

1 **4.11 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE**
2

3 For resource areas identifying potentially adverse impacts in Chapter 4, an analysis was performed to
4 identify whether there would be disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority populations and
5 low-income populations (see Section 5.14).
6

7 In addition, targeted outreach to minority and low-income groups and organizations is being conducted as
8 part of the LEIS process to expand participation of potentially affected populations.
9

10 In accordance with *EO 12898*, Section 3.11 addresses the existing locations of minority populations and
11 low-income populations living in the three counties affected by the proposed alternatives. The LEIS
12 public participation process was expanded to include identification of organizations representing and
13 serving members of minority and low-income populations. Scoping letters were sent to approximately 75
14 organizations and individuals identified through this process. In addition, scoping letters in English and
15 Spanish were sent to all recipients.
16

17 **4.11.1 Alternative 1**
18

19 As described in Section 2.1.1, military activities could vary from the same as currently conducted to an
20 expanded range of capabilities and intensified use. Noise from expanded aviation and training activities
21 has been assessed in Section 4.12. Assuming the same relative combination of aircraft, operations on
22 North and South McGregor could be expanded by a factor of 6.3 and 7.9, respectively, and still not
23 exceed L_{dnmr} 55. Other activities such as the proposed expansion of the GAF activities at HAFB and the
24 associated new air-to-ground training range; the potential development of a helicopter training range; and
25 the designation of additional controlled access FTX sites would either increase noise levels solely within
26 the training ranges and restricted airspace boundaries, or would be located within areas where capacity
27 still exists to increase activity levels without exceeding noise thresholds. Therefore, if elevated noise
28 levels remain within the training ranges and restricted areas, there would be no significant adverse noise
29 effects and no potential for disproportionately high and adverse noise effects on minority or low-income
30 populations.
31

32 Alternative 1 would not cause environmental health or safety risks that would disproportionately affect
33 children.
34

35 **4.11.2 Alternative 2**
36

37 Under Alternative 2, aircraft-related noise would be the same as under Alternative 1, with some increased
38 potential for noise impacts due to increased recreation access on public lands. The extent of recreation
39 activities is not currently known. As under Alternative 1, if elevated noise levels remain within the
40 training ranges and restricted areas, noise level increases would occur, but there would be no significant
41 adverse noise effects and no potential for disproportionately high and adverse noise effects on minority or
42 low-income populations.
43

44 Increased ground access to TCPs, if identified on the returned lands, could make it easier for Native
45 Americans to practice certain traditions.
46

47 Alternative 2 would not cause environmental health or safety risks that would disproportionately affect
48 children.
49

1 **4.11.3 Alternative 3**
2

3 Under Alternative 3, elevated noise levels on Otero Mesa would not occur. Missile firings would become
4 more directionally constrained, reducing noise dispersion, and noise from ground training would be
5 reduced. Depending upon the specific location, noise would be similar to or less than Alternative 1. As
6 under Alternative 2, if noise levels remain within the training ranges and restricted areas, noise level
7 increases would occur, but there would be no significant adverse noise effects and no potential for
8 disproportionately high and adverse noise effects on minority or low-income populations.
9

10 Increased ground access to TCPs, if identified on the returned lands, could make it easier for Native
11 Americans to practice certain traditions.
12

13 Alternative 3 would not cause environmental health or safety risks that would disproportionately affect
14 children.
15

16 **4.11.4 Alternative 4**
17

18 Under Alternative 4, depending upon the specific location, noise would be similar to or less than
19 Alternative 1. As under Alternative 3, if elevated noise levels from military training activities remain
20 within the training ranges and restricted areas, increases would occur, but there would be no significant
21 adverse noise effects and no potential for disproportionately high and adverse noise effects on minority or
22 low-income populations.
23

24 Increased ground access to TCPs, if identified on the returned lands, could make it easier for Native
25 Americans to practice certain traditions.
26

27 Alternative 4 would not cause environmental health or safety risks that would disproportionately affect
28 children.
29

30 **4.11.5 Alternative 5 - No Action**
31

32 Under Alternative 5, aircraft noise would be similar to or less than current levels. Noise associated with
33 resource management and nonmilitary activities (i.e., increased public access, recreation, and grazing)
34 would not be expected to result in significant noise effects. Intensive development such as extraction of
35 mineral resources, would be expected to undergo individual assessment of noise levels at the time the
36 proposal is submitted. There would be no disproportionately high and adverse noise effects on minority
37 or low-income populations.
38

39 Increased ground access to TCPs, if identified on the returned lands, could make it easier for Native
40 Americans to practice certain traditions.
41

42 If lands owned in-fee by the Army were exchanged for facilities in TAs 8 and 32, Fort Bliss would have a
43 reduced capability to support its current air defense mission, and many installation facilities located on
44 McGregor Range would have to be relocated. The loss of these facilities would result in the loss of
45 several activities at Fort Bliss, and would result in a potential loss of military, civilian, and secondary jobs
46 in the local economy, as well as, potential reductions in TDY personnel and expenditures related to
47 training exercises (Section 4.10.5). The magnitude of the potential job loss would not be considered
48 significant, given the projected future job growth in the ROI of more than 114,000 jobs between 2000 and
49 2015. There would be no disproportionately high and adverse socioeconomic impacts on minority or
50 low-income populations from the No Action Alternative.
51

**McGregor Range Land Withdrawal
Legislative Environmental Impact Statement**

1 Alternative 5 would not cause environmental health or safety risks that would disproportionately affect
2 children.

3
4 **4.11.6 Alternative 6**

5
6 Under Alternative 6, the returned area would be the same as described for Alternative 3, but the land
7 would be designated as a NCA. Military uses would be the same as those described for Alternatives 3, 4,
8 or 5, depending upon the extent of the defined returned area. Some shifting of range activities could occur
9 that could modify patterns and sources of noise. However, this alternative requires congressional action
10 for implementation. Because the precise nature and extent of the congressional action cannot be
11 determined at this time, detailed environmental justice analysis of this alternative is deferred at this time
12 until the proposal is specified for this type of nonmilitary withdrawal by the DOI.

13
14 **4.11.7 Cumulative Impacts**

15
16 There would be no disproportionately high and adverse health or environmental effects on minority or
17 low-income populations from cumulative effects of the project alternatives.

18
19 **4.11.8 Mitigation**

20
21 No mitigations are recommended for environmental justice.

22
23 **4.11.9 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources**

24
25 No irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources would occur.