact Assessment, request for

Ref: (a) BO 11000.1

Encl: (1) Environmental Impact Assessment (Sample)

1. It is requested that an environmental impact assessment (EIA) be prepared in accordance with reference (a) for MCON Construction Project P-624, Bachelor Enlisted Quarters, and returned no later than 1 July 1979 for review by the Environmental Impact Review Board. A sample EIA is attached as enclosure (1).

2. If there are questions or you require further assistance, please contact Mr. Wooten, Natural Resources and Environmental Affairs Division, Base Maintenance, on extension 5003.

C. A. TACK
By direction

Copy to: (w/o encl)
AC/S FAC
BMO

f u w
11 may

PWD:CWB:mtm
11000

MAY 11 1979

From: Commanding General
To: Commanding General, Second Marine Division

Subj: Environmental Impact Assessment, request for

Ref: (a) BO 11000.1

Encl: (1) Environmental Impact Assessment (Sample)

1. It is requested that an environmental impact assessment (EIA) be prepared in accordance with reference (a) for MCON Construction Project P-525, Auto Organizational Shop, Hadnot Point Area, and returned no later than 1 July 1979 for review by the Environmental Impact Board. A sample EIA is attached as enclosure (1).

2. If there are questions or you require further assistance, please contact Mr. Wooten, Natural Resources and Environmental Affairs Division, Base Maintenance, on extension 5003.

C. A. TACK
By direction

Copy to: (w/o encl)
AC/S FAC
BMO

JLW

PWD:CWB:mtm
11000

MAY 11 1979

11 May

From: Commanding General
To: Commanding General, Second Marine Division

Subj: Environmental Impact Assessment, request for

Ref: (a) BO 11000.1

Encl: (1) Environmental Impact Assessment (Sample)

1. It is requested that an environmental impact assessment (EIA) be prepared in accordance with reference (a) for MCON Construction Project P-527, Electronic/Communications Maintenance Shop, and returned no later than 1 July 1979 for review by the Environmental Impact Review Board. A sample EIA is attached as enclosure (1).

2. If there are questions or you require further assistance, please contact Mr. Wooten, Natural Resources and Environmental Affairs Division, Base Maintenance, on extension 5003.

C. A. TACK
By direction

Copy to: (w/o encl)
AC/S FAC
BMO

BASE MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT
Marine Corps Base
Camp Lejeune, North Carolina 28542

MAIN/JIW/th
6240/2
JAN 16 1979

From: Base Maintenance Officer
To: Assistant Chief of Staff, Facilities

Subj: Joint Exercise Solid Shield 79, Environmental Impact Assessment (SS-79 EIA); comments concerning

Ref: (a) FoneCon btwn Mr. Charles Hollis, US Army Corps of Engineers, and Mr. Julian Wooten, Base Maintenance Dept, on 10 Jan 79

1. Subject document has been reviewed and the following comments are offered:

a. Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina is involved in formal consultation with the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service concerning a possible training conflict with red-cockaded woodpeckers (Denrocopos borealis) and the Atlantic Loggerhead sea turtles (Caretta caretta). When biological opinions and recommendations concerning the woodpeckers and sea turtles are received from the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, appropriate precautions and/or restrictions relative to endangered species found at Camp Lejeune will be provided.

b. A portable pier system to extend into the Atlantic Ocean is planned for Onslow Beach, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. During reference (a) it was learned that an Army Corps of Engineers "letter" permit authorizing the pier and piling is required. Upon completion of the training exercise the entire structure and piling must be removed.

2. It is suggested that the subject assessment be processed by the Environmental Impact Review Board.

J. KOVACH

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS
MARINE CORPS BASE
CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA 28542

IN REPLY REFER TO
FAC:JLBlake
5420/3
17 Jan 1979

From: Commanding General
To: Commander in Chief, U. S. Atlantic Fleet, Norfolk, Virginia 23511 (N37)

Subj: Joint Exercise Solid Shield 79, Environmental Impact Assessment (SS-79 EIA); comments concerning

Ref: (a) FoneCon btwn Mr. Charles Hollis, US Army Corps of Engineers, and Mr. Julian Wooten, Base Maintenance Dept, on 10 Jan 79

1. The subject document has been reviewed and the following comments are offered:

a. Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, is involved in formal consultation with the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service concerning a possible training conflict with red-cockaded woodpeckers (Dendrocopos borealis) and the Atlantic Loggerhead sea turtles (Caretta caretta). When biological opinions and recommendations concerning the woodpeckers and sea turtles are received from the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, appropriate precautions and/or restrictions relative to endangered species found at Camp Lejeune will be provided.

b. A portable pier system to extend into the Atlantic Ocean is planned for Onslow Beach, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. During reference (a), it was learned that an Army Corps of Engineers "letter" permit authorizing the pier and piling is required. Upon completion of the training exercise the entire structure and piling must be removed.

