

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR LEASE OF LAND FOR ENERGY GENERATION AND STORAGE, RESILIENCY, RELIABILITY, AND SECURITY AT JOINT BASE PEARL HARBOR-HICKAM, HAWAII**

Pursuant to Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500–1508) implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), United States (U.S.) Department of the Navy (Navy) NEPA Regulations (32 CFR Part 775), and the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations Instruction 5090.1E, the Navy gives notice that an Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared. Based on this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required for the lease of land for energy generation and storage, resiliency, reliability, and security at Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam (JBPHH), Hawaii. The action would be implemented as set out in the Proposed Action. The analysis and information presented in the EA is incorporated by reference into this FONSI.

**PROPOSED ACTION**

This FONSI applies to the Navy's lease of land for a private developer to construct and operate the proposed facilities as described in the EA: Lease of Land for Energy Generation and Storage, Resiliency, Reliability, and Security at JBPHH, Hawaii.

The Proposed Action includes the following:

- The Navy's lease of up to 25 acres of land and the related granting of an interconnection easement on JBPHH to a designated lessee to construct, operate, and maintain a 103-megawatt (MW)-capacity Firm Renewable Generation (FRG) power plant (FRG Plant) (Site 2) with a collocated battery energy storage system (BESS) of 50 MW/100 MW hour (MWh) and 6 MW photovoltaic (PV) system with a 6 MW/24 MWh BESS (Site 5). The lease would be under the authority of 10 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 2667, "Leases: non-excess property of military departments and Defense Agencies." The interconnection easement property would be under the authority of 10 U.S.C. § 2668, "Easements for rights-of-way." The current lease period is planned to be 37 years, with a potential to extend for up to an additional 13-years.
- The lessee's construction, ownership, operation, and maintenance of a 103-MW-capacity FRG Plant with a collocated 50 MW/100 MWh BESS (Site 2) and 6 MW PV system with a 6 MW/24 MWh BESS (Site 5), and a new underground 46 kilovolt (kV) electrical transmission backbone connecting Hawaiian Electric Company (HECO) substations located on JBPHH to the new FRG Plant. Site 5 would be connected to the system using existing HECO electrical utility lines. The lessee would be the sole owner of the FRG Plant and the BESS.
- In-kind consideration projects including: the 46 kV Electrical Transmission Backbone; Defense Logistics Agency Relocation; Replace Protective Relays; Replace Live Front Equipment, Hickam; Protective Relay Coordination Study; and Replace Electrical Handholes.

## **PURPOSE AND NEED**

The need for the Proposed Action is to address the Navy's critical energy security gaps, in support of the Navy's responsibilities to 10 U.S.C. § 8062, by providing energy resiliency to the entire base in the event of a grid outage. JBPHH's aging (average age of over 50 years), undersized infrastructure, and overloaded distribution system also impact reliability. The project would improve the energy diversity and resiliency at JBPHH, which would ensure that the base is prepared for future natural or human-caused disruptions. The power generation facilities proposed would also provide renewable energy to the HECO power grid, which would greatly improve electrical resiliency and reliability for HECO customers on Oahu, including the Navy. It would also enable HECO to move cheaper, cleaner energy to where it is needed, both on- and off-base, which supports the installation's renewable energy goals while contributing to the Hawaii Clean Energy Initiative's goal of generating 100 percent of Hawaii's energy from renewable sources by 2045 (Hawaii Revised Statutes § 196–10.5).

## **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

**No Action Alternative.** Under the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Action would not occur. A lease would not be executed; the FRG Plant and BESS at Site 2, the PV system and BESS at Site 5, and the 46 kV electrical transmission backbone would not be constructed; and the existing facilities at these sites would not be demolished. In the case of a natural or human-caused disaster event, JBPHH energy diversity and resiliency goals would not be achieved and the project would not contribute to the State of Hawaii's (SOH's) goal of reaching 100 percent clean energy by 2045. The No Action Alternative is used to analyze the consequences of not undertaking the Proposed Action and serves to establish a comparative baseline for analysis.

