

# Expansion of the Foreign Military Sales F-35 Pilot Training Center

at Ebbing Air National Guard Base, Arkansas



## Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Summary

April 2026

This page intentionally left blank.

This Summary of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the Expansion of the Foreign Military Sales (FMS) F-35 Pilot Training Center (PTC) at Ebbing Air National Guard (ANG) Base, Arkansas (the “Final SEIS”) provides an overview of the in-depth analysis of the Proposed Action that is presented in the full Final SEIS.

A CD containing the Final SEIS as well as this Summary is provided inside the back cover of this Summary. The Final SEIS is available at each of the public libraries listed. In addition, an electronic copy of the Final SEIS is available online at [www.FMSPTCEIS.com](http://www.FMSPTCEIS.com).

Fort Smith Public Library – Main Branch  
3201 Rogers Avenue  
Fort Smith, AR 72903

Fort Smith Public Library – Windsor Drive  
Branch  
4701 Windsor Drive  
Fort Smith, AR 72904

Fort Smith Public Library – Dallas Street  
Branch  
8100 Dallas Street  
Fort Smith, AR 72903

Van Buren Public Library  
1409 Main Street  
Van Buren, AR 72956

Fort Smith Public Library – Miller Branch  
8701 S. 28th Street  
Fort Smith, AR 72908

## **Privacy Advisory**

This Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) has been provided in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act as amended by Public Law 118-5, Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 (42 United States Code Section 4321 et seq.).

The United States Department of the Air Force (DAF) provided an opportunity for public input on its decision-making, allowed the public to offer input on alternative ways for the DAF to accomplish what it is proposing, and solicited comments on the DAF's analysis of environmental effects.

Public input allows the DAF to make better-informed decisions. Substantive comments provided on the Draft SEIS and DAF responses are published in this Final SEIS. Providing personal information was voluntary. Private addresses were compiled to develop a stakeholder inventory. However, only the names of the individuals making comments and specific comments are disclosed. Personal information, home addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses are not published in the Final SEIS.

### **Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973**

The digital version of this SEIS and its project website are compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 because assistive technology (e.g., "screen readers") can be used to help the disabled understand these electronic media. Due to the nature of graphics, figures, tables, and images occurring in the document, accessibility may be limited to a descriptive title for each item.

## COVER

- a. **Responsible Lead Agency:** Department of the Air Force (DAF); Air Education and Training Command (AETC)
- b. **Cooperating Agencies:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA); United States Forest Service (USFS)
- c. **Title:** *Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the Expansion of the Foreign Military Sales (FMS) F-35 Pilot Training Center (PTC) at Ebbing Air National Guard (ANG) Base, Arkansas*
- d. **Inquiries:** Information regarding the SEIS is available on the project website at <https://www.fmsptceis.com>. Questions can also be directed to the AETC Public Affairs: phone number: (210) 652-9324; email address: AETC.PAO@us.af.mil.
- e. **Designation:** Final SEIS
- f. **Abstract:** The DAF is proposing to expand the FMS PTC at Ebbing ANG Base, Arkansas. The DAF is the lead agency and FAA and USFS are serving as Cooperating Agencies because the scope of the DAF's Proposed Action and Alternatives involve activities under FAA's and USFS's jurisdiction by law and special expertise. This SEIS was prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42 of the United States Code §§ 4321–4347; *Department of Defense National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Procedures*; FAA Order 1050.1G, *FAA National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Procedures*; and Forest Service Handbook 1909.15, *National Environmental Policy Act Handbook*. The Proposed Action (i.e., the Preferred Alternative) is to beddown 12 additional F-35s at Ebbing ANG Base, for a total of 36 F-35 and 12 F-16 aircraft, and for F-35B aircraft to conduct Short Takeoff and Vertical Landing operations on the airfield. The Proposed Action would also include increased airfield and airspace operations; construction projects; and personnel increases. Alternative 1 would implement F-35B Short Takeoff and Vertical Landing operations on the airfield, which would require the construction of a Vertical Landing Pad, but the DAF would not beddown any additional aircraft, construct new facilities, or increase personnel. This SEIS analyzes potential effects from implementing the Proposed Action, Alternative 1, and the No Action Alternative.
- g. **Final SEIS:** During the 48-day public review and comment period for the Draft SEIS, the DAF received 71 total comment submittals containing 59 substantive comments. Some local citizens expressed concern about the potential noise effects on the local community and residents.
- h. **EIS Identification Number:** SEIS-007-57-UAF-1750846563.