T. R. BAISLEY
By direction

Copy to:
CG, FMFLant
COMCABEAST
CG, 2d MAW
CG, 4th MAB
CG, 2d FSSG

Blind copy to:
AC/S, Trng
BMaintO

BASE MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT
Marine Corps Base
Camp Lejeune, North Carolina 28542

2/27/79

From: Assistant Maintenance Officer
To: Julian

Subj:

Please arrange for Maj. Fonega to come over and talk w/ BMO about these recommendation.

Thursday
1330
1 March 79

BWE

	ACTION	INFO	INITIAL
BMO		✓	Bailey
ABMO		✓	BWR
MAINT NCO			
SAFETY CHMN			
PROP			
M&R			
OPNS			
ADMIN			
TELE			
UTIL			
ENVIRON AFF			
SECRETARY			
F&A BRANCH			
UMACS			
MME			

BMO:

Would like to discuss.

BWR

O.K. —

OPNAV 5216/144 (REV. 6-70)
S/N 0107-LF-778-8099

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Memorandum

DATE: 26 Feb 1979

FROM Director, Natural Resources and Environmental Affairs Division

TO Base Maintenance Officer

SUBJ Trip Report

1. Purpose of Trip: To attend EIS Conference

2. Duration 22-23 Feb 1979

3. Key Persons Contacted on Trip:

   a. Mr. Sheppard Moore, EPA
   b. Mr. James Holdaway, EPA
   c. Mr. George Moein, EPA
   d. MS. Sara Turnipseed, EPA
   e. Mr. E. I. Heinen, EPA

4. Topics of Discussion were:

   a. Implementating the CEQ Regulations
   b. Wetlands
   c. Air Issues
   d. EIS Review Procedures
   e. Environmental Impacts of Cultural Practices on Natural Ecosystems

5. Narrative Summary: The conference was held to familiarize major federal and state activities in Region IV with the new National Environmental Policy Act regulations which become effective in July 1979. It was determined that an EIS for Camp Lejeune is required by law. One environmental consultant estimated from $400,000 to $500,000 to prepare a statement for Camp Lejeune.

6. It is recommended that a meeting between SJAO and Base Maintenance be arranged to determine a course of action.

7. It is also recommended that HQMC be advised of the legal requirement for a base EIS and ask for guidance.

Julian I. Wooten

JULIAN I. WOOTEN

26 Feb 1979

Director, Natural Resources and Environmental Affairs Division

Base Maintenance Officer

Trip Report

1. Purpose of Trip: To attend EIS Conference

2. Duration 22-23 Feb 1979

3. Key Persons Contacted on Trip:

a. Mr. Sheppard Moore, EPA
b. Mr. James Holdaway, EPA
c. Mr. George Moein, EPA
d. Ms. Sara Turnipseed, EPA
e. Mr. E. I. Heinen, EPA

4. Topics of Discussion were:

a. Implementating the CEQ Regulations
b. Wetlands
c. Air Issues
d. EIS Review Procedures
e. Environmental Impacts of Cultural Practices on Natural Ecosystems

5. Narrative Summary: The conference was held to familiarize major federal and state activities in Region IV with the new National Environmental Policy Act regulations which become effective in July 1979. It was determined that an EIS for Camp Lejeune is required by law. One environmental consultant estimated from $400,000 to $500,000 to prepare a statement for Camp Lejeune.

6. It is recommended that a meeting between SJAO and Base Maintenance be arranged to determine a course of action.

7. It is also recommended that HQMC be advised of the legal requirement for a base EIS and ask for guidance.

JULIAN L. WOOTEN

NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS DIVISION
BASE MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT
MARINE CORPS BASE
CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA 28542

25 April 79

From: Director, NREA Division
To: BMO
Subj: attached

1. This should be processed by the EIR Board.

Jahain

NREA.
I view it as A&S Fac makes the next move!
Bailey

APR 20 1979

	ACTION	INFO	INITIAL
BMO		✓	
ABMO		✓	
MAINT NCO			
SAFETY CHMN			
PROP			
M&R			
OPNS			
ADMIN			
TELE			
UTIL			
ENVIRON AFF		✓	
SECRETARY			
F&A BRANCH			
UMACS			
MME			

