APPENDIX A

TANK AND BRADLEY FIGHTING VEHICLE GUNNERY TABLES

GUNNERY TABLES

Abrams M1A1 Tank Systems gunnery exercises consist of the following tank tables and in the following sequence:

- Table I Basic Gunnery Skills (Individual)
 - Trains the soldier in basic gunnery skills to include target acquisition, target designation, gun laying, manipulation, and direct-fire adjustment.
- Table II Basic Gunnery Skills (Individual/Crew)
 - Trains the individual soldier and crew to engage stationary and moving targets, placed in tactical arrays, from a stationary tank.
- Table III Basic Training Course (Crew)
 - Tasks the crew to refine skills developed in Tables I and II and introduces offensive engagements and Nuclear-Biological-Chemical (NBC) conditions. A minimum of one day and one night engagement will be fired in an NBC environment.
- Table IV Tank Crew Proficiency Course (Crew)
 - This is the basic qualification table for tanks crews and is designed to evaluate the tank crew's ability to engage stationary and moving targets placed in tactical arrays, from a stationary and moving tank.
- Table V Preliminary Machine Gun Training (Crew)
 - Trains the tank crew to engage stationary and moving targets, placed in tactical arrays, from a stationary and moving tank with tank-mounted automatic weapons. One day and one night engagement will be fired in an NBC environment.
- Table VI Preliminary Main Gun Training (Crew)
 - Consists of eight tasks designed to train the tank crew to engage stationary and moving targets using either precision or degraded-mode gunnery techniques from a stationary or moving tank; this is the first table where main gun firing occurs.
- Table VII Intermediate Training Course (Crew)
 - Trains the tank crew to engage moving and stationary, air and ground targets with tank-mounted weapons; consists of six day and three night tasks with single, multiple, or multiple-weapon system engagements (to include main gun or machine gun); one day engagement will be fired with protective masks and over-pressurization.
- Table VIII Intermediate Qualification Course (Crew)
 - This is the individual crew qualification table testing the skills learned in the previous tables; consists of five day and five night firing tasks; one of the day and one of the night engagements will be in an NBC environment.
- Table XI Advanced Training Course (Platoon)
 - Trains the platoon to control and distribute platoon direct fire to destroy enemy targets in a tactical scenario; table is fired using gunnery training devices or dry against full-scale targets; constitutes the "dry run" prior to attempting Table XII tasks.

- Table XII Advanced Qualification Course (Platoon).
 - This is the platoon qualification course and requires the platoon leader to integrate fire and maneuver while testing the platoon's ability to engage moving and stationary, air and ground targets with all tank-mounted weapons during daylight and periods of limited visibility (such as night); requires the platoon to fire a scenario linking day and night phases; table is fired live (full caliber) (FM 17-12-1-2).

Bradley Master Gunner exercises consist of the following tank tables and in the following sequence:

- Table I Bradley Crew Defense (Crew)
 - This table trains crews to engage targets with training devices and introduces them to training in a gunnery environment; consists of 10 day and 10 night engagements.
- Table II Bradley Crew Proficiency Course (Crew)
 - This table introduces the crew to moving BFV engagements and develops the driving skills of the driver while the crew engages moving and stationary targets from a moving and stationary BFV; consists of six day and six night engagements.
- Table III Bradley Squad/Section Exercise (Squad)
 - This table integrates the dismounted squad with their vehicle section while conducting squad collective tasks; consists of mounted, dismounted, and crew drills.
- Table IV Bradley Platoon Proficiency Course (Crew)
 - This table integrates the mounted and dismounted elements of the platoon while conducting platoon collective tasks; consists of mounted and dismounted attack and defend scenarios.
- Table V Crew Practice 1 (Crew)
 - This table introduces the crew to a live-fire gunnery environment utilizing the 7.62mm coax machine gun against stationary and moving targets; consist of five day and five night engagements.
- Table VI Crew Practice 2 (Crew)
 - This table is the first to require the crew to fire with full-caliber ammunition using the 25mm gun and the 7.62mm coax burst techniques against moving and stationary targets and against point and area targets; consists of four day and three night engagements.
- Table VII Crew Practice 3 (Crew)
 - This table is the first to require the crew to conduct offensive engagements with full-caliber ammunition at combat ranges to engage moving and stationary targets during day and night from a stationary and moving BFV; consist of four day and four night engagements.
- Table VIII Crew Qualification (Crew)
 - This is a single-vehicle qualification table that evaluates the crew's ability to acquire and engage targets during various firing conditions; consists of five day and five night engagements.

