



UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS
Marine Corps Base
Camp Lejeune, North Carolina 28542-5001

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5420/2
FAC
11 FEB 1986

From: Commanding General, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune


Subj: MINUTES OF ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REVIEW BOARD:

Ref: (a) Chmn, EEIRB ltr 6280/1 FAC dtd 10 13 Jan 1986

Encl: (1) P-185, General Purpose Warehouse, MCAS, NR
(2) P-410, Bachelor Enlisted Quarters, MCAS, NR
(3) P-449, Commissary, MCAS, NR
(4) P-451, Aircraft Hangar Modernization, MCAS, NR
(5) P-520, Operational Trainer Facility, MCAS, NR
(6) P-810, Mechanics Training Building, Increment 3, Camp Johnson
(7) P-678, Combat Vehicle Maintenance Shop, Hadnot Pt
(8) P-626, Bachelor Enlisted Quarters, Hadnot Pt
(9) P-057, 2d FSSG Headquarters, French Creek
(10) P-257, Field Maintenance Shop
(11) P-065, Gymnasium, French Creek
(12) P-824, Chapel, Tarawa Terrace
(13) P-851, Electrical Distribution Improvements, Montford Pt
(14) P-842, Regional Automated Service Center
(15) P-841, Mess Hall Addition, French Creek
(16) P-803, Field Maintenance Complex, Increment 2
(17) P-124, Bachelor Officers Quarters, Paradise Pt
(18) P-672, Road Improvements, Brewster Blvd
(19) Mechanized Movement Course

1. Subject board was convened at 0930, 30 January 1986 in the Conference Room of Building 1 for the purpose of reviewing and acting on the preliminary environmental assessments (PEA) contained in enclosures (1) through (19). The following individuals were present:

Col R. A. Tiebout	Chairman
LtCol J. A. Marapoti, DivEngr	Member
LtCol W. M. Rice, BMaintO	Member
Capt M. D. Doman, SJA	Advisor
Capt Ralph Way, TFAC	Member
SSgt F. P. Walsh, 2d FSSG	Member
Mr. F. E. Acosta, MCAS, NR	Member
Mr. R. E. Alexander, EnvEngr	Advisor
Mr. F. W. Estes, Jr., PubWks	Guest
Mr. E. G. Jones, Jr., PubWks	Member
Mr. D. D. Sharpe, BEcologist	Advisor
Mr. J. I. Wooten, Dir, NREA	Advisor



Subj: MINUTES OF ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
REVIEW BOARD

2. Col Tiebout explained that the majority of the projects for review were for the MCON FY-88 program. A change now requires a biennial submission, which will combine FY-88/89. HQMC will be briefed on the submission 19 Feb 1986.

3. The following projects were approved as having no significant environmental impact/controversy or additional requirements except as noted.

a. P-185, General Purpose Warehouse, MCAS, NR. PEA was previously approved; however, project was expanded to 60,000 sq ft. Project will now require a State-approved erosion control plan because of the enlargement.

b. P-410, Three-Story Bachelor Enlisted Quarters, MCAS, NR. Project will be located in a forested area. Timber harvesting will be coordinated by NREA staff; project requires an approved sediment control plan with a study of stormwater release structures.

c. P-449, Commissary, MCAS, NR. Project will be in accordance with master plan in personnel support area; some tree harvesting and an approved sediment control plan will be required. Erosion problems in the storm channel must be addressed in the plan.


d. P-451, Aircraft Hangar Modernization, MCAS, NR. Project consists of a 60,000 sq ft addition to existing hangar; size of storm drainage system will be increased and a sediment control plan will be required. Mr. Acosta stated they were in the process of putting hazardous materials (HM) storage outside of each one of the hangars. He agreed to check into the requirement for HM lockers located inside to be vented to the outside.

e. P-520, Operational Trainer Facility, MCAS, NR. Facility will accommodate new swing-wing type trainer aircraft, and will be adjacent to existing trainer facility.

f. P-810, Mechanics Training Building (Increment #3, Montford Pt). All increments of project were covered by the master plan; impacts were assessed by P-808 in January 1982.

g. P-678, Combat Vehicle Maintenance Shop. Project will be located in Division shop area and will have pollution abatement facilities. An approved sediment control plan is required. Project will be included in the Cogdell's Creek watershed study.

h. P-626, Bachelor Enlisted Quarters, Hadnot Pt. Project will require demolition of buildings at existing site. LtCol Rice suggested drainage be looked at carefully during design because of all the new parking lots going in; sediment control plan is required.



