

ERRATA SHEET
Environmental Assessment of the Proposed National Infantry Museum
September 15, 2004

1. This Errata Sheet includes revisions to the Environmental Assessment of the Proposed National Infantry Museum, dated July 2004 (EA), and signed on July 19, 2004. Further review of the EA and comments necessitate correcting and clarifying information presented in the EA. None of the information provided in this Errata Sheet results in a significant change to the environment conditions or the project activity, the analysis of the potential environmental impacts, or the mitigation proposed; therefore an additional or revised environmental analysis is not required. Italics indicate inserted text.

2. The following revisions or additional information is provided to the EA:

Page 4, Section 2.1. Add to end of the first sentence on the page: *“Due to the vital partnership role that the NIF would play in constructing and operating a new NIM, the NIF has been invited and has accepted cooperating agency status for purposes of developing this Environmental Assessment. Fort Benning will be the lead agency. The MOA and its amendments (including those amendments pending) specify the responsibilities and coordination of both Fort Benning and the NIF.”*

Page 4, Section 2.1. Fourth full paragraph, revise citation for the Master Plan to read, “(Lord, 2002 and updates by French and Associates, 2004)”.

Page 7, Section 2.2. Add a second paragraph: *“For any of the alternatives discussed in detail, the Chapel at Harmony Church will be abated for asbestos and lead based paint prior to relocating the Chapel. After the Chapel building is relocated, the building foundation will be removed and the area reseeded, using a process similar to one used to remove the other World War II Company Street buildings from their original location throughout this area of the installation and other cantonment areas on Fort Benning. No environmental impacts are expected at the current site of the Chapel, with the exception of potential impacts to cultural resources. These impacts have been addressed in prior environmental studies and the current Interpretive Plan for the World War II Company Street.”*

Also for all of the alternatives, some of the collection will continue to be stored in locations on Fort Benning other than the NIM facilities, and no impacts to the environment are expected from that storage. Continuation of storage of these artifacts under less than optimal storage conditions may result in a minor adverse impact to those items considered cultural resources.”

Page 10, Section 3.1. Third paragraph, second sentence, delete “, including cumulative impacts”.

Page 12, Section 3.2.3. After the third paragraph, add another paragraph: *“The construction and operation of the NIM at this Alternative site would not encroach on Fort Benning, i.e. there would be no negative effects on Fort Benning’s mission and specifically military training. Under Georgia law (official Code of Georgia 36-66-6), any rezoning within a certain distance of Fort Benning requires notification to the Garrison Commander. The City land upon which the NIM will be built is presently not zoned. The City intends to rezone this land and to comply with the Georgia notice requirements as part of that process. Also the move of the Chapel and other buildings associated with the WW II Company Street and monuments to this alternative site would have no impacts on land use.”*

Page 13, Section 3.2.4. Change the second sentence to read: “Minor adverse long-term impacts to the regional undeveloped lands are likely to continue *due to other projects in the ROI, however*

implementation of any of the alternatives would result in negligible incremental impacts, and therefore no cumulative impacts for Land Use."

Page 13, Section 3.3. Strike the last phrase of the first sentence that reads "...construction because the area is relatively flat." Revise the last sentence to read, "The ROI for soils includes *the Fort Benning and City land for the NIM (which encompasses the construction areas and the soil/fill material borrow areas)* staging areas, and areas within the local watershed including the Chattahoochee River, Upatoi Creek, and unnamed streams and drainages into these waterways."

Page 15, Section 3.3.4. Replace the last sentence with: "*Other actions in the ROI may result in a combined moderate adverse impact to soils as regional growth continues and top soil is removed but soil erosion control measures and related permitting for those projects would reduce the impacts. There would be no (Alternative A) or negligible (action alternatives) incremental impacts, and therefore implementation of any of the alternatives would result in no cumulative impacts to soils.*"

Page 18, Section 3.4.4. Replace the fifth and sixth sentence with "*The other projects in the ROI may combine for moderate adverse impacts to water quality in the ROI, however proper mitigation for those projects should reduce those negative impacts. There would be no (Alternative A) or negligible (action alternatives) incremental impacts, and therefore implementation of any of the alternatives would result in no cumulative impacts to water quality.*"

Page 20, Section 3.5.4. First paragraph, last sentence, delete "cumulative". Second paragraph, last sentence, delete "cumulative". Third paragraph, first sentence, delete "cumulative"; insert second sentence: "*There would be no (Alternative A and B) or negligible (Alternative C) incremental impacts, and therefore implementation of any of the alternatives would result in no cumulative impacts to wetlands.*"

Page 21, Section 3.6. Third paragraph of section, first sentence, after "Fort Benning" add "*or the City property*".