- Table IX Scout Team Training (Scout Team)
 - This trains and evaluates scout team tactical and gunnery skills on stationary and moving targets; may be conducted using either live-fire or laser-fire; team training table must contain, at a minimum, the nine combat critical tasks, three commander-selected tactical tasks, and the required percentage of gunnery tasks; consists of four day and three night tasks, including at least one NBC and auxiliary sight engagement.
- Table X Scout Team Qualification (Scout Team)
 - This evaluates the scout team's tactical and gunnery proficiency in a realistic tactical and live-fire scenario; consists of eight day and two night tasks/engagements, including at least one NBC and auxiliary sight engagement.
- Table XI Bradley Platoon Practice (Platoon)
 - This table prepares the platoon for qualification and is the first time that BFV and dismounted infantry conduct live-fire at the platoon level; platoon gunnery consists overall of one day and one night engagement; a minimum of two NBC engagements are conducted by both the BFV and the dismounted infantry, with one occurring during the day and one occurring at night.
- Table XII Qualification (Platoon)
 - This evaluates the platoon's ability to execute collective tasks in a tactical live-fire environment; mounted and dismounted infantry are integrated and evaluated on their ability to fight as a cohesive BFV platoon; consists of an evaluation of tasks learned during Table XI (FM 23-1).

APPENDIX B

PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT PLAN FOR THE FORT BENNING DMPRC

Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex Public and Stakeholder Involvement Plan

Revised on 26 August 2003

1. PURPOSE.

1.1 Need for Project. Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a Digital Multipurpose Range Complex (DMPRC) to enhance realistic training required to prepare Soldiers for their missions. Specifically the current range used to train Bradley Fighting Vehicle crews and Abrams tank crews for gunnery training falls short of the standard called "Table XII." The training capability on the current range (Hastings Range) is limited by several factors including range configuration, and antiquated targetry and equipment. A DMPRC at Fort Benning would support Army Transformation by providing a state-of-the-art range for the legacy forces for decades.

1.2 Need for Public and Stakeholder Involvement Plan. Construction and operation of a DMPRC at Fort Benning involves legally mandated public comment and document review periods, as well as an opportunity to distribute positive news about Fort Benning and the proposed DMPRC while proactively identifying and addressing related community concerns. In addition to the general public, stakeholders must be identified and invited to participate, as well as regulator involvement, as appropriate. This Plan presents a comprehensive means of satisfying legal requirements while enhancing community knowledge and participation in the planning for the proposed DMPRC at Fort Benning. Throughout this Plan, "public" is used to broadly describe individuals that are in communities near the project proposal area or that may be interested or affected by the DMPRC action. "Stakeholder" is used to identify those entities that have an additional relationship to Fort Benning environmental resources or regulatory ore governmental duties. Stakeholders include Federally recognized American Indian Tribes affiliated with the Fort Benning area (Tribes); Federal, state and local governmental agencies with regulatory authority over Fort Benning (e.g. United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and Georgia Environmental Protection Division); special interest groups with a charter involving environmental or military matters, and others.

1.2.1 Public involvement required by environmental laws and regulations.

1.2.1.1 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The primary law that drives public involvement is the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). NEPA requires Federal agencies, such as the Army at Fort Benning, to prepare an environmental analysis of the proposed action and alternatives. Potential environmental impacts, both direct and indirect, are identified for the proposal and each alternative, and possible mitigation for any negative impacts is presented. Also, cumulative impacts (i.e. incremental impacts when considering other projects or actions in a region of affect) are identified as well as any resultant mitigation. Differing levels of NEPA analysis are available, however the proposed DMPRC is a significant Federal action that has the

potential to impact the environment, so Fort Benning is preparing an environmental impact statement (EIS).

An EIS is a comprehensive document that generally follows a specific format that can appear daunting to those other than environmental planning professions. The Council for Environmental Quality (CEQ) has NEPA oversight for the Federal government and has published regulations and guidance for preparation of an EIS. The Army supplements NEPA and the CEQ directions with an Army Regulation 200-2, Environmental Effects of Army Actions (AR 200-2), current version effective 29 March 2002. AR 200-2 provides guidelines for the contents of an EIS and the processes required for full environmental analysis with participation by public, stakeholders, and regulators. This Plan will not restate the provisions of AR 200-2, so attention to the specific requirements provided therein is required to fully comply with AR 200-2 and the Army's guidance on public and stakeholder participation and scoping.