This page intentionally left blank.

## Final

# Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Expansion of the Foreign Military Sales (FMS) F-35 Pilot Training Center (PTC) at Ebbing Air National Guard (ANG) Base, Arkansas

## Summary

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

	<u>Page</u>
<b>S.1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>S.2. Purpose of and Need for the Action (SEIS Chapter 1) .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>S.3. Overview of Proposed Action and Alternatives (SEIS Chapter 2) .....</b>	<b>2</b>
S.3.1 Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative) (SEIS Section 2.1).....	2
S.3.1.1 Aircraft Operations (SEIS Section 2.1.1).....	2
S.3.1.2 Personnel/Manpower (SEIS Section 2.1.2).....	3
S.3.1.3 Facility Requirements (SEIS Section 2.1.3).....	3
S.3.2 No Action Alternative (SEIS Section 2.2) .....	4
S.3.3 Alternative 1 (SEIS Section 2.3).....	4
<b>S.4. Environmental Consequences (SEIS Chapter 3).....</b>	<b>4</b>

### LIST OF TABLES

---

Table S-1. Comparison of Environmental Effects by Alternative .....	4
---	---

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

---

%	percent
ANG	Air National Guard
DAF	Department of the Air Force
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
FMS	Foreign Military Sales
FSRA	Fort Smith Regional Airport
IR	Instrument Route
MOA	Military Operations Area
MTR	Military Training Route
PAA	Primary Aerospace Vehicle Authorization
PTC	Pilot Training Center
ROD	Record of Decision
SEIS	Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
STOVL	Short Takeoff and Vertical Landing
VLP	Vertical Landing Pad
VR	Visual Route

## SUMMARY

---

### S.1. INTRODUCTION

This Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) has been prepared to analyze the potential environmental consequences of proposed modifications to the Foreign Military Sales (FMS) Pilot Training Center (PTC) at Ebbing Air National Guard (ANG) Base in Fort Smith, Arkansas. In January 2023, the Department of the Air Force (DAF) completed the *Beddown of a Foreign Military Sales (FMS) Pilot Training Center (PTC) at Ebbing Air National Guard Base, Arkansas or Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Michigan Final Environmental Impact Statement* (EIS) (hereinafter referred to as the “[2023 FMS PTC EIS](#)”). On March 11, 2023, the DAF and signed the [Record of Decision \(ROD\)](#) selecting Ebbing ANG Base as the location for the FMS PTC, authorizing the beddown of 24 F-35 aircraft and relocation of 12 Republic of Singapore Air Force F-16 aircraft.

Since the signing of the 2023 FMS PTC EIS ROD, new training requirements have emerged due to additional FMS purchases of F-35 aircraft, including operations that incorporate the F-35B's Short Takeoff and Vertical Landing (STOVL) capabilities. This SEIS evaluates the environmental effects associated with expanding the FMS PTC mission at Ebbing ANG Base, which includes increasing aircraft capacity at Ebbing ANG Base from 24 to 36 F-35 Primary Aerospace Vehicle Authorization (PAA), revising training requirements, expanding the footprint of the PTC through construction of new infrastructure, renovation of existing facilities, and an increase in personnel.

The DAF is the lead agency and the Federal Aviation Administration and the United States Forest Service are serving as Cooperating Agencies because the scope of the DAF's Proposed Action and Alternatives involve activities under the Federal Aviation Administration's and United States Forest Service's jurisdiction by law and special expertise. The DAF prepared this SEIS in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 United States Code § 4321 et seq.); *Department of Defense National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Procedures*; FAA Order 1050.1G, *National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Procedures*; and Forest Service Handbook 1909.15, *National Environmental Policy Act Handbook*.

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

As stated in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS ([§ 1.3](#)), the purpose of the action is to establish a permanent FMS F-35 PTC at a single location within the Continental United States for FMS F-35 pilot training.