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS
Marine Corps Air Station
(Helicopter)
New River, Jacksonville
North Carolina 28545

204:BJB:cbm
11000
16 Apr 1979

From: Commanding Officer
To: Commanding General, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, N. C. 28542
(AC/S Facilities)

Subj: Environmental Impact Assessment for Military Construction Project P-183, Combat Vehicle Maintenance Facility, MCAS(H), New River FY 79

Ref: (a) FONECON btwn Betty J. Blake (Fac, MCAS(H), NR) and Bill Barnes (PubWks, MCB, CLNC) of 5 Mar 1979
(b) BO 11000.1 w/Ch 1

Encl: (1) Subject Environmental Impact Assessment

1. In accordance with references (a) and (b), enclosure (1) is herewith submitted in support of subject project.

2. If any additional information is required, please contact Assistant Facilities Officer, S-4, MCAS(H), New River, telephone 455-6506/6518, or S-4 Officer, Detachment "A", MWSG-27, telephone 455-6665/6603.

P. F. ANGLE
By direction

Copy to:
CG, MCB, CLNC (PWO)
CG, MCB, CLNC (Maint)
CO, Det "A", MWSG-27

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS
Marine Corps Air Station
(Helicopter)
New River, Jacksonville
North Carolina 28545

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

P-183, Combat Vehicle Maintenance Facility, FY 79
(Project Title)

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION (HELICOPTER), NEW RIVER

JACKSONVILLE, N. C. 28545
(Military Installation)

9 April 1979
(Date)

Prepared by:

BETTY J. BLAKE
Construction Projects Assistant

BETTY J. BLAKE
Facilities, MCAS(H), NR

Approved by:

R. H. HUCKABY
Assistant Chief of Staff, Facilities

R. H. HUCKABY
Assistant Chief of Staff,
Facilities, MCB, CLNC

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Submitting DoD Component: Department of the Navy

Installation: MARINE CORPS AIR STATION (HELICOPTER, NEW RIVER, JACKSONVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA 28545

Project Title: P-183, Combat Vehicle Maintenance

Date of Submission: 9 April 1979

1. Introduction

a. Project Description

Permanent maintenance complex which will be compatible with existing facilities at MCAS(H), New River for indefinite duration. The buildings are to be one and two story with a raised concrete floor; load-bearing masonry walls, and designed to include seismic and high wind load construction features; air-conditioning; steam heating distribution system; bituminous concrete & concrete pavements also a loading ramp, wash apron and interior air and fire protection design to provide an inspection station; petroleum, oil, and lubrication storage area; security fence and lighting; utilities connected; admin office space; a vented battery shop; exhaust system; deluge shower and head facilities; parts storage area for vehicle and maintenance equipment; service station area; tire shop area; vehicle exhaust system within shop spaces; air pressure for each maintenance area; lubrication rack with on and off ramps; 220 and 110 volt circuitry; overhead lift beams and electric winches with 12-ton lift capacity; and classroom space for students.

P-183 is programmed to contain sufficient drains and storage facilities to include curbs, oil sumps and flammable storage facilities to prevent petroleum, oils, fuels and other lubricants from having an adverse impact on the environment. However, excessive fuel spills cannot be anticipated nor projected; therefore, in the event of occurrence local standard operating procedures (cont.-)

2. Relationship of Proposed Action to Land Use Plans, Policies and Controls for the Affected Area:

	Conforms With	No Plans For Area	Conflicts With
a. Land Use Plans	X		
b. Clear Air Control	X		
c. Federal Water Pollution Control Act	X		

Paragraph 1.a (continued):

would be adhered to.

b. Existing Site Characteristics

This project site location is on DeMarco Street beyond the new BEQ Complex, MCAS(H), New River. The existing area is wooded and undeveloped. The soil condition is indicated on the Master Plan for this Activity as being Good.

3. The probable Impact of the Proposed Action on the Environment:

a. Assessment of the positive and negative effects of the proposed action as it affects both the national and/or the international environment. The potentially significant effect of this action is that it:

(1) ~~Will~~/will not cause emissions into the atmosphere of toxic or hazardous substances or significant amounts of other pollutants. It will/~~will not~~ significantly reduce the amount of pollution in the atmosphere?

(2) ~~Will~~/will not cause the creation of excessive noise, when considering the proximity and likely effects of the noise on humans or wildlife?

(3) ~~Will~~/will not introduce toxic or hazardous substances or significant amounts of chemicals, organic substances or solid wastes into bodies of water, on land or otherwise effect water or soil quality?