**Proposed Action Alternative.** The EA analyzes potential impacts of the Proposed Action Alternative as previously described.

### **Alternatives Considered but Not Carried Forward for Detailed Analysis**

#### *Navy Constructs, Owns, and Operates On-Site Renewable Energy Generation Facilities:*

Under this alternative, the Navy would construct, own, and operate renewable energy power generation facilities and associated infrastructure at JBPHH. The facilities would not supply power to the grid serving all Oahu customers but would serve only JBPHH. This alternative would guarantee that power could be reliably delivered to support Navy operations during an emergency, alleviating the energy threats to the installations and enhancing energy security. It would not provide additional power to the local communities or energy security benefits for the island. This alternative is not a viable option because while this alternative would support the Navy's mission, it is not economically feasible and would not meet the Department of Defense-HECO Energy Partnership Charter arrangement with HECO to supply power to the community (DoD, 2005). Therefore, this alternative does not satisfy the purpose and need for the Proposed Action and was not further evaluated.

### *Selection of a Different Firm Renewable Generation Plant Location on JBPHH:*

A three-phase siting study was conducted at JBPHH that analyzed 15 potential locations for an FRG Plant on the base. Of the 15 sites throughout the installation, five were deemed suitable for 100 MW power plant development. The goal of Phase 1 of the study was to identify and eliminate infeasible sites. Phase 2 of the study used the same criteria for scoring sites as Phase 1, with added weight given to proximity to Station C (Navy Electrical Station), to address energy security and resiliency. During Phase 3 of the site selection process, three sites from Phase 2 were proposed for a 100 MW power plant based on the site selection study: Site 1/N (the Lake Erie location), Site 2/D (the Warehouses YA and YB location), and Site 3/L (the Russell Avenue location). Information for each site was provided to industry/developer candidates; of the three sites provided, only Site 2/D received a proposal for a 100 MW power plant on base. The other sites were thus deemed not feasible and were not considered further.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

No significant direct, indirect, or cumulative environmental impacts would occur from implementing the Proposed Action. Certain environmental resources (water, geology and topography, soils, land use, airspace, infrastructure and utilities, public health and safety, hazardous materials and wastes, socioeconomics, recreation, and environmental justice) were not analyzed in detail in the EA because implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in any potential environmental impacts on these resources or impacts would be negligible. Potential environmental impacts to air quality, cultural resources, biological resources, visual resources, noise, and transportation were analyzed in detail and are summarized below.

#### **Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases**

- Construction of the project would comply with Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR) § 11-60.1-33. Construction phase emissions of criteria pollutants and hazardous air pollutants would not result in significant impacts on air quality because they are temporary and would not change the area's attainment status or appreciably increase human health risks in areas where sensitive receptors and/or public presence are anticipated. Temporary increases in pollutant concentrations are expected for receptors immediately downwind of activities, similar to other construction projects within project neighborhoods.
- A quantitative impact assessment indicated that operation of the project would not cause or contribute to a violation of any national or SOH ambient air quality standards for criteria pollutants and would comply with the limits to ambient air concentrations of hazardous air pollutants established by HAR § 11-60.1-179. Emissions during the operations phase of the project would primarily be generated by energy production at Site 2. FRG Plant equipment, including emissions controls, would be operated and maintained according to manufacturer specifications. Equipment subject to air permitting requirements would be covered under a new Title V permit the lessee is required to obtain as a separate source from JBPHH. The PV system and the BESS at Site 5 would have minimal operational emissions.

- Estimated greenhouse gas emission increases over the 35 months of construction and the annual operation of the power plant would not interfere with Hawaii’s statewide goal to be carbon net-negative by 2045. In summary, implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative would have less than significant impacts to air quality and greenhouse gasses.