The need for the action is to provide a centralized location for FMS training and pilot production, as stated in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS ([§ 1.3](#)). After the 2023 FMS PTC EIS ROD was signed, additional FMS nation customer participation in the F-35 enterprise resulted in additional training requirements exceeding the current 24 F-35 PAA limit. Therefore, the DAF needs additional F-35 capacity to expand beyond 24 F-35 PAA at Ebbing ANG Base, as authorized in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS ROD, to meet the new requirements.

The SEIS addresses the need for new requirements and refined operational procedures identified since completion of the 2023 FMS PTC EIS. These include increasing the capacity and footprint of the PTC at Ebbing ANG Base/Fort Smith Regional Airport (FSRA), basing 12 additional F-35 PAA, incorporating F-35B STOVL requirements and Vertical Landing Pads (VLPs), implementing new construction and renovation projects, and increasing the number of support personnel.

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

The SEIS evaluates the environmental effects of three alternatives: (1) the Proposed Action to expand the FMS PTC at Ebbing ANG Base to accommodate up to 36 F-35 aircraft, (2) the No Action Alternative, which would maintain the existing beddown of 24 F-35s and 12 F-16s as approved in the 2023 FMS PTC ROD, and (3) Alternative 1, which would implement refined operational procedures (including STOVL operations) and construct a VLP, but would not beddown the additional 12 F-35 aircraft or increase personnel at Ebbing ANG Base.

#### **S.3.1 Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative) (SEIS Section 2.1)**

The DAF proposes to expand the FMS PTC mission at Ebbing ANG Base beyond what was analyzed in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS and authorized in the ROD, which included 24 F-35 and 12 F-16 aircraft, and associated operations, personnel, and facilities. The Proposed Action would beddown an additional 12 F-35s for a total of 36 F-35 PAA and 12 F-16 aircraft at Ebbing ANG Base. There would also be an increase in F-35 operations, personnel, and new facilities as described in the following subsections. The actual number of F-35s present at Ebbing ANG Base at any one time may vary based on customer countries' needs. However, the steady-state number of F-35s would not exceed 36 PAA, and FMS PTC operations would not exceed those analyzed in this SEIS. The analysis is based on the maximum number of FMS PTC operations that would be authorized. Additionally, while the 2023 FMS PTC EIS did not include F-35B STOVL operations, they are included as part of this Proposed Action.

##### **S.3.1.1 Aircraft Operations (SEIS Section 2.1.1)**

###### ***Airfield Operations***

The FSRA airfield would be utilized for FMS PTC F-35 training operations under the Proposed Action and would include VLP maneuvers. Annual airfield operations would increase from 63,979 in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS to 69,661.

###### ***Airspace and Ranges***

F-35 operations under the Proposed Action would occur within existing designated Special Use Airspace, which are the same airspace and ranges originally included and described in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS. Aircraft operating out of Ebbing ANG Base/FSRA primarily utilize the Hog Military Operations Area (MOA)<sup>1</sup>; the Shirley MOA; a corridor between the Hog and Shirley MOAs called

---

<sup>1</sup> A MOA is airspace designated outside of Class A airspace, to separate or segregate certain nonhazardous military activities from Instrument Flight Rules traffic and to identify for Visual Flight Rules traffic where these activities are conducted.

the “Pig Path”; Military Training Routes (MTRs)<sup>2</sup> consisting of Visual Routes<sup>3</sup> (VRs), including VR-189, VR-1102, VR-1103, VR-1104, VR-1113, VR-1130, and VR-1182; and Instrument Routes<sup>4</sup> (IRs) consisting of IR-117, IR-120, IR-121, and IR-164. While predominant FMS PTC training operations would occur in the primary use airspace, FMS PTC aircraft training may occasionally occur in other Special Use Airspace, Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace, and MTRs as discussed in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS. Operations on the “Pig Path” would be relatively infrequent and would consist primarily of FMS PTC aircraft transiting between the Hog and Shirley MOA airspace complexes.

Annual airspace events under the Proposed Action would increase by 13 percent (%) and MTR events would increase by 2% as compared to the 2023 FMS PTC EIS. However, annual nighttime operations and events would decrease by approximately 26%.