Page 23, Section 3.6.3. Third full paragraph on page, delete fourth sentence regarding controlled burning.

Page 24, Section 3.6.3. Add to end of first paragraph on page: "*Several isolated occurrences of Georgia protected species were found on the City property in areas that are either not planned for development, or if in the path of development will be transplanted elsewhere on the City property.*"

Page 24, Section 3.6.3. Add to beginning of fourth paragraph on the page: "*Overall, implementing this alternative would have a moderate adverse effect to vegetation on the Fort Benning and City property through native plant removal and disturbance of the plant community.*"

Page 24, Section 3.6.4. Replace last sentence in section with: "*There would be no (Alternative A) or negligible (Alternative B and C) incremental impacts to vegetation in the ROI due to the NIM proposal, and therefore implementation of any of the alternatives would result in no cumulative impacts to vegetation.*"

Page 25, Section 3.7. Add to the end of the section: "*The RCW and associated habitat is found at various locations on Fort Benning, including near the current NIM location. The City property contains many of the same species that inhabit Fort Benning, however no Federal or state listed species are known to exist on the City property. Existing information indicates that the City property has no species of concern. The threshold level of significance for wildlife is loss of wildlife at a level that would eliminate*

occurrence of an animal species on Fort Benning or the City property or that would degrade the habitat so that the population of an animal species is measurably reduced on Fort Benning or the surrounding City property. The ROI for wildlife includes Fort Benning and Muscogee County. No species are expected to be impacted under any alternative in the current areas of the Chapel, WWII Company Street buildings, or the monuments."

Page 26, Section 3.7.3. Revise the fifth sentence to read: "Potential habitat was present for such species, but the biological assessment from Environmental Resource Analysts suggest the site of greatest potential is the aforementioned upland sandhill in the southern portion of the site, *which is not planned for development due to minimizing impacts to cultural resources in that area.*"

Page 27, Section 3.7.3. Add before last sentence in section: "Suitable habitat for amphibians and reptiles was not found in the highly degraded stream through the site. This intermittent stream, carrying significant loads of urban runoff and debris, was not considered to be suitable habitat for fish or other species and was therefore not surveyed." Change the last sentence to read, "Mitigation would be restricting development from the southern portion that consists of potential habitat for Federal or state listed faunal species."

Page 27, Section 3.7.4. Delete the first sentence of this section. Replace last sentence in section with: "The other projects in the ROI may cause adverse impacts to wildlife in the ROI, however proper mitigation for those projects and the City's green space areas and Fort Benning's wildlife management should reduce those negative impacts. There would be no (Alternative A) or negligible (action alternatives) incremental impacts, and therefore implementation of any of the alternatives would result in no cumulative impacts to wildlife."

Page 27, Section 3.8. Delete the third sentence and replace with: "That includes the Main Post Historic District, the current site of the Chapel and monuments, the City NIM property and any associated viewsheds. The relocation to the current site of other WWII Company Street buildings on Bergen Street adjacent to the existing NIM) was the subject of a prior cultural resources MOA."

Page 27, Section 3.8.1. Replace the third sentence with: "All proposed actions in the Fort Benning portion of the ROI are managed in accordance with the applicable Federal regulatory requirements and Army guidance, including additional procedural requirements for any future maintenance activities or other undertakings that may effect the current NIM or the Main Post Historic District. The Chapel relocation would be an adverse impact due to the move of that building from its historic location; however, that would be mitigated through consultation with the Georgia State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). Developing the WWII Company Street would have a positive effect to cultural resources by adding that educational facility to the current NIM area. Overall there would be no effect to cultural resources from this alternative."