(4) ~~Will~~/will not significantly alter the rate of sediment deposit or temperature of a body of water?

(5) ~~Will~~/will not require the use of non-renewable energy sources, e.g., fossil fuels, etc., in apparently excessive or disproportionate amounts?

(6) ~~Will~~/will not result in a significant destruction of vegetation, wild or marine life?

(7) ~~Will~~/will not affect, beneficially or adversely, other forms of life or the ecosystems of which they are a part?

(8) ~~Will~~/will not result in contamination or deterioration of food or food sources?

(9) ~~Will~~/will not affect population density and congestion?

(10) ~~Will~~/will not cause a major change in landscape, extensive clearing, paving or excavation?

(11) ~~Will~~/will not affect, beneficially or adversely, neighborhood character (aesthetic qualities) and zoning?

(12) ~~Will~~/will not alter area hydrologic properties?

b. The proposed action will have a potentially significant effect on the following:

ITEM	Favorable	Adverse	No Effect
Traffic	☐	☐	X
Community Facilities	☐	☐	X
Schools	☐	☐	X
Waste Treatment Facilities	☐	☐	X
Utilities	☐	☐	X
Land Management	☐	☐	X
Solid Waste Disposal	☐	☐	X
Area Appearance	X	☐	☐
Other (See Attachment _____)			

4. Alternatives to the Proposed Action

[X] There is no feasible alternative.

[ ] Only feasible alternative is to take no action. The effects of this alternative are discussed in Attachment _____.

[ ] Various alternatives and their effects are discussed in Attachment _____.

5. Any Probable Adverse Environmental Effects Which Cannot Be Avoided Should The Proposal Be Implemented

In Item 3.(10) above, clearing of the land and paving will be required in the project; however, all existing trees which can be saved are saved and protected during construction. Upon removal of trees, if adequate drainage and run-off areas are provided, this should preclude an effect on the environment.

[X] No adverse effects on the environment are anticipated.

[ ] Probable adverse effects are discussed in Attachment _____.

6. Relationship Between Local Short-Term Uses of the Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity

No change in short-term use.

[ ] No change in the maintenance and/or enhancement of long-term productivity.

[X] Adverse effects on the environment will occur only during the construction period and these ~~will~~/will not create permanent or long-lasting adverse effects.

[ ] The proposed action will enhance the short-term use of resources by:

- [ ] Abating existing or potential pollution.
- [ ] Enhancing the area appearance.
- [ ] Reducing utility requirements
- [ ] Improvements in operational efficiency.
- [ ] Improvements in habitability of existing facilities.
- [ ] Other: _____

_____

[X] Long-term productivity will be enhanced by:

- [X] Abating existing or potential pollution. (Dust)
- [ ] Reducing utility requirements.
- [X] Improvement in operational efficiency.
- [ ] Other: _____

_____

7. Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources Which Would Be Involved in the Proposed Action Should It Be Implemented

[X] No significant irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources.

[X] No destruction of identified archeological sites or sites having possible historic or architectural interests.

[X] No effect on known endangered species of wildlife.

[X] No significant change in land use.

[ ] Potentially significant irreversible or irretrievable commitments or resources are discussed in Attachment _____.

[ ] Other: _____

_____

8. Considerations That Offset the Adverse Environmental Effects N/A

a. This course of action as compared to adverse environmental effects of alternatives (Section 4) are discussed in Attachment _____.

b. Cost benefit analysis of proposed action is Attachment _____.

9. Summary

[X] It is concluded that the proposed action will have no significant adverse effects on the environment.

[X] There has not been, nor is there currently, any known controversy concerning the proposed action.

[ ] Based on this assessment, it is concluded that an Environmental Impact Statement must be prepared prior to implementation of the proposed action.

BASE MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT
Marine Corps Base
Camp Lejeune, North Carolina 28542

MAIN/JIW/th
6240/2
23 Apr 1979

From: Base Maintenance Officer
To: Public Works Officer

Subj: Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for MCON Project P-410, Alternate Access Route

Ref: (a) PWO memo PWO:CWB:mmm P-410 dtd 16 Apr 79
(b) BO 11000.1

1. Reference (a) requested the Base Maintenance Officer be tasked with preparation of an EIA for subject project. This Department non-concurs with this request for the following reasons.

a. Reference (b) establishes requirements and procedures for actions that may impact on the environment. Assessments are reviewed by the Environmental Impact Review Board (EIRB) to determine the significance of projects and the need for higher level procedural actions.

b. Paragraph 5 of reference (b) places responsibility for EIA preparation with the action sponsor. Environmental assessments are required to be a part of the planning process that leads to a project commitment.

c. This Department serves on the EIRB and provides technical assistance to action sponsors. To task this Department with EIA preparation for projects not sponsored by this Department violates established regulations and renders inoperative the EIRB function which is the Commanding General's principal means of insuring compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

d. The decision making process for the alternate access route project occurred between the Public Works Department and Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

e. This Department is not staffed to devote the extensive manhours necessary to develop EIA's.