**Cultural Resources:**

- In recognition of the potential impacts to cultural resources, JBPHH has developed a National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 program alternative in consultation with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the National Park Service (NPS), the Hawaii State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHOs), and interested parties. The *2024 Programmatic Agreement Among Commander Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Hawaii State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding an Enhanced Use Lease to Support Construction and Operation of Renewable Energy Generation Facilities at Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Oahu, Hawaii* (2024 programmatic agreement [PA]) defines procedures to protect and resolve adverse effects to historic properties.
- *Archaeological Resources:* No known archaeological resources are present within the construction footprints of Sites 2 and 5; however, ground disturbance associated with construction raises the possibility for post-review discoveries. Excavations for the installation of underground electrical transmission lines and other ground-disturbing activities would occur in areas with the potential to impact previously unidentified archaeological resources that may contribute to the Pearl Harbor National Historic Landmark (PHNHL) District, the Hickam Field National Historic Landmark Area, the Hickam Historic District, Plantation Era sites, or sites of significance in Native Hawaiian culture. Consistent with the 2024 PA, JBPHH would consult with the SHPO, the Oahu Council of Hawaiian Civic Clubs (OCHCC), the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA), and interested NHOs to develop an Archaeological Resources Management Plan (ARMP) to avoid known archaeological resources and testing to assess the potential presence of previously unidentified archaeological resources, prior to the initiation of ground-disturbing activities associated with the project. The ARMP would incorporate specific measures for the identification, avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of adverse effects to archaeological resources. If archaeological resources are found within the period of significance and the areas of significance of the PHNHL or the Hickam Field National Historic Landmark Area, then JBPHH would also consult with NPS. Once construction is complete, no further activities would occur that could impact archaeological resources. With these procedures in place, the Proposed Action would result in less than significant impacts on archaeological resources.
- *Architectural Resources:* The Navy has determined that the Proposed Action Alternative would have adverse effects on the PHNHL from the removal of three contributors to the PHNHL District (Warehouses YA and YB and General Warehouse Supply) and from the introduction of incompatible buildings, exhaust stacks, and auditory and visual intrusions affecting the setting, feeling, and association of the PHNHL District. Consistent with the 2024 PA, JBPHH would ensure that specific measures to reduce sound and visual impacts are incorporated in the project design and that additional measures to mitigate adverse effects are completed in conjunction with the Proposed

Action. These measures are detailed in the 2024 PA (Appendix D of the EA). See also best management practices (BMPs) VISUAL MGMT-2 and -3 in Table 2.7-1 of the EA. Through implementation of the 2024 PA, including measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate adverse effects, no significant impacts to the PHNHL District and the associated architectural resources would occur during the construction or operation phase.

- *Resources of Importance to Native Hawaiians:* The Proposed Action Alternative does not include any activities that would alter resources of importance to Native Hawaiians as defined in Section 3.3.1.3 of the EA because no areas with identified culturally important resources exist within the Proposed Action areas. Therefore, no impacts to cultural resources important to these groups are anticipated.

### **Biological Resources**

- *Vegetation:* As Sites 2 and 5 do not contain native plant communities and loss of vegetation due to the project is minimal, the Proposed Action construction phase would have no significant impacts to vegetation. No permanent loss of significant or critical terrestrial habitat would occur under the Proposed Action Alternative. To prevent human-caused erosion over time, the Proposed Action Alternative would include landscape treatment consisting of planting, protective fencing, and walkways. Installation personnel would continue to manage nearby habitats according to the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan. With these measures in place, operation of the Proposed Action Alternative would have less than significant impacts to vegetation.
- *Wildlife and special status species:* Construction could result in potential stressors including noise disturbance, physical disturbance and strikes, secondary stressors (loss of habitat and/or water quality), and emissions with the potential to affect wildlife. Increases in noise levels from construction activities would be negligible, short-term, and temporary. BMPs and standard operating procedures (SOPs) would be implemented to prevent water quality degradation and ponding, as well as to reduce the attraction of seabirds, waterbirds, and shorebirds to the project areas. In addition, BMPs and SOPs such as pre-construction surveys for birds and special status species (including the white tern and Hawaiian short-eared owl), use of native vegetation for revegetation efforts, and design elements to limit attraction and entanglement risks would further minimize potential impacts. Additionally, the Proposed Action would avoid the addition of barbed wire fencing that could entangle Hawaiian hoary bats. With these measures in place, construction impacts to wildlife and special status species would be less than significant.
- No significant impacts to terrestrial wildlife or special status species are expected to occur during the operational phase of the Proposed Action. Water management and lighting management BMPs and SOPs would be implemented to avoid attracting seabirds and other migratory birds to the site, and to minimize the potential for pollutants to enter stormwater flows. Noise generated during facility operations at Site 2 and Site 5 would be mitigated to meet HAR Chapter (Ch.) 11-46 criteria for Class A zoning districts, which would be consistent with noise currently experienced by wildlife in the area. During operation, impacts to wildlife habitat at Sites 2 and 5 could occur from the routine landscaping operations and maintenance; however, all activities involving removal, pruning, or trimming of existing trees and large shrubs during bird nesting would be avoided or monitored to