NEPA requires several opportunities for public participation, often called public scoping, during preparation of and EIS. Public interaction is based on two-way communication that reflect the needs of the community, utilizing such methods as notices, brochures, news releases, web page information, summaries, draft documents, public meetings, comments and other methods. Fort Benning should update the community at least at each significant phase or milestone of environmental planning. This Plan will address the optimal means of meeting the NEPA requirements at each stage. More details regarding the requirements for notices, documents reviews and comment periods are provided below.

1.2.1.2. Other Laws and Regulations. There are a range of other laws and regulations that require public notices and participation during the planning phases of a Federal project, and some are relevant to the proposed DMPRC. Although NEPA may address some of the topics and issues in the EIS, Fort Benning must still satisfy the requirements of these other laws and regulations. Additional requirements for public or stakeholder involvement include laws, regulations or executive orders addressing: historic properties or cultural resources; permits for wetland disturbance; and others. Often additional planning documents will be required and available for public review and comment.

1.2.1.3. Integration of Information. Fort Benning will use information sharing, referencing, and other means to maximize the efficiency and affect of public and stakeholder involvement in the environmental planning process. Because NEPA is an umbrella-type process and produces a comprehensive document, other public participation requirements will be woven into the existing framework for the NEPA public involvement. When the Environmental Impact Computer System (ECIS) is established in approximately fiscal year (FY) 2004, i.e. the Fall of calendar year 2003, as indicated by AR 200-2, then Fort Benning will utilize the ECIS.

1.2.2. Proactive Information Opportunity. AR 200-2 encourages continuous, two-way communication to enhance public and stakeholder participation. Fort Benning should take this

opportunity to educate the public about Fort Benning's mission, environmental stewardship, the proposed DMPRC, and mitigation important to the community. Various methods of communication with the public or more focused audiences are available, such as: mailings in the form of letters, brochures, information packets; electronic communications by emailing or website information; telephone calls and information lines; articles for Post and local newspapers; information presented via radio or television broadcasts; open houses or site visits; and meetings on an individual, small group or large group format. Normally, using a few communication devices that are focused and meet the communities needs will be most effective. This Plan will introduce opportunities to inform the public at various phases or milestone events.

1.2.3. Goals of Plan. Fort Benning is committed to meet the legal requirements and also take measures for more meaningful communication and involvement of the public and stakeholders in our planning of the proposed DMPRC. Limitations in resources, personnel and time impose constraints that necessitate an efficient and realistic Plan. This Plan must assist DMPRC planners and be realistic for implementation. Goals for this Plan include:

i. Promote an understanding of public and stakeholder involvement requirements and opportunities for better resourcing and scheduling;

ii. Specify steps needed to meet legal responsibilities for comment opportunities of public members and stakeholders;

iii. List realistic time frames and responsible persons or offices for each step;

iv. Coordinate activities to maximize the quality of the information, ensure the information relates to planning actions in process, and incorporate any resultant feedback into future participation or planning processes;

v. Incorporate opportunities to present information to better partner with the community; and

vi. Keep PAOs informed at all levels.

2. PLAN STRUCTURE. This Plan is presented chronologically, providing the anticipated steps, time frames and actions. Although this Plan is meant to serve as a foundation for public and stakeholder involvement, it will probably have to be adjusted to accommodate changes. Items in this Plan should be evaluated for suitability before engaging in the recommended actions. AR 200-2 divides the scoping process into three phases for simplification: the preliminary Phase, the Public Interaction Phase, and the Final Phase. Although the majority of public and stakeholder involvement is conducted in the Public Interaction Phase, the other two stages encompass important steps to prepare for and respond to public and stakeholder involvement. This Plan will use the three phases to organize this Plan, although the phases often overlap.