Subj: MINUTES OF ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
REVIEW BOARD

i. P-057, 2d FSSG Headquarters. Previously approved
January 1984.

j. P-256, Field Maintenance Shop. Project will require
some timber harvesting and project will be in watershed study
also. A sediment control plan is required.

k. P-065, Gymnasium and P-824, Chapel. Projects approved
although it is doubtful they will ever be built considering
budget cuts that will be forthcoming.

l. P-851, Electrical Distribution Improvements, Montford
Pt. Project will increase electrical capacity of primary power
to Montford Pt. Existing lines will be used; no adverse impacts
noted.

m. P-842, Regional Automated Service Center. Project is
planned for open area and should present no environmental
problems.

n. P-841, Mess Hall Addition. Addition is being added to
an existing building; no environmental constraints.

o. P-803, Field Maintenance Complex, Increment #2.
Previous approval of Increment #2 also covers this project and
two successive increments, P-804 and 805.

p. P-124, Bachelor Officer Quarters, Paradise Pt. Some
timber removal may be required.

q. P-672, Road Improvements (Brewster Blvd Overpass).
Timber harvesting and a sediment control plan will be required.
Building 712, which is a NACIP study site, must also be addressed
during project design.

r. Mechanized Movement Course. LtCol Marapoti briefed
Board members on background and stated that this project has the
highest priority of any Division project at this time. The
mobility/counermobility portion of the course should be
partially available by mid-June to coincide with arrival of new
vehicle at that time. He assured the Board that Division wished
to avoid conflict with endangered species, archaeological sites
and minimize soil erosion to the fullest possible extent and
still be able to construct the course. Mr. Wooten will check
into the possibility of having timber removal added to an
existing contract. Existing road crossings are to be used. A
walk-through of the area with the Division Engineer,
Environmentalists and Tankers was suggested and restrictions that
must be observed will be documented. The project will have no
impact on LZ Bluebird. It was suggested that the portion of Mile
Hammock Bay which has Red-Cockaded Woodpecker sites be excluded
to eliminate any misunderstandings. A Corps of Engineers' review

[The page contains extremely faint, illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side. Two circular punch holes are visible at the top of the page.]

Subj: MINUTES OF ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
REVIEW BOARD

i. P-057, 2d FSSG Headquarters. Previously approved
January 1984.

j. P-256, Field Maintenance Shop. Project will require
some timber harvesting and project will be in watershed study
also. A sediment control plan is required.

k. P-065, Gymnasium and P-824, Chapel. Projects approved
although it is doubtful they will ever be built considering
budget cuts that will be forthcoming.

l. P-851, Electrical Distribution Improvements, Montford
Pt. Project will increase electrical capacity of primary power
to Montford Pt. Existing lines will be used; no adverse impacts
noted.

m. P-842, Regional Automated Service Center. Project is
planned for open area and should present no environmental
problems.


n. P-841, Mess Hall Addition. Addition is being added to
an existing building; no environmental constraints.

o. P-803, Field Maintenance Complex, Increment #2.
Previous approval of Increment #2 also covers this project and
two successive increments, P-804 and 805.

p. P-124, Bachelor Officer Quarters, Paradise Pt. Some
timber removal may be required.

q. P-672, Road Improvements (Brewster Blvd Overpass).
Timber harvesting and a sediment control plan will be required.
Building 712, which is a NACIP study site, must also be addressed
during project design.

r. Mechanized Movement Course. LtCol Marapoti briefed
Board members on background and stated that this project has the
highest priority of any Division project at this time. The
mobility/counter-mobility portion of the course should be
partially available by mid-June to coincide with arrival of new
vehicle at that time. He assured the Board that Division wished
to avoid conflict with endangered species, archaeological sites
and minimize soil erosion to the fullest possible extent and
still be able to construct the course. Mr. Wooten will check
into the possibility of having timber removal added to an
existing contract. Existing road crossings are to be used. A
walk-through of the area with the Division Engineer,
Environmentalists and Tankers was suggested and restrictions that
must be observed will be documented. The project will have no
impact on LZ Bluebird. It was suggested that the portion of Mile
Hammock Bay which has Red-Cockaded Woodpecker sites be excluded
to eliminate any misunderstandings. A Corps of Engineers' review



Subj: MINUTES OF ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
.REVIEW BOARD

105
04
04 K
408
6E

will probably be a requirement because of the wetlands. A sediment basin may also be required. Mr. Alexander stated that an archaeologist's opinion would be required also. Col Tiebout directed Mr. Alexander to take the lead in coordinating efforts to try and meet the time frame.

4. Mr. Alexander informed the Board of a new requirement by the Corps of Engineers regarding rubble disposal. We now are required to place the rubble rather than just push it up. Cost of rubble disposal is to be studied; i.e., cost of having Base forces dispose of with continued use as rip-rap or require the contractor to dispose of it.

5. Mr. Wooten questioned the use of the current borrow pit adjacent to Curtis Road at the Air Station, as it is some of the highest ground in the area and would make a good site location for future projects. It was noted that a PEA will be available for Board review at the next meeting.

6. Mr. Alexander distributed copies of the North Carolina Environmental Permit Directory as an aid for members in determining environmental requirements/restrictions. Copies of this document will also be provided to architectural/engineering firms.