### ***Munitions and Countermeasure Use***

The Proposed Action also includes munitions and countermeasure use in the same ranges and airspace as authorized and described in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS. Razorback Range (Restricted Area 2401/Restricted Area 2402 [R-2401/R-2402]) contains varied target sets for supporting laser and air-to-ground weapons training. Live weapons are not permitted in the Razorback Range. However, live-fire training would be conducted during formal training exercises at Fort Johnson (formerly Fort Polk), Louisiana. Munitions and countermeasure use under the Proposed Action would increase by 126,758, flare use by 4,000 and chaff use by 8,000 as compared to the 2023 FMS PTC EIS.

#### **S.3.1.2 Personnel/Manpower (SEIS Section 2.1.2)**

The Proposed Action would add 271 personnel and 325 dependents, for a total of an additional 596 persons at Ebbing ANG Base. This would represent a 31% increase in total persons over the 2023 FMS PTC EIS ROD.

#### **S.3.1.3 Facility Requirements (SEIS Section 2.1.3)**

Construction and renovation projects would occur at Ebbing ANG Base/FSRA to support the 12 new F-35 PAA and STOVL operations. Under the Proposed Action, the DAF would construct and renovate approximately 1.2 million square feet of facilities. These projects are in addition to the construction and renovation projects described and listed in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS. Most FMS PTC facilities under the Proposed Action would primarily be developed near the main ramp, with a couple of projects proposed for other parts of the FSRA airfield, outside Ebbing ANG Base boundaries.

To support the proposed F-35B STOVL operations, the DAF would construct one VLP within the FSRA airfield. This SEIS evaluates two alternative locations to site the VLP: the West VLP Site Subalternative and the East VLP Site Subalternative. The West VLP Site Subalternative would construct the VLP and connecting taxiway along the southwestern end of Runway 02/20 and the

---

<sup>2</sup> Generally, MTRs are established below 10,000 feet mean sea level for operations at speeds in excess of 250 knots.

<sup>3</sup> Visual Flight Rules means that the aircraft may operate without the use of instrumentation during nice and clear weather. Clouds, heavy precipitation, low visibility, and otherwise adverse weather conditions should be avoided under Visual Flight Rules.

<sup>4</sup> Instrument Flight Rules implies that the flight may operate in cloudy or otherwise adverse weather conditions using instruments only.

East VLP Site Subalternative would construct the VLP and connecting taxiway along the southeastern end of Runway 08/26.

### S.3.2 No Action Alternative (SEIS Section 2.2)

Under the No Action Alternative, the DAF would not expand the FMS PTC mission at Ebbing ANG Base and the DAF would proceed with the implementation of the 2023 FMS PTC ROD issued on March 11, 2023. The total number of military aircraft, operations, and personnel at Ebbing ANG Base/FSRA would not change from what was authorized in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS ROD. Additionally, only those construction and renovation projects assessed in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS for Ebbing ANG Base/FSRA would occur.

If the No Action Alternative were implemented, the DAF would need to undertake a new basing action to determine another location that meets the underlying purpose and need. This would require additional National Environmental Policy Act analysis. That process and subsequent beddown would not meet national security agreements with FMS customer countries.

### S.3.3 Alternative 1 (SEIS Section 2.3)

Under Alternative 1, the DAF would not beddown the additional 12 F-35 PAA, but FMS PTC operations would be modified for the existing 24 F-35 PAA to satisfy new requirements and refined operational procedures identified for F-35A and F-35B aircraft since completion of the 2023 FMS PTC EIS. The number of annual military operations at FSRA, airspace events, MTR events, nighttime operations and events, as well as use of munitions and countermeasures would not change from those included in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS. Personnel numbers would not change from the 2023 FMS PTC EIS ROD. Since F-35B aircraft would conduct STOVL operations under Alternative 1, the West VLP Site and the East VLP Site Subalternatives are carried forward for detailed analyses under this alternative.

## S.4. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES (SEIS CHAPTER 3)

**Table S-1** presents a summary of potential environmental effects by alternative and environmental resource area. This table compares the environmental effects of the Proposed Action and Alternative 1 to the No Action Alternative. Additionally, the table includes a summary of potential effects from implementing proposed mitigation measures, where applicable. There are no proposed mitigation measures for activities under the airspace and ranges because no significant effects were identified in the analyses for any resource area.