3. PRELIMINARY PHASE.

3.1. Initial Internal Scoping. This is an internal Fort Benning action that is normally very informal and may result in limited amounts of documentation. Often proponents of the proposal start this internal scoping as a natural part of planning for the proposal, rather than as a conscious

effort to conduct internal scoping. Internal scoping is a process of identifying project requirements, initial environmental concerns, and possibly explore options to address those concerns. Internal scoping is important because it commences the environmental analysis; however internal scoping obviously is only a precursor to public and stakeholder involvement. It is important for the proponent and all those working with the proponent to keep in mind that the decisions regarding the project are not final and are just proposals. Until the process of environmental analysis and documenting a decision is complete, the proponent should be open to modifying the project, especially to reduce environmental impacts or to incorporate comments or mitigation.

3.1.1. Identify Proponent. Initially, the proponent(s) of the proposal is identified. There is often a misunderstanding that the environmental office is the proponent because environmental analysis is involved; however that is not the case. The environmental office assists the proponent in meeting the proponent's environmental responsibilities, but the Environmental Management Division (EMD) of Fort Benning does not get funding, personnel or resources to complete the environmental planning and documentation. Instead those are normally the proponent's responsibility. Usually the proponent is the person or activity that has initiated the action, has initiated a funding request, and makes the important decisions or recommendations regarding the project. For the DMPRC proposal, the proponent has been identified as the Directorate of Training (DOT), Fort Benning; however, the Directorate of Facilities Engineering and Logistics (DFEL) plays a vital role for Military Construction Activity (MCA) projects. In DFEL the Real Property Master Planner and the DMPRC Environmental Project Manager will work closely with DOT and range planners and users. As the project planning progresses, other units or activities may be added to the list of proponents, but currently they should be considered stakeholders, affected or interested parties, or beneficiaries of the project. This is often a good time to identify who will be the point of contact (POC) for the proponent for routine matters. The Range Division Chief and Range Manager have been designated as the DOT POCs for the DMPRC proposal.

3.1.2. Coordinate with Environmental Planners. For actions that could have, i.e. the potential to have, a negative impact or a substantial positive impact on the environment, the proponent is required to coordinate with EMD. Early coordination is required for large or complex projects. Failure to coordinate early can lead to several problems, including failure to maintain a proper NEPA record, delay in project execution, extra expense from redesigns and incorporation of mitigation, plus other problems. Normally the proponent initiates coordination by submitting a completed Fort Benning Form 144R to EMD to determine what level of NEPA analysis is required; however the NEPA documentation for some proposals obviously requires more complex NEPA analysis and the internal scoping can begin with a kick-off meeting or other ways. Identifying the POC for the environmental office is also beneficial at this point. For the DMPRC project, the main POC is the DMPRC Environmental Project Manager.

The DMPRC internal scoping commenced in 1999 in conjunction with the DOT and the Fort Benning command submitting a request for Major Construction Activity (MCA) funding for construction of the DMPRC. Obtaining funding is often a long process and often is started before intense interaction with the environmental office because at this stage very little information about the project is available and funding may never be obtained. Normally after funding is reasonably certain, the proponent begins working in earnest on project design and environmental concerns. With indications that the DMPRC project was high on the list of possible projects for approval, DOT coordinated with EMD in 1999 to begin a draft Environmental Assessment. DOT and EMD initially explored possible construction locations for the DMPRC and the obvious environmental concerns. Further data gathering and analysis will be necessary during the NEPA process, but several locations were considered for feasibility based upon mission requirements and estimates of environmental impacts. The draft EA was never finalized because Fort Benning determined an EIS was required; therefore the EIS will incorporate the draft EA scoping only to the extent of the preliminary phase because the draft EA was not presented for public review and comment. One site analyzed in the draft EA was found to best meet mission requirements and minimize environmental impacts, and that site has been considered Fort Benning's preferred site- Alternative III. A secondary site was also carried forward as an action alternative for EIS – Alternative II. Another alternative that arose as a result of internal scoping was the use of existing ranges at Fort Stewart, GA.