7. The meeting adjourned at 1100. Next meeting will be at the call of the Chairman.


R/S

R. A. Tiebout
R. A. TIEBOUT

CS: Concur: W Nonconcur _____
CG: Approved: K Disapproved _____

11 FEB 1986

DISTRIBUTION: (Members) (Advisors)(w/o encl)
Rep, 2d MarDiv (G-4)(w/encl (19) only) Dir, NREA
Rep, 2d FSSG (G-4)(w/o encl) SupvEcologist
Rep, 6th MAB (G-4)(w/o encl) BWildlifeMgr
Rep, MCAS, NR (S-4) BGameProt, PMO
TFACO (w/o encl) SAFD
BMO (w/o encl) SJA
PWO DRMO
Ch, VetMedSvc, NavHosp
Ch, Occup/PrevMed, NavHosp



UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS
Marine Corps Base
Camp Lejeune, North Carolina 28542

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT/ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT REVIEW BOARD
PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (PEA)

SUBJ: P-841, Mess Hall Addition

In accordance with Base Orders 11000.1B and 11015.2G, the subject action has been reviewed by the Marine Corps Base Environmental Impact Review Board.


BOARD ACTION

xx The board agreed there appears to be no significant environmental impact or controversy associated with this project.

 The Board agreed there appears to be no significant environmental impact or controversy associated with this project provided:

 The Board agreed there is potential environmental impact with the project and recommends the following:

Copy to:
Action Sponsor
PEA File
EnvEngr



REQUEST FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REVIEW; FORMAT AND PROCEDURES FOR SUBMISSION OF

1. Action Sponsor: Commanding General, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune
2. Name, Address, Phone Number of Point of Contact: _____
Attn: Mr. Gene Jones, Chief, Planning Branch, Public Works Division, Ext. 1833
3. Title and Brief Description of Proposed Action (state purpose, when proposed action is to occur, and any proposed environmental protection measure):

MESS HALL ADDITION (P-841)

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Expand the dining area and provide a mini-galley and serving line for fast food service in Dining Facility, FC-540. Match existing architectural motif. Include utility connections, energy conservation and pollution abatement features.

II. PROJECT PURPOSE


This project will provide additional messing area by expanding dining facility to FC-540 in the French Creek Area. To improve the present situation of the overcrowdedness of the present situation in the dining area.

III. SITE SELECTION

The environmental impact of location of the project has been documented in the current Base Master Plan. This facility will be located in the "500" area of French Creek, an expansion of FC-540. (See Enclosure (1).)

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the information provided above and in the Base Master Plan, this project will not have significant adverse environmental impact on the environment. Therefore, the need is getting great for larger dining facilities due to the overcrowded dining facilities. Preparation of an environmental assessment per MCO 6280.5 is not required.



4. Location: Attach a Camp Lejeune Special Map (or equivalent quality map) showing location of proposed action/project site(s).

5. Potential Environmental Impact/Considerations: (See Note 1)

a. Air Quality: Will there be any open burning associated with the project/action? No Will there be any new boilers, incinerators or fuel storage tanks (larger than 1,000 gallons) provided? No Will there be any paint booths, solvent vats, degreasers or other vapor-producing industrial processes involved? No Will the project involve the use or disposal of asbestos? No Will project cause dust problems? No

b. Land Quality: Will the action require use of significant amount of earthen fill material? No Will there be an increase in level of soil disturbance/damage to vegetation? No Will there be one acre or more of land cleared/disturbed? No

c. Groundwater Quality: Does the project involve use of herbicides, insecticides or other pesticides in significant amounts? No Does the project involve installation/use of septic tanks, or any other on-site disposal of sanitary waste? No Will there be any wells dug or any excavations deeper than twenty feet? No Will any toxic or hazardous material/waste requiring disposal be used or generated by the project? No Will there be a net increase of solid waste caused by implementing the project/action? Yes Will the project or action be carried out within 200 feet of a drinking water supply well? No

d. Surface Water Quality: Is the project located on or in a water body or adjacent 100-year flood plain? Unknown Will the project involve construction of drainage ditches/underground drains for purposes of lowering water table? No Will all wastewater be connected to sanitary sewer? Yes Will there be an increase in erosion/siltation from soil disturbing activity? No Will petroleum oil and lubricants be routinely stored or used at the site? No Will the project increase rates of surface/storm water run-off? Yes

e. Natural Resources: Will there be a loss of forest land? No Will public access for hunting, boating, fishing, etc., be restricted? Yes Is there a change in land use from what is presently shown in Base Master Plan? No Will removal of existing vegetation be required? Yes Are there any known effects on any endangered species? No Does the project involve the purchase or sale of any real estate? No

f. Socio-Economic Considerations: Will the project cause an increase/decrease in on or off-base military population? No Will there be any increased demand on a local or state government to provide services? No Will there be any changes to traffic flow and patterns on or off-base? No Will any noise, traffic, dust, etc., be generated which may affect off-base persons or property? No Is there any known controversy associated with the type of project or action proposed? No Are there any historical or archaeological sites affected by project/action? No

NOTE 1. Answer either "yes", "no" or "unknown". Answers should be based on information available to the action sponsor at time of submission to the Base Environmental Impact Review Board. Do not delay the submission of this request awaiting additional information. Many environmental considerations need to be addressed in early planning stages. If additional information becomes available after submission, it should be forwarded to the EIRB.