ensure compliance with the MBTA. The solar array would use anti-glare technology to avoid creating additional light or glare that would attract or disorient avian species. With these measures in place, operations would have no adverse effects on wildlife and impacts would be less than significant.

- The Navy requested an informal consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) pursuant to Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act. In a letter dated April 22, 2024, the USFWS concurred with the Navy's finding that the Proposed Action activities may affect, but are not likely to adversely affect, the following designated Endangered Species Act-listed species:
  - Ae'o (Hawaiian stilt, *Himantopus mexicanus knudseni*)
  - Akeake (band-rumped storm petrel, *Oceanodroma castro*)
  - Uau (Hawaiian petrel, *Pterodroma phaeopygia sandwichensis*)
  - Ao (Newell's shearwater, *Puffinus auricularis newelli*)
  - Opeapea (Hawaiian hoary bat, *Aeorestes semotus*)
- No effects on federally- and SOH-listed marine species or critical marine habitat are anticipated during construction or operations with the implementation of water management BMPs. No effects to the seabed or Essential Fish Habitat are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Action. Therefore, no adverse effects would occur to marine species and impacts would be less than significant.

### Visual Resources

- The Proposed Action Alternative would lead to changes to the visual character of the area at and around Sites 2 and 5. At both sites, active construction activities would be contained within a fenced construction site. The fencing would include screening material to obstruct and minimize street views of heavy equipment, stockpile areas, and other building demolition and construction activities.
- The visual effects of operations at Site 2 would be permanent due to the exhaust stacks of the FRG Plant. In general, the visual contrast level from the new facilities and structures at Site 2 would not be strong because the FRG Plant would have the same building massing and scale as the two existing buildings. In addition, retaining mature shade trees would help maintain the character of the area. The exhaust stacks would be painted an appropriate color to blend into their surroundings, further reducing the visual contrast between the exhaust stacks and the surrounding sky. Additionally, a permanent fence would be constructed to obstruct and minimize street views of the FRG Plant.
- Vegetation (e.g., hedges, shrubs) would be planted along the proposed fence line at Site 2 and behind the historic Hale Alii Officers' Quarters to augment gaps in existing vegetation, which would create visual screening and minimize visual impacts. Plantings would be consistent with the JBPHH Landscaping Guidelines, Installation Appearance Plan, and Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan.
- Trees or tall shrubs would be planted along the Site 5 fence line to reduce the visual contrast for viewers and residences along Salt Lake Boulevard to a medium level of intensity. From vantage

points at the neighborhood park and along Maluna Street, the intensity of visual contrast would be low to medium due to distance as well as structures and trees that obstruct the view of Site 5.