2. It is the view of this Department that the Public Works Department is the action sponsor as this Department had no involvement in the project formulation.

T. R. BAISLEY

Copy to:
AC/S Fac

APR 17 1979

	ACTION	INFO	INITIAL
BMO			
ABMO		✓	
MAINT NCO			
SAFETY CHMN			
PROP			
M&R			
OPNS			
ADMIN			
TELE			
UTIL			
ENVIRON AFF			
SECRETARY			
F&A BRANCH			
UMACS			
MME			

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
Building 1005, Marine Corps Base
Camp Lejeune, North Carolina 28542

In reply refer to

PWD:CWB:mmm
P-410
16 April 1979

From: Public Works Officer
To: Base Maintenance Officer

Subj: Environmental Impact Assessment; request for

Ref: (a) BO 11000.1

Encl: (1) Environmental Impact Assessment (sample)

1. Request that an Environmental Impact Assessment be prepared in accordance with reference (a) for MCON project P-410, Alternate Access Route, and forwarded to the Public Works Officer, via the Chairman, Environmental Impact Review Board.

2. This assessment is required not later than 27 April 1979. Format and instructions are attached as enclosure (1).

C. A. TACK

Copy to: (With Encl)
AC/S, Fac

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

_____
(Project Title)

MARINE CORPS BASE, CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA 28542
(Military Installation)

_____
(Date)

Prepared by:

_____
(Title)

Approved by:

_____
(Chairman, Environmental Impact Review Board)

_____
(Installation Commander or Representative)

ENCL (1)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Submitting DoD Component: Department of the Navy

Installation: Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, N. C. 28542

Project Title:

Date of Submission:

1. Introduction

   a. Project Description

   b.

2. Relationship of Proposed Action to Land Use Plans, Policies and Controls for the Affected Area:

	Conforms With	No Plans For Area	Conflicts With
a. Land Use Plans	☐	☐	☐
b. Clear Air Control	☐	☐	☐
c. Federal Water Pollution Control Act	☐	☐	☐

3. The probable Impact of the Proposed Action on the Environment:

a. Assessment of the positive and negative effects of the proposed action as it affects both the national and/or the international environment. The potentially significant effect of this action is that it:

(1) Will/will not cause emissions into the atmosphere of toxic or hazardous substances or significant amounts of other pollutants. It will/will not significantly reduce the amount of pollution in the atmosphere?

(2) Will/will not cause the creation of excessive noise, when considering the proximity and likely effects of the noise on humans or wildlife?

(3) Will/will not introduce toxic or hazardous substances or significant amounts of chemicals, organic substances or solid wastes into bodies of water, on land or otherwise effect water or soil quality?

(4) Will/will not significantly alter the rate of sediment deposit or temperature of a body of water?

(5) Will/will not require the use of non-renewable energy sources, e.g., fossil fuels, etc., in apparently excessive or disproportionate amounts?

(6) Will/will not result in a significant destruction of vegetation, wild or marine life?

(7) Will/will not affect, beneficially or adversely, other forms of life or the ecosystems of which they are a part?

(8) Will/will not result in contamination or deterioration of food or food sources?

(9) Will/will not affect population density and congestion?

(10) Will/will not cause a major change in landscape, extensive clearing, paving or excavation?

(11) Will/will not affect, beneficially or adversely, neighborhood character (aesthetic qualities) and zoning?

(12) Will/will not alter area hydrologic properties?

b. The proposed action will have a potentially significant effect on the following:

ITEM	Favorable	Adverse	No Effect
Traffic	☐	☐	☐
Community Facilities	☐	☐	☐
Schools	☐	☐	☐
Waste Treatment Facilities	☐	☐	☐
Utilities	☐	☐	☐
Land Management	☐	☐	☐
Solid Waste Disposal	☐	☐	☐
Area Appearance	☐	☐	☐
Other (See Attachment ____)			

4. Alternatives to the Proposed Action

☐ There is no feasible alternative.