Page 28, Section 3.8.2. Delete from first sentence, "and all proposed actions within this district are handled in accordance with the ICRMP".

Page 28, Section 3.8.3. Second paragraph, add after the first sentence: "The determination that the City property sites are not eligible is subject to coordination with the SHPO and the American Indian Tribes affiliated with the Fort Benning area. If the sites on City property are found to be eligible, then further consultation would be required to mitigate for construction and disturbance of those sites. If inadvertent discoveries of sites occurs on the City property area during the NIM project, all activity that could impact the site would cease until appropriate notice and/or consultation with the SHPO and Tribes." Revise the beginning of the currently second sentence in that paragraph to read, "The other two sites which are on Fort Benning property."

Page 29, Section 3.8.3. After second paragraph on page, add new third paragraph: *"Under this alternative, the WWII Company Street buildings would be removed from the current NIM location on Bergen Street to the new NIM location. The Chapel would be relocated directly from Harmony Church to the new NIM location. Because the relocation would be to a different area than previously discussed with the SHPO, consultation would be required. This consultation is presently underway with the Interpretive Plan Update and a draft MOA with the SHPO. The relocation of the monuments would result in no potential impacts to cultural resources. Fort Benning would attempt to find a productive compatible use for the current NIM building after the collection is moved and the new NIM is operational. Fort Benning has committed to the SHPO in correspondence to seek a long-term use of Bradley Hall and to maintain it in a suitable condition. If the future use differs substantially from the current use, or if disposal of the current NIM building is proposed, Fort Benning would consult with the SHPO to mitigate any adverse impacts. There would be a positive impact due to a significant portion of the museum collection being moved out of non-optimal conditions and moved to the new NIM or related facilities designed to properly store or restore those items, however some of the collection would still be stored in the current locations on Fort Benning."*

Page 30, Section 3.8.3. Add to the end of the second paragraph on the page: *"To mitigate the impacts to the Historic District and view shed, Fort Benning would consult with the SHPO to assure all new NIM building designs and NIM master plan would be compatible with Benning Boulevard and the Main Post Historic District."* Add just before the end of the third paragraph *"and Tribes"*.

Page 31, Section 3.8.4. First full paragraph on the page, first sentence, delete *"cumulative"*. Replace the last sentence in that paragraph with: *"With Implementation of the mitigation as determined through consultation, there would be negligible incremental impacts to cultural resources in the ROI due to any alternatives of the NIM proposal, and therefore implementation of any of the alternatives would result in no cumulative impacts to cultural resources."*

Page 31, Section 3.9. Replace second sentence in first paragraph with: *"Georgia and Alabama air regulation offices have recommended to US EPA that only Russell County in Alabama be designated as nonattainment, although US EPA often places an entire metropolitan statistical area into nonattainment."* Change the fourth sentence in that paragraph to read: *"If areas of Fort Benning are included in the nonattainment designation, then Fort Benning projects will be evaluated for general conformity determination."*

Page 31, Section 3.9.1. Add a sentence on the end of the paragraph: *"Overall this alternative would have very minor long term adverse impacts."*

Page 32, Section 3.9.2. First paragraph, add to the end of the first sentence, *"... (HVAC) systems at the existing NIM, until that system could be replaced during the renovations."*

Page 33, Section 3.9.4. Replace last sentence with: *"The other projects in the ROI may cause adverse impacts to air quality in the ROI, however proper mitigation for those projects through best management practices and air permitting requirements should reduce those negative impacts. There would be no incremental impacts of any alternative, and therefore implementation of any of the alternatives would result in no cumulative impacts to air quality."*

Page 34, Section 3.10. Last paragraph, revise second sentence to read: *"The ROI is the very local areas immediately adjacent to each alternative site where construction of new facilities or relocation sites (current location buildings and monuments are moved from as well as their proposed relocation areas) and noise from construction or relocation/renovation can be heard."*