- The installation of ground-mounted PV panels at Site 5 would result in the permanent loss of approximately 5 acres of an open field and the removal of several non-native trees, thereby altering the visual character at this site. From some public vantage points along Salt Lake Boulevard, viewers would experience a high level of visual contrast. This low-level infrastructure would not obstruct any mountain and harbor views from nearby public vantage points. Additionally, modern solar panels are constructed of dark-colored materials and are covered with anti-reflective coatings to prevent glare.
- Lighting for worker activity and security would add to existing lighting at Sites 2 and 5. The increased lighting at Site 2 is expected to include sources at the top of tall structures. This lighting would be visible from public locations, but this change would not substantially alter views or view quality due to the broad distribution of light sources within JBPHH. Lighting at Site 5 would be more limited and lower in profile than lighting at Site 2. Increased lighting at Site 5 is expected to include sources on the top of the PV mount structures. Views from public locations (Salt Lake Boulevard) and nearby residential housing would not be obstructed or substantially degraded. The project would follow the Dark Skies Instruction and follow other BMPs identified in the EA, including developing a lighting plan. With the implementation of the BMPs and design measures described in Table 2.7-1 the EA, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to visual resources.

## Noise

- The SOH Department of Health regulates excessive noise sources, including equipment related to operational noise and construction activities under Ch. 342F, Hawaii Revised Statutes (Noise Pollution) and HAR Ch. 11-46 (Community Noise Control).
- Construction of the Proposed Action Alternative would result in short-term, intermittent noise impacts from the operation of heavy equipment, power and hand tools, and construction vehicles throughout the project area. Construction activity and associated noise levels would vary at each location as the work progresses. Heavy equipment operation would occur sporadically throughout daytime hours (7 a.m.–5 p.m.). Short-term (less than 3 years), temporary adverse noise impacts are anticipated during construction. Mufflers and vibratory or hydraulic drivers with shrouds would be used on construction equipment and vehicles to minimize noise impacts during these activities. A construction noise mitigation and management plan would be implemented in association with BMPs to reduce construction noise to less than significant impacts.
- For long-term facility operations at Sites 2 and 5, the JBPHH lease includes a requirement that all project facilities comply with the noise thresholds outlined under HAR Ch. 11-46 criteria for a Class A zoning district (i.e., residential, public and open space). The ambient noise levels monitored in this area are relatively low, with average hourly equivalent sound levels of 54 decibels (A-weighted scale) (dBA) during daytime hours (7 a.m.–10 p.m.) and 45 dBA during nighttime hours (10 p.m.–7 a.m.). Before the application of planned noise reduction measures, noise modeling predictions indicate potential noise exceedances during the operation phase that range from 3 to 16 dBA above

the design criteria at Site 2 and 1 to 14 dBA at Site 5 for the receptors immediately adjacent to each site. At Site 2, noise sources would include the cooling radiator field for the FRG Plant facility, engines, and components associated with the BESS units. At Site 5, the only operational noise source would be the BESS unit.

- The lease and the 2024 PA require design measures to be implemented to reduce operational noise below the thresholds include noise barriers for the BESS units, low-noise fans, metal enclosures for engine generators, noise-silencer designs for air intakes and exhaust fans, double-entry personnel doors, and other manufacturer-provided mitigation solutions.
- Per the lease with the Navy and the 2024 PA, the developer would be required to implement industry-standard noise mitigation measures into the facility design and to monitor and demonstrate compliance with the HAR Ch. 11-46 thresholds over time. In the event that the thresholds are not met, additional noise controls must be implemented within an agreed upon time period and additional monitoring and compliance undertaken until all operating facilities meet the designated thresholds. With these measures in place, the effects of operational noise on the surrounding sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

## **Transportation**

- The JBPHH roadway network in each site vicinity would be affected by the construction traffic related to the installation of the FRG Plant and PV panels at Sites 2 and 5, respectively, duct banks, transport of materials to and from the work sites, and construction employee-generated travel. Short-term construction effects to the transportation system may occur. These effects may include increasing user delay and travel times at both internal and external intersections when construction traffic travels to and from the site. The addition of vehicles and increase in user delay could create short-term, localized congestion. Additionally, congestion is anticipated where lanes would need to be closed due to construction adjacent to the roadway.
- To minimize potential impacts during construction, a construction traffic management plan (CTMP) would be developed to direct traffic during construction. As part of this traffic plan, the construction manager would review and use the construction schedule to manage the construction workers' arrival and departure times, reducing impacts to peak hour traffic. The CTMP would include a list of lane closures and times, as well as traffic control measures such as speed limit reductions, pavement markings, and flaggers to identify the appropriate work zone management strategies. The CTMP would complement the traffic control plan to mitigate impacts that may arise during construction. Standard practices to protect construction workers, pedestrians, and motorists near roadways would address safe travel for vehicles near construction sites. With the CTMP in place, no significant impacts on transportation are anticipated during the construction phase.
- The Navy is developing a parking strategy for construction worker vehicles and other construction vehicles at Site 2 and is evaluating measures to reduce the number of existing JBPHH parking stalls needed for the construction workforce. At Site 5, the staging area and construction workforce parking would occupy all existing parking stalls. The Navy is evaluating measures to address the



