

Finding of No Significant Impact:

Fort Campbell, Kentucky

Implementation of BRAC and Other Transformation Actions

The 2002 Base Closure and Realignment law (commonly referred to as BRAC) amended the Defense Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, Public Law 101-510, by authorizing another round of realignments and closures in 2005. Fort Campbell has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) that evaluates the potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts associated with construction of an Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) and Operations Maintenance Shop (OMS), and transfer of the 52nd Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) group to Fort Campbell. These actions reflect the recommendations of the BRAC Commission. In addition, the EA considers the potential impacts of other non BRAC-directed changes in personnel occurring at Fort Campbell through 2011.

The actions evaluated in the EA are the components of a major federal action, which must be evaluated under the national Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The attached EA, which is incorporated by reference, was prepared pursuant to 32 Code of Federal Regulations Part 651 and U.S. Council on Environmental Quality regulations (Title 40, U.S. Code, Parts 1500-1508) for implementing the procedural requirements of NEPA. In preparation of the EA, it was determined that no action alternatives other than the proposed action would satisfy the purpose and need of the proposed action without greater costs and/or impacts to post resources.

Description of the Proposed Action

The proposed action involves implementation of the BRAC Commission recommendations and Army Modular Force (AMF), Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy (IGPBS) and other Army actions that will result in changes to the force structure and population of Fort Campbell. The BRAC Commission recommendations are construction of an AFRC and OMS, relocation of personnel associated with the USAR and OMS, relocation of the 52nd EOD to Fort Campbell, and relocation of an unspecified aviation attack battalion from Fort Campbell. Other personnel changes included in the proposed action are identified in Section 1 of the attached EA and are incorporated by reference. Construction of facilities to support personnel changes was addressed in previous EAs and is not part of the proposed action.

An AFRC and OMS would be constructed on approximately 7 acres of previously cleared land in the southeastern portion of the post. The AFRC would be capable of accommodating 200 personnel and would contain administrative, educational, assembly, library, and physical fitness areas for four U.S. Army Reserve (USAR) units. The OMS would provide administrative areas, work bays, educational spaces, tool and parts storage, building operations, and support spaces for the USAR units to perform their assigned mission. Construction is scheduled to begin in 2007.

Fort Campbell would undergo a net force increase of approximately 700 permanently assigned active duty army personnel and 300 USAR personnel as a result of BRAC and

other transformation actions, including relocation of the 52nd EOD from Fort Gillem under BRAC. Training for these personnel would not require construction of new training ranges or training facilities but training range use would increase slightly.

The specific components of the proposed action are described in the attached EA, and are incorporated by reference.

The proposed action is the preferred alternative in this analysis.

No Action Alternative

The no action alternative would not satisfy the need for the proposed action, but was considered in the analysis to provide a baseline for comparison of impacts of the proposed action. Under the no action alternative, Fort Campbell would not construct facilities as described in the Commission’s recommendation. Units would be maintained in existing facilities and structures both on and off Fort Campbell. The no action alternative would not implement the 2005 BRAC Commission’s recommendations.

Environmental Consequences

The analysis evaluated potential impacts to land use, air quality, noise, geology and soils, water resources, biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomics, transportation, utilities, and hazardous and toxic substances. No significant negative environmental or socioeconomic consequences were identified in the EA as a result of the proposed action. No mitigation is required to reduce impacts to less than significant. Project design and site selection would minimize and avoid impacts to the extent practicable. Table 1 summarizes project design features that will be implemented during project construction and operation to reduce environmental impacts.

TABLE 1
Project Design Features to be Implemented with the Proposed Action
Construction and Operation of Armed Forces Reserve Center and Operations Maintenance Shop

Resource Area	Control Measures
Land Use	Implementation of measures such as exterior dark sky lights in building designs to prevent change in land use from Open to developed from interfering with night training activities at Sabre Heliport.
Air Quality	Use of sprinkling/irrigation, vegetative cover, and mulching as dust abatement measures during construction.
Noise	Use of hearing protection as appropriate.
Soils	Use of sediment barriers (silt fence or straw bales), temporary detention basins, grade stabilization with seed and mulch, and geotextile slope stabilization to minimize impacts to soils.
Surface Water	Use of sediment barriers (silt fence or straw bales), temporary detention basins, grade stabilization with seed and mulch, and geotextile slope stabilization to minimize erosion and transport of sediments to surface waters.
Stormwater	Use of silt fencing, guttering and other flow control measures, and detention and infiltration areas to prevent onsite and downstream impacts from stormwater.

TABLE 1

Project Design Features to be Implemented with the Proposed Action
Construction and Operation of Armed Forces Reserve Center and Operations Maintenance Shop

Resource Area	Control Measures
Transportation	Use of traffic control procedures, including flaggers and posted detours, if necessary to facilitate traffic flow during construction

Construction associated with the preferred alternative would result in minor impacts to air quality from construction, temporary traffic impacts, and generation of construction-related noise. All of these impacts would be temporary and less than significant.

Minor displacement of wildlife, both temporary and permanent, would occur from the construction area and adjoining areas, but this impact would be temporary as animals would acclimate to the areas into which they relocate or return to areas adjacent to the construction sites.

A minor positive impact to the local economy would result from construction-related jobs and construction-related purchases of supplies and materials. The increase in military personnel and their dependents would provide a minor benefit to the local economy through new disposable income and increased tax revenues, but would not overly burden community services (fire, police, medical, education).

The increase of approximately 1,000 military personnel and their dependents to Fort Campbell through 2011 and would result in an increased demand for on-post housing and training resources. Off-post housing is expected to increase as the region grows and be capable of accommodating any personnel that could not be housed on-post.

There would be a net reduction in vehicle emissions as a result of reduced numbers of helicopters training at Fort Campbell, which more than offset the increase in personal and military ground vehicles. The preferred alternative would result in negligible impacts to land use, geology and soils, and vegetation that would be confined to a previously disturbed area. Impacts to soils would be controlled through the use of appropriate best management practice (BMPs) and soil stabilization techniques.

No appreciable impacts on solid wastes, hazardous materials, fuels, and the Environmental Restoration Program would occur. There would be no impacts to cultural resources.

No new training ranges would be required to accommodate the units relocating to or activating at Fort Campbell. The approximate 3.5 percent increase in personnel would not exceed the capacity of Fort Campbell training ranges.

The proposed action would be implemented entirely within the Tennessee portion of Fort Campbell. Contractors would be required to comply with the Fort Campbell Policy for Storm Water Erosion and Sediment Control at Construction Projects to minimize impacts from soil erosion and impacts to water quality. All appropriate BMPs for general construction would be followed. Fort Campbell would file a Notice of Intent for a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Stormwater Construction Permit with the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation prior to implementing the project. Post-construction stormwater controls included in project construction would minimize or

eliminate the long-term effects of increased runoff from the increased impervious surface area resulting from construction of the AFRC, OMS, and supporting infrastructure.

A general conformity analysis for air quality will be conducted prior to implementation of the proposed action. This analysis must result in a Record of Non-Applicability for the proposed action or the proposed action will be modified to achieve conformity.

Conclusion

Based on the analysis presented in the EA, I find that implementation of the proposed action, as described, would have no significant impact on the human or natural environment. Therefore, a Finding of No Significant Impact is issued for the proposed action and no Environmental Impact Statement is required.



JEFFREY J. SCHLOESSER
MG, U.S. Army
Commanding

2006/12/18
Date