**Table S-1. Comparison of Environmental Effects by Alternative**

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative 1
Noise	<p><u>Installation and Surrounding Area</u>: There would be no additional noise effects, and noise levels would be as described in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS <a href="#">§ 3.3.5</a> (Section 3.2.1.1).</p> <p><u>Airspace and Ranges</u>: There would be no additional noise effects. Noise levels would be as described in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS <a href="#">§ 3.3.4.2</a> and</p>	<p><u>Installation and Surrounding Area</u>: Up to an additional 1,788 acres of land affected by DNL 65 dBA or greater and up to an additional 6,493 people affected by DNL 65 dBA or greater (Section 3.2.2.1.1). Noise increases at multiple representative points of interest would be adverse and significant. The DAF is proposing three operational mitigation measures to minimize noise effects</p>	<p><u>Installation and Surrounding Area</u>: Up to an additional 870 acres of land affected by DNL 65 dBA or greater and up to an additional 4,426 people affected by DNL 65 dBA or greater (Section 3.2.2.2.1). Noise increases at multiple representative points of interest would be adverse and significant. The DAF is proposing three operational</p>

**Table S-1. Comparison of Environmental Effects by Alternative**

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative 1
	would remain below $L_{dnmr}$ 65 dBA and DNL 65 dBA (Section 3.2.1.2).	(Section 3.2.2.5.1). The 0% hold-down mitigation would reduce land and residents affected by DNL 65 dBA or greater by up to 83 acres and 453 residents. The 50% hold-down mitigation would reduce land and residents exposed to DNL 65 dBA or greater by up to 317 acres and 780 residents. The 100% hold-down mitigation would reduce land and residents affected by DNL 65 dBA or greater by up to 524 acres and 1,129 residents.  <u>Airspace and Ranges:</u> Time-averaged noise levels would remain below $L_{dnmr}$ 65 dBA and DNL 65 dBA (Section 3.2.2.1.2). Therefore, noise effects would not be significant.	mitigation measures to minimize noise effects (Section 3.2.2.5.2). The 0% hold-down mitigation would reduce land and residents affected by DNL 65 dBA or greater by up to 90 acres and 344 residents. The 50% hold-down mitigation would reduce land and residents exposed to DNL 65 dBA or greater by up to 271 acres and 742 residents. The 100% hold-down mitigation would reduce land and residents affected by DNL 65 dBA or greater by up to 447 acres and 1,096 residents.  <u>Airspace and Ranges:</u> Time-averaged noise levels would remain below $L_{dnmr}$ 65 dBA and DNL 65 dBA (Section 3.2.2.2.2). Therefore, noise effects would not be significant.
Land Use	<u>Installation and Surrounding Area:</u> Noise levels at Ebbing ANG Base/FSRA would be the same as what was described and authorized in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS § 3.4.5.1 and ROD (Section 3.3.1.1). Significant adverse effects to residential land use would continue. Some commercial and public/quasi-public uses in the surrounding area could also continue to experience moderate adverse effects.  <u>Airspace and Ranges:</u> Noise levels in the airspace would not change from what was described in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS § 3.4.4.2 (Section 3.3.2.3.2). There would be no significant effects on underlying land uses and associated activities.	<u>Installation and Surrounding Area:</u> The land area outside the Ebbing ANG Base/FSRA boundary exposed to noise levels of DNL 65 dBA and greater under the West and East VLP Site Subalternatives would increase by 1,764 and 1,788 acres respectively. Notably, the area of residential land exposed to noise of DNL 65 dBA and greater would increase by 556 and 561 acres, respectively. The effects on residential land use are adverse and significant under both subalternatives (Section 3.3.2.1.1). The DAF is proposing three operational mitigation measures to minimize noise effects. The 0% hold-down, 50% hold-down, and 100% hold-down mitigation measures would reduce residential areas exposed to noise levels of DNL 65 dBA or greater by up to 42 acres, 89 acres, and 138 acres, respectively (Section 3.3.2.5.1).  <u>Airspace and Ranges:</u> Noise levels in the airspace would remain below $L_{dnmr}$ 65 dBA	<u>Installation and Surrounding Area:</u> The land area outside the Ebbing ANG Base/FSRA boundary exposed to noise levels of DNL 65 dBA and greater under the West and East VLP Site Subalternatives would increase by 863 and 870 acres, respectively. Notably, the area of residential land exposed to noise of DNL 65 dBA and greater would increase by 322 and 323 acres, respectively. The effects on residential land use are adverse and significant under both subalternatives (Section 3.3.2.2.1). The 0% hold-down, 50% hold-down, and 100% hold-down mitigation measures would reduce residential areas exposed to noise levels of DNL 65 dBA or greater by up to 33 acres, 86 acres, and 131 acres, respectively (Section 3.3.2.5.2).  <u>Airspace and Ranges:</u> Noise levels in the airspace would remain below $L_{dnmr}$