need for these parking stalls during the construction period. Once construction is complete at Site 5, as many parking stalls as possible would be returned to JBPHH.

- Operation of the facilities is not anticipated to create long-term impacts to the transportation network. The addition of six to eight vehicles during the peak hour periods for the worker trips to and from the site and an additional 15 trucks per day for biofuel delivery are expected to add minimal additional traffic volume on the roadways and at the key intersections. The long-term operational impacts would be similar to those of the No Action Alternative. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

## **CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Based on the analysis of each resource area combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, the Proposed Action would not result in significant cumulative impacts.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES**

The following measures are incorporated in the 2024 PA developed through the NHPA Section 106 consultation process. Additional detail on these measures, including monitoring and enforcement, is provided in the PA (Appendix D of the EA).

Under the authority of 10 United States Code (U.S.C.) § 2667, Navy will sign a lease with the developer (Lessee) and ensure the developer adheres to the terms of the lease, the EA, and the PA. Commander Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam (JBC) will work with the Lessee to ensure the provisions below are met and compliance is maintained. JBC will ensure the Minimization, Monitoring and Mitigation Plan is followed during construction and operation. During the first two years after the, execution of the PA, JBC shall provide quarterly updates to the Signatories, Concurring Parties, and consulting parties on the design, construction, and operation of these facilities regarding the effectiveness of auditory and visual effects minimization measures. During the following three years, JBC shall provide semi-annual updates to confirm continued effectiveness of the stipulated auditory and visual effects minimization measures. Each year, on the anniversary of the execution of the PA or another date agreed upon by the Signatories, JBC shall provide to the Signatories, Concurring Parties, and consulting parties a summary report detailing work undertaken pursuant to its terms. Such report shall include any scheduling changes proposed, any problems encountered, and any disputes and objections received in response to JBC's efforts to carry out the terms of this Agreement.

## **MEASURES TO AVOID, MINIMIZE, AND MITIGATE ADVERSE EFFECTS**

### **A. Avoid and Minimize Adverse Effects to the PHNHL and Contributing Properties**

#### **1. Measures to Minimize Auditory Effects**

- a) Prior to construction, JBC shall require the Lessee as part of the lease to incorporate specific industry standard sound reduction measures into building and equipment designs to minimize the Undertaking's auditory effects to residents and users of adjacent historic properties, including the Marine Officers' Quarters and the Hale Alii Officers' Quarters.