Page 34, Section 3.10.1. Before the last sentence add: *"There would be no effects at the original site of the Chapel. The aesthetics near the NIM would be enhanced somewhat from the establishment of the WWII Company Street near the existing NIM because of the presence of those WWII buildings, although there would be some short-term noise associated with the rehabilitation or renovation of those buildings and possibly some increased traffic if visitor attendance increased. The NIM building probably would continue to receive insufficient funding for optimal maintenance, which would continue the minor adverse impacts due to the building's appearance."*

Page 34, Section 3.10.2. Replace the last sentence in the section with: *"The potential impacts due to the relocation of the Chapel and the development and operation of the WWII Company Street would be the same as those described for Alternative A."*

Page 35, Section 3.10.3. Before last sentence add: *"The relocation of the Chapel at would have the same effects on the original Chapel location as described for Alternative A. The relocation of the other WWII Company Street buildings from the current location to the new NIM location would cause some temporary negative impacts during the move, but the development of the WWII Company Street on the NIM site would be a positive minor impact. The vacated current NIM building would accommodate another useful purpose, but may not receive the additional funding required for optimal maintenance; while the associated aesthetic effect cannot be determined, the cultural resource consultation requirements for the potential impacts of reuse of the current NIM building would minimize negative impacts."* In last sentence, change "implanting" to "implementing".

Page 35, Section 3.11.1. First paragraph, add to the end of the second sentence: *", but usually they can be managed in place if intact"*.

Page 36, Section 3.11.1. Second paragraph, replace first sentence with: *"Although LBP and ACM abatement would occur at the current Chapel location prior to the relocation, the abatement will follow all applicable safety and environmental regulations to minimize impacts to safety by avoidance of hazardous materials contact with persons or the environment. Controlled access to sites for the Chapel relocation and the WWII Company Street rehabilitation and renovation would be maintained in accordance with industry standards to ensure safety. There would be no impacts to children or minority or low-income populations. Overall, this alternative would have no effect to the public health or safety."*

Page 37, Section 3.11.3. Add after the bulleted list: *"The drums, batteries and other solid waste found on Fort Benning property do not appear to have caused any contamination and they will be disposed of in a properly licensed landfill; however no NIM construction is proposed for these areas. Fort Benning Environmental Management Division (EMD) will make a determination whether or not the solid waste locations qualify as areas of concern or solid waste management units and, if so, follow the applicable Federal and state laws, and permit requirements. EMD will also follow any Federal or state requirements for disposition of the monitoring well and the sludge application area."*

Page 37, Section 3.11.4. Delete the text in this section and replace with: *"Because the required safety and environmental requirements will be followed under any alternative, which will minimize the safety risks, there would be no cumulative impacts to public health or safety from any of the alternatives, even considering other projects in the ROI."*

Page 41, Section 4.1. First paragraph, after the first sentence add: *"The Chapel would be relocated to the current NIM site and the WWII Company Street would be developed, but there generally would be only short-term negative impacts related to the relocation and renovation/restoration."*

Page 41, Section 4.1. Second paragraph, change the second sentence to read: *"The Chapel would be relocated to the current NIM site and the WWII Company Street would be developed, but there generally would be only short-term negative impacts related to the relocation and renovation/restoration."*

Page 41, Section 4.1. Third paragraph, second sentence, replace the words after "archeological resources" with, *"and mitigation would minimize adverse impacts to other historic properties"*. In the third sentence change "a wetland" to *"two wetland areas."* Replace the last sentence in the paragraph with: *"No Federal or state listed species or other environmental media would be significantly impacted by this alternative."*

3. The Mitigation and Monitoring Plan at EA Appendix B is a draft and is subject to revision based upon further project details, consultation on cultural resource matters, and other factors. Requests for copies of the latest draft or the final Mitigation and Monitoring Plan should be made to: Mr. John E. Brown, NEPA Program Manager, Environmental Management Division, Building 6, Room 309, Fort Benning, Georgia 31905-5122.

4. Point of contact regarding this EA Errata Sheet: Mr. John E. Brown, NEPA Program Manager, Environmental Management Division, Building 6, Room 309, Fort Benning, Georgia 31905-5122.

Sincerely


Craig Taylor
Acting Director of Public Works

SEP 15 2004