☐ Only feasible alternative is to take no action. The effects of this alternative are discussed in Attachment_____.

☐ Various alternatives and their effects are discussed in Attachment _____.

5. Any Probable Adverse Environmental Effects Which Cannot Be Avoided Should The Proposal Be Implemented

☐ No adverse effects on the environment are anticipated.

☐ Probable adverse effects are discussed in Attachment_____.

6. Relationship Between Local Short-Term Uses of the Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity

No change in short-term use.

☐ No change in the maintenance and/or enhancement of long-term productivity.

☐ Adverse effects on the environment will occur only during the construction period and these will/will not create permanent or long-lasting adverse effects.

☐ The proposed action will enhance the short-term use of resources by:

- ☐ Abating existing or potential pollution.
- ☐ Enhancing the area appearance.
- ☐ Reducing utility requirements
- ☐ Improvements in operational efficiency.
- ☐ Improvements in habitability of existing facilities.
- ☐ Other: _____

_____.

☐ Long-term productivity will be enhanced by:

- ☐ Abating existing or potential pollution. (Dust)
- ☐ Reducing utility requirements.
- ☐ Improvement in operational efficiency.
- ☐ Other: _____

_____.

7. Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources Which Would Be Involved in the Proposed Action Should It Be Implemented

☐ No significant irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources.

☐ No destruction of identified archeological sites or sites having possible historic or architectural interests.

☐ No effect on known endangered species of wildlife.

☐ No significant change in land use.

☐ Potentially significant irreversible or irretrievable commitments or resources are discussed in Attachment_____.

☐ Other:_____

_____

8. Considerations That Offset the Adverse Environmental Effects

a. This course of action as compared to adverse environmental effects of alternatives (Section 4) are discussed in Attachment _____.

b. Cost benefit analysis of proposed action is Attachment _____.

9. Summary

☐ It is concluded that the proposed action will have no significant adverse effects on the environment.

☐ There has not been, nor is there currently, any known controversy concerning the proposed action.

☐ Based on this assessment, it is concluded that an Environmental Impact Statement must be prepared prior to implementation of the proposed action.

BMO _____ ABMO _____

NAVAL MESSAGE

OPNAV FORM 2110/28 (REV. 3-69) S/N-0107-LF-705-4001

RELEASED BY	DRAFTED BY	PHONE EXT NR	PAGE	PAGES
	J. I. WOOTEN	5003	1 OF	1

DATE	TOR/TOD	ROUTED BY	CHECKED BY
19 JANUARY 1979			

MESSAGE NR	DATE/TIME GROUP	PRECEDENCE	FLASH	IMMEDIATE	PRIORITY	ROUTINE
		ACTION				XX
		INFO				

FM CG MCB CAMP LEJEUNE NC
TO CMC WASHINGTON DC

UNCLAS//N06280//

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS (EIS): EPA MTG

CMC FOR LFF-2

A. CMC MSG 121430Z JAN 79

1. AS REQUESTED BY REF (A), MARINE CORPS BASE, CAMP LEJEUNE, IS SENDING TWO REPS, MAJ JOHN JANEGA, SJA, AND MR. JULIAN WOOTEN, BASE MAINT DEPT, TO SUBJECT MTG ON 22-23 FEBRUARY 1979.

DISTRIBUTION:
BMAINTO (1) SJA (1)

UNCLASSIFIED

DATE/ TIME GROUP

BASE MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT
Marine Corps Base
Camp Lejeune, North Carolina 28542

MAIN/JIW/th
6240/2
17 Jan 1979

From: Base Maintenance Officer
To: Assistant Chief of Staff, Facilities

Subj: Environmental Impact Assessment/Candidate Environmental Impact Statement (EIA/CEIS)

Ref: (a) AC/S Fac mtg btwn SJA, PWO and BMO on 6 Dec 78
(b) National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
(c) MCO P11000.8A
(d) BO 11000.1

1. As a result of recent developments associated with the pipeline project at Courthouse Bay and during discussions, reference (a), it became evident that new and stronger emphasis should be placed on compliance with references (b), (c) and (d).

2. To prevent future recurrence of situations similar to the pipeline and more serious events, it is recommended that the EIA/CEIS preparation and review process be implemented completely.

3. Accordingly, it is recommended that the contents and procedures relative to environmental considerations addressed in references (a) and (b) be considered standard operating procedures for all proposed and ongoing actions meeting criteria established by references (b), (c) and (d).

B. W. ELSTON
By direction