- b) JBC shall require the Lessee to conduct periodic sound monitoring to confirm that operation of the facility complies and remains in compliance with Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR) Ch. 11-46 criteria for Class A zoning districts not to exceed 55 dBA from 7am to 10pm, and 45 dBA from 10pm to 7am (Hawaii Revised Statutes § 342F-31; HAR § 11-46-3).
  - c) JBC shall require the Lessee to provide a sound reduction design and plan for periodic monitoring and reporting to the Signatories, Concurring Parties, and consulting parties regarding the effectiveness of these measures, consistent with Stipulation III of this Agreement.
2. JBC shall incorporate enforcement measures in the lease to require modifications to operations and/or facility features in the event these sound minimization measures fail to comply with stipulated limits.
- a) JBC shall regularly assess Lessee compliance and effectiveness of auditory effects minimization.
  - b) In the event auditory effects minimization measures fail to comply with stipulated limits, JBC shall require the Lessee to implement remedies to minimize auditory effects and return operations to compliance. JBC shall notify the Signatories and Concurring Parties of such failure within 7 calendar days, shall provide updates on remedies, and shall report on effectiveness of remedies consistent with Stipulation III of this Agreement.
3. Measures to Minimize Visual Effects to Historic Properties
- a) JBC shall incorporate measures in the lease requiring the Lessee to include visual effects minimization measures in the site and building design.
  - b) JBC shall require the Lessee to provide a visual effects minimization plan and to demonstrate the effectiveness of the visual effects minimization measures set forth in this stipulation.
  - c) JBC shall require the Lessee to preserve and maintain existing vegetative screening and mature plantings to the degree possible, and to plant additional, locally appropriate vegetation to provide visual screening and minimize visual impacts to the adjacent historic properties, especially the Marine Officers' Quarters and the Hale Alii Officers' Quarters.
  - d) JBC shall require the Lessee to minimize visual effects of new construction by painting the new facilities to blend into their surroundings and employ low sheen paints or other glare reduction methods.
  - e) JBC shall require the Lessee to design site lighting to reduce change in the area, including luminaire color temperatures compatible with the warmer lighting used for the housing areas.
  - f) JBC shall regularly assess Lessee compliance and effectiveness of visual effects minimization.

- g) JBC shall require the Lessee to provide periodic reporting to support JBC consultation with the parties on the effectiveness of visual effects monitoring, consistent with Stipulation III of this Agreement.
  - h) In the event visual minimization measures fail to comply with the requirements of this stipulation, JBC shall require the Lessee to implement remedies to restore to compliant condition. JBC shall notify the Signatories and Concurring Parties of such failure within 7 calendar days, provide updates on remedies, and report on effectiveness consistent with Stipulation III of this Agreement.
  - i) JBC shall incorporate in the lease enforcement measures requiring modifications in the event these visual effects minimization requirements fail to protect the neighboring historic homes.
4. Measures to Minimize Adverse Effects from Air Emissions
- a) JBC and the lease shall require the Lessee to obtain and maintain a new Title V Operating Permit for all equipment subject to air permitting, consistent with the Clean Air Act.
  - b) JBC and the lease shall require plant equipment, including emissions controls to be operated and maintained according to manufacturer specifications.
  - c) JBC and the lease shall require that operational emissions of criteria pollutants from the facility remain in compliance with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and State Ambient Air Quality Standards. Ambient air concentrations of any hazardous air pollutant shall comply with limits established by HAR § 11-60.1-179.
5. JBC shall require the Lessee to deconstruct the historic warehouses to support reuse of materials such as redwood framing and cladding, and to maximize the availability of the materials for reuse by the public.
- a) JBC shall require the Lessee to provide updates on the deconstruction consistent with Stipulation III of this Agreement.
6. Prior to the initiation of ground-disturbing activities associated with the Undertaking, JBC shall consult with the SHPO, OCHCC, the OHA, and interested NHOs to develop an ARMP that considers known archaeological resources and testing to assess the potential presence of any previously unidentified archaeological resources.
- a) The plan shall incorporate specific measures for the identification of archaeological resources.
  - b) The plan shall incorporate specific measures for the avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of adverse effects to archaeological resources.
  - c) The plan shall incorporate specific measures for archaeological monitoring and a post-review discovery plan.
  - d) The plan shall incorporate requirements for reporting to the SHPO, OCHCC, OHA, and interested NHOs on the results of these measures.

- e) JBC shall submit the plan to SHPO, OCHCC, OHA, and interested NHOs for review. JBC shall take into account all comments received within 30 calendar days and shall consult for up to 30 calendar days to resolve any disagreements and submit the final plan to SHPO for acceptance.
- f) If archaeological resources are found within the period of significance and the areas of significance of the PHNHL or the HFNHLD, then JBC will also consult with NPS.