**Table S-1. Comparison of Environmental Effects by Alternative**

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative 1
		<p>and DNL 65 dBA, which is compatible with all land use categories in developed areas (Section 3.3.2.1.2). Some noise-sensitive land uses would experience up to <math>L_{dnmr}</math> 3.1 dBA (DNL 3 dBA) time-averaged noise increases. These small increases may be perceived as adverse effects to visitors or users of these areas where an otherwise quiet setting is expected for primitive recreation. However, the resulting time-averaged noise-level increases would not be significant based on DoD and FAA guidelines for outdoor recreational uses.</p>	<p>65 dBA and DNL 65 dBA, which is compatible with all land use categories in developed areas (Section 3.3.2.2.2). Some noise-sensitive land uses would experience up to <math>L_{dnmr}</math> 2 dBA (DNL 1.9 dBA) time-averaged noise increases. These small increases may be perceived as adverse effects to visitors or users of these areas where an otherwise quiet setting is expected for primitive recreation. However, the resulting time-averaged noise-level increases would not be significant based on DoD and FAA guidelines for outdoor recreational uses.</p>
Socioeconomics	<p><u>Installation and Surrounding Area</u>: There would be no additional incoming personnel or dependents associated beyond what was authorized in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS and ROD. Socioeconomic conditions would continue as under existing conditions and trends (Section 3.4.1.1). As indicated in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS § 3.5.4.1, there would be no significant effects to socioeconomic resources.</p>	<p><u>Installation and Surrounding Area</u>: There would be an increase of 596 people to the ROI by 2029. The population increase would be minor (less than 5% of the total projected population in the ROI) and would remain within the range of Sebastian County's projected population for the year 2029. Some beneficial effects may occur from additional employment and income associated with incoming personal and construction activities. An additional 271 housing units may be demanded by the end state of 2029 under this alternative. An estimated 204 children of school age would be associated with the incoming personnel and may result in larger class sizes and additional pressures for resources and expenditures but would also result in additional funding from additional enrollment. Potential noise effects to residents are discussed above in <i>Noise</i> as well as in Section 3.2.2.1.1 (<i>Noise, Environmental Consequences, Proposed Action, Installation and Surrounding Area</i>) and Section 3.2.2.5.1 (<i>Noise, Environmental Consequences,</i></p>	<p><u>Installation and Surrounding Area</u>: Potential effects to socioeconomic resources under this alternative would be the same as those described under the No Action Alternative. Under this alternative, there may be temporary and minor beneficial effects associated with the employment and income generated during VLP construction. Potential noise effects to residents are discussed above in <i>Noise</i> as well as in Section 3.2.2.2.1 (<i>Noise, Environmental Consequences, Alternative 1, Installation and Surrounding Area</i>) and Section 3.2.2.5.2 (<i>Noise, Environmental Consequences, Mitigations, Mitigated Alternative 1</i>).</p>