Because Fort Stewart has a role in a couple of the currently proposed DMPRC alternatives and was analyzed as a potential alternative in its own right, coordination with Fort Stewart staff was initiated. During the processes outlined in this Plan, Fort Benning worked with Fort Stewart personnel to incorporate that community into the DMPRC public and stakeholder scoping process. This involved inclusion of Fort Stewart area affected or interested persons, information and document distribution, and possibly public meetings. Ongoing analysis of the use of existing Fort Stewart ranges as an alternative, however, determined it to be non-viable and it was eliminated from further in-depth evaluation in the DEIS. Specifically, the cost to transport all required troops and equipment (to include tanks and/or BFVs) would be prohibitive; and, although sufficient range space exists on Fort Stewart to accommodate advanced gunnery training, the time to get on the queue for this training is approximately two years, which is an unrealistic lead time for scheduling training. This alternative may be evaluated later throughout the ongoing NEPA process for this project, should more interest develop as a result of subsequent scoping meetings and public input and/or following the review of the DEIS

3.1.3. Document internal scoping efforts. NEPA compliance involves keeping records of alternatives explored, issues brought up, personnel involved, and other aspects of the internal scoping process. Preparing meeting minutes or notes or other evidence of internal scoping is helpful not only for maintaining an administrative file, but also to later recall information for environmental document preparation. Options that may have been considered informally in the internal scoping process may be a basis for an alternative to study formally in the EIS. This internal scoping does not substitute for public scoping, but it is a necessary precursor.

3.1.4. Coordinate with Public Affairs Officers (PAO). The Environmental Project Coordinator as well as EMD and DFEL will keep the Public Affairs Officers (PAOs) at Fort Benning informed regarding environmental planning and scoping for the DMPRC. The Fort Benning PAO will in turn keep the appropriate TRADOC and DA PAOs, including Fort Stewart PAO, informed through routine communication and copies of news releases and other informative documents.

3.1.5. Tentative List of Affected and Interested Parties (Mailing List). EMD maintains

a NEPA mailing list consisting of individuals or entities that have shown interest in Fort Benning's environmental studies or projects in the past. The mailing list also includes Federal, state and local government offices, consulting American Indian Tribes, and anyone else requesting to be on the mailing list. This list should be thoroughly reviewed and adjusted for each NEPA action. Moving toward an electronic mailing database would be more efficient for many on the mailing list, and EMD should acquire email addresses for those who indicate a preference to receive email rather than traditional mail. At this time however, email cannot totally replace the numerous mailings that are required for notices associated with the DMPRC EIS processing.

For the DMPRC proposal, Fort Benning has taken the basic Mailing List and adjusted it accordingly. Several entities or individuals were added to the List based on interest in similar projects at Fort Benning or other Army installations; incorporating those interested or affected due to potential impacts at Fort Stewart; to expand the List per guidance in AR 200-2 to include additional groups, organizations, individuals, governmental agencies, and others; and in response to initial discussions with other governmental agency representatives. A few names were also removed from the standard list to reflect an initial determination that those individuals or entities would not be interested or affected by the DMPRC proposal. Part of the scoping process will be to continue requesting additional entries for the Mailing List through all stages and means of scoping. This List will be updated routinely to add individuals, organizations, entities and government agencies that may be affected by or interested in the DMPRC proposal.

3.1.6. Tentative environmental planning and decision-making schedule. The DMPRC Environmental Coordinator maintains a schedule of the NEPA process and the other major environmental planning processes. The DMPRC design is required with enough specificity to conduct meaningful environmental analysis, but at an early enough stage that allows further changes based on comments and mitigation requirements. For the DMPRC, Fort Benning is using the standard design for initial environmental planning; however indications are that notable changes may be made by the range designers based on internal Army input until the 60% design stage. This means that development of the PDEIS may be delayed if the design does not proceed in a timely manner. The goal is to incorporate into the PDEIS the supporting environmental information in stages, e.g. the noise information in one month, the wetlands information during the next months, the protected species information after that, and so on. This approach will leverage the information prepared to satisfy other environmental planning requirements by using that in the PDEIS preparation. Drafting of the PDEIS will require collecting additional information and conducting additional analysis, but duplication of effort will be avoided. This means that the PDEIS may be stalled while waiting for specific enough information to sustain rigorous environmental analysis. Fort Benning personnel are working closely to conduct a thorough environmental analysis and avoid delays where possible. Fort Benning will follow the AR 200-2 timeframes required for EIS processing. The EIS preparation process is not considered exempt from any of the normal procedural requirements of scoping or AR 200-2 at this time; however mission and national security or unforeseen events could change that status.