**B. Mitigate Adverse Effects to the PHNHL and Contributing Built Historic Properties**

1. JBC has previously completed Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) documentation for Warehouses YA and YB (HABS No. HI-415) and General Warehouse Supply (HABS No. HI-388).
  - a) The HABS documents are publicly accessible at <https://www.loc.gov/pictures/collection/hh/item/hi0676/> and <https://www.loc.gov/pictures/collection/hh/item/hi0641/>
2. Prior to deconstruction, JBC shall require and a qualified staff member of the Navy Cultural Resources Program shall oversee preparation of supplementary digital documentation of the warehouses to be removed.
  - a) Documentation shall include setting, overview, and design details.
  - b) JBC shall consult with the Signatories, Concurring Parties, and consulting parties on the documentation plan.
  - c) JBC shall take into account all comments made to the documentation plan by Signatories, Concurring Parties, and consulting parties received within 30 calendar days and shall consult for up to 30 calendar days with the intention of resolving any disagreements.
  - d) JBC shall ensure that documentation will be made available to the Signatories, Concurring Parties, and consulting parties, and to the public via the Hawaii State Library System and/or the Hawaii State Archives, as applicable.
3. JBC shall replace the elevator in the historic Port Operations Control Tower as an essential investment to enhance the mission capability and sustainment of a significant Category I contributor, as a measure to improve the PHNHL.
  - a) JBC shall initiate the replacement planning and design within three years and complete construction within five years of the date of this Agreement.
  - b) Prior to initiation of construction, JBC shall provide draft designs to the Signatories, Concurring Parties, and consulting parties to demonstrate that the project is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and introduces no adverse effects to the historic tower or to the PHNHL.
  - c) JBC shall take into account all comments by Signatories, Concurring Parties, and consulting parties received with 30 calendar days and shall consult for up to 30 calendar days with the intention resolving any disagreements.

## **PUBLIC OUTREACH**

The Navy prepared a Draft EA to inform the public of the Proposed Action and alternatives and to allow the opportunity for public review and comment. Formal notification and opportunity for public participation were provided during the preparation of the EA. In coordination with the public comment period on the Draft EA, the Navy provided information and invited public comments on the potential effects to historic properties, consistent with Section 106 of the NHPA.

A Notice of Availability of the Draft EA and NHPA consultation documentation were published in the *Honolulu Star-Advertiser* (Honolulu, Hawaii) on April 3, 2024. The Draft EA and NHPA consultation documentation were made available for public review during a 48-day comment period (April 3, 2024, through May 20, 2024) in local public libraries and online at <https://pacific.navfac.navy.mil/About-Us/National-Environmental-Policy-Act-NEPA-Information>.

Four public comments were received on the Draft EA. One comment was received in favor of the proposed project, noting the potential benefit to the Oahu electrical grid. Several comments were received regarding the choice of fuel for the project, with one comment recommending nuclear power and another recommending use of natural gas. One commenter was concerned with potential noise and visual impacts from the Proposed Action on the PHNHL District. The commenter indicated that the EA did not clearly describe why other locations outside the PHNHL District were not considered as alternatives. The commenter indicated that an EIS was prepared for an Army power plant project on the island, and questioned why an EIS was not developed for this project, despite the Army's EIS concluding the project would have no significant impacts. The commenter also noted that the description of the Little Makalapa project in the cumulative analysis included a description of a redevelopment project at that site that is no longer planned to take place.

These comments were analyzed and, where appropriate, changes have been incorporated into the Final EA.

## **FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

Based on the analysis presented in the EA, which has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of NEPA and Navy policies and procedures (32 CFR Part 775), and in consideration of comments received during public review of the Draft EA and coordination with the USFWS and SHPO, the Navy finds that implementation of the Proposed Action would not significantly impact the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an EIS will not be prepared. Interested parties may obtain an electronic copy of the Final EA and FONSI from the Navy's NEPA Information webpage: <https://pacific.navfac.navy.mil/About-Us/National-Environmental-Policy-Act-NEPA-Information>.

Approved by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S.D. Barnett", written over a horizontal line.

Stephen Barnett, Rear Admiral (RADM)

Commander, Navy Region Hawaii