**Table S-1. Comparison of Environmental Effects by Alternative**

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative 1
		<i>Mitigations, Mitigated Proposed Action).</i>	
Cultural Resources	<p><u>Installation and Surrounding Area:</u> As described in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS § 3.7.4, there would be no effects to archaeological or traditional cultural properties and no adverse effects to architectural resources (Section 3.5.2.3.1).</p> <p><u>Airspace and Ranges:</u> As described in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS § 3.7.4, there would be no effects to archaeological or traditional cultural properties and no adverse effects to architectural resources (Section 3.5.2.3.2).</p>	<p><u>Installation and Surrounding Area:</u> There would be no effects to archaeological resources or traditional cultural properties and no adverse effects to architectural resources (Section 3.5.2.1.1). The DAF completed Section 106 consultation with the Arkansas SHPO and federally recognized Tribes. Additionally, noise levels from implementing the three operational mitigation measures under the Proposed Action would have no effects to archaeological resources or traditional cultural properties and no adverse effects to architectural resources (Section 3.5.2.5.1).</p> <p><u>Airspace and Ranges:</u> There would be no adverse effects to archaeological resources, architectural resources, or traditional cultural properties (Section 3.5.2.1.2). The DAF completed Section 106 consultation with the Arkansas SHPO, Oklahoma SHPO, and federally recognized Tribes.</p>	<p><u>Installation and Surrounding Area:</u> There would be no effects to archaeological resources or traditional cultural properties and no adverse effects to architectural resources (Section 3.5.2.2.1). The DAF completed Section 106 consultation with the Arkansas SHPO and federally recognized Tribes. Additionally, noise levels from implementing the three operational mitigation measures under Alternative 1 would have no effects to archaeological resources or traditional cultural properties and no adverse effects to architectural resources (Section 3.5.2.5.2).</p> <p><u>Airspace and Ranges:</u> There would be no adverse effects to archaeological resources, architectural resources, or traditional cultural properties (Section 3.5.2.2.2). The DAF completed Section 106 Consultation with the Arkansas SHPO, Oklahoma SHPO, and federally recognized Tribes.</p>
Biological Resources	<p><u>Installation and Surrounding Area:</u> Consequences to biological resources would be the same as those described in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS § 3.8.4.1 (Section 3.6.2.3.1). The USFWS concurred that the beddown of the FMS PTC at Ebbing ANG Base may affect but is not likely to adversely affect federally listed species. ESA Section 7 consultation with the USFWS regarding the Ebbing ANG Base/FSRA portion of the FMS PTC beddown was completed on March 30, 2022.</p> <p><u>Airspace and Ranges:</u> Consequences to biological</p>	<p><u>Installation and Surrounding Area:</u> Consequences to biological resources include vegetation removal in currently maintained and landscaped areas for construction activities. Wildlife would experience increased noise effects from airfield operations compared to the No Action Alternative (Section 3.6.2.1.1). The USFWS concurred that the Proposed Action may affect but is not likely to adversely affect federally listed species. ESA Section 7 consultation with the USFWS regarding the Proposed Action was completed on May 30, 2025.</p>	<p><u>Installation and Surrounding Area:</u> Consequences to biological resources include vegetation removal in currently maintained and landscaped areas for constructing the VLP. Wildlife would experience increased noise effects from STOV operations compared to the No Action Alternative (Section 3.6.2.2.1).</p> <p><u>Airspace and Ranges:</u> Changes in noise levels in the airspace would range from a decrease of L<sub>dnmr</sub> 6.4 dBA to an increase of L<sub>dnmr</sub> 2 dBA (decrease of DNL 6 dBA to an increase of DNL 1.9 dBA), compared</p>

**Table S-1. Comparison of Environmental Effects by Alternative**

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative 1
	<p>resources within the airspace would be the same as those described in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS <a href="#">§ 3.8.4.2</a> (Section 3.6.2.3.2). The USFWS concurred that the beddown of the FMS PTC at Ebbing ANG Base may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect federally listed species. ESA Section 7 consultation with the USFWS regarding the airspace component of the FMS PTC beddown was completed on December 20, 2022.</p>	<p><u><i>Airspace and Ranges:</i></u> Changes in noise levels in the airspace would range from a decrease of <math>L_{dnmr}</math> 6.3 dBA to an increase of <math>L_{dnmr}</math> 3.1 dBA (decrease of DNL 6 dBA to an increase of DNL 3 dBA), compared to the No Action Alternative. Some wildlife would be exposed to increased noise from airspace and range operations, but not to a significant level. An increase in munitions and countermeasure use would not result in significant biological resources effects (Section 3.6.2.1.2). The USFWS concurred that the Proposed Action may affect but is not likely to adversely affect federally listed species. ESA Section 7 consultation with the USFWS was completed on May 30, 2025.</p>	<p>to the No Action Alternative. Noise effects to wildlife would be consistent with the No Action Alternative and would not be significant (Section 3.6.2.2.2).</p>
Physical Resources	<p><u><i>Installation and Surrounding Area:</i></u> Surface water, groundwater, and wetlands effects would be minimized through required design elements, and permit-related BMPs addressed in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS <a href="#">§ 3.9.4</a>. There would be no effects to floodplains, topography, and soils (Section 3.7.2.3.1).</p> <p><u><i>Airspace and Ranges:</i></u> There would be no interaction with the resource under the airspace if the No Action Alternative is implemented (Section 3.7.2.3.2).</p>	<p><u><i>Installation and Surrounding Area:</i></u> There would be no effects to topographical features, groundwater, wetlands, or floodplains (Section 3.7.2.1.1). Soil erosion and surface water effects would be minimized through required design elements and permit-related BMPs. Aquatic features were identified in the eastern arm/de-arm expansion area and the West VLP Site during 2025 surveys. However, none of these features fit the definition of a jurisdictional WOTUS. The DAF would coordinate with the USACE Little Rock District, Regulatory Branch prior to construction activities to either pursue an Approved Jurisdictional Determination or a Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination. The DAF would apply for a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit, as appropriate, and coordinate any required mitigations with USACE.</p> <p><u><i>Airspace and Ranges:</i></u> Increased use of chaff and flares within the airspace have been shown to pose no adverse effects to physical resources. There would be no discernable concentration of chaff or flares deposited in water bodies</p>	<p><u><i>Installation and Surrounding Area:</i></u> There would be no effects to topographical features, groundwater, wetlands, or floodplains (Section 3.7.2.2.1). Soil erosion and surface water effects would be minimized through required design elements and permit-related BMPs. Aquatic features were identified in the West VLP Site during 2025 surveys. However, none of these features fit the definition of a jurisdictional WOTUS. The DAF would coordinate with the USACE Little Rock District, Regulatory Branch prior to construction activities to either pursue an Approved Jurisdictional Determination or a Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination. The DAF would apply for a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit, as appropriate, and coordinate any required mitigations with USACE.</p> <p><u><i>Airspace and Ranges:</i></u> There would be no interaction with the resource under the airspace if Alternative 1 is</p>

**Table S-1. Comparison of Environmental Effects by Alternative**

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative 1
		beneath the airspace (Section 3.7.2.1.2).	implemented (Section 3.7.2.2.2).
Air Quality	<p><u><i>Installation and Surrounding Area:</i></u> Air emissions would remain consistent with current operations, and no changes in emissions levels would occur. As described in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS <a href="#">§ 3.10.4.1</a>, all criteria pollutant emissions would remain within regulatory thresholds (Section 3.8.2.3.1).</p> <p><u><i>Airspace and Ranges:</i></u> Existing operations in airspace and ranges would not change and would be within regulatory thresholds, as discussed in the 2023 FMS PTC EIS <a href="#">§ 3.10.4.2</a> (Section 3.8.2.3.2).</p>	<p><u><i>Installation and Surrounding Area:</i></u> Emissions from construction, operations, and increased personnel would remain within regulatory thresholds. Emissions would not adversely affect air quality. Emissions from the three operational mitigation measures under the Proposed Action would remain well below significance indicator thresholds and no adverse effects on air quality would occur (Section 3.8.2.1.1).</p> <p><u><i>Airspace and Ranges:</i></u> Emissions from expanded use of airspace would remain within regulatory thresholds (Section 3.8.2.1.2).</p>	<p><u><i>Installation and Surrounding Area:</i></u> Emissions from limited construction and existing operations would remain within regulatory thresholds. Emissions from the three operational mitigation measures under Alternative 1 would remain well below significance indicator thresholds and no adverse effects on air quality would occur (Section 3.8.2.2.1).</p> <p><u><i>Airspace and Ranges:</i></u> Emissions associated with airspace use would remain within regulatory thresholds (Section 3.8.2.2.2).</p>

**Key:** % = percent; § = Section; ANG = Air National Guard; BMP = best management practice; EIS = Environmental Impact Statement; dBA = A-weighted decibels; DNL = day-night average sound level; DoD = Department of Defense; ESA = Endangered Species Act; FAA = Federal Aviation Administration; FMS = Foreign Military Sales;  $L_{dnmr}$  = onset rate-adjusted monthly day-night average sound level; PTC = Pilot Training Center; ROD = Record of Decision; ROI = region of influence; SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer; USACE = United States Army Corps of Engineers; USFWS = United States Fish and Wildlife Service; VLP = Vertical Landing Pad; WOTUS = waters of the United States

This page intentionally left blank.