3.2. Preparation of a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS.

3.2.1. NOI Drafting. A Notice of Intent (NOI) signals to the public that an EIS will be prepared for a proposed project. The NOI is a fairly structured notice that states basic information about the proposal and asks the public for input. Normally plans to hold a public meeting associated with preparation of a draft EIS (DEIS) is included in the NOI. AR 200-2 requires additional draft letters and memorandums to accompany the NOI during Army routing, such as the Information for Members of Congress, Response to Correspondents, Press Release and a section of Questions and Answers. These documents compose the NOI package. Although the proponent is responsible for the NOI package, the environmental office often does most of the drafting of the NOI package.

The NOI must be written in layman's terms. Military and environmental jargon and acronyms should be avoided where possible. Use simple, straightforward language. A suggested format is included in the AR 200-2, but it is better to obtain a recent example of an NOI package that the MACOM and DA approved and use that as a template. The Installation should involve all relevant Installation offices and personnel when drafting the NOI package, to include not only the proponent and the environmental office, but also the public affairs office, the staff judge advocate's office, and others.

3.2.2. NOI Package Routing. The Proponent must staff the NOI package through the Installation and Major Command (MACOM) proponent channels to the Headquarters level per AR 200-2, and the NOI package is coordinated with the environmental staff at each level. Often it is beneficial to have informal coordination between the Installation and MACOM environmental staffs prior to a formal submission. EMD may provide a draft NOI package to TRADOC environmental office with a request for informal review. Informal review comments may be incorporated or addressed prior to the formal submission to the MACOM which may speed up the formal review process. DA usually involves the Army Environmental Center (AEC) in review of the NOI package, but the Installation could request AEC informal review of the NOI package if warranted.

After TRADOC and DA revisions are incorporated into the NOI package, DA sends the NOI to the EPA and notifies Congress of the NOI. Shortly thereafter, EPA normally requests publication of the NOI in the FR. Usually the request must be submitted at least a week prior to publication. The Installation should publish the NOI and possibly the Press Release in the local newspaper and the Installation newspaper (*The Bayonet*). Additional means of getting the notice out to the public should be considered to ensure the public knows about this early opportunity to provide input and attend any expected public scoping meetings.

3.2.3 Current Status of DMPRC NOI (as of 26 August 2003). Using the information obtained from internal scoping, Fort Benning prepared an NOI for the DMPRC and submitted it via TRADOC to HQDA on 16 August 2001. In September 2001, TRADOC indicated that the NOI package should be revised to include more information regarding the Army Transformation initiative, so Fort Benning withdrew the NOI package (October 01), made appropriate revisions (November 01), rerouted for Ft Benning signature (December

01), and resubmitted it to TRADOC on 25 January 2002. After endorsement by TRADOC and HQDA coordination, HQDA authorized release of the NOI for publication in the FR.

In accordance with CEQ Regulation 1508.22 and AR 200-2, an NOI advising the public of the intent of the Army to prepare an EIS for the DMPRC was published in February 2003 in the Federal Register and in the following local newspapers: the Columbus Ledger-Enquirer (Columbus), The Tri-County Journal (Buena Vista), and The Savannah Morning News (Fort Stewart); in addition, the NOI also invited participation in the two public scoping meetings held on 18 and 20 February in Columbus and Buena Vista, GA, as described above. Due to the potential for utilization of existing ranges on Fort Stewart in "Alternative I, No Action/Status Quo," of the PDEIS, the organizations/agencies/individuals in Fort Stewart and its surrounding communities received copies of the NOI and other public documents, such as the aforementioned newsletters.

3.2.4. Remaining Steps for NOI Approval and Publication. None; see above.

3.2.5. Public Comments Prior to the NOI. Occasionally a member of the public, a stakeholder or a regulator will submit written comments or give verbal input prior to the publication of the NOI. Regulators have a tendency to provide input prior to the NOI publication especially if Fort Benning communicates early with those regulators about the project. Fort Benning should capture those public, stakeholder and regulator comments for the administrative record, and consider them as input or scoping for the proposal. Some regulators will be providing later formal reviews, such as the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) preparing a biological opinion, or EPA providing DEIS review comments, but earlier comments should be documented if feasible.

4. PUBLIC INTERACTION PHASE. Although the public meetings are often the most publicized opportunity during the Public Interaction Phase of the EIS process, other forms of public scoping should not be neglected. This phase starts at beginning of the public comment period with publication of the NOI and goes through the completion of the public comment period for the DEIS.

4.1. Preparing for the initial scoping meeting.

Planning for the public scoping meeting should involve a disciplinary team which must include the PAO representative, the proponent, environmental specialists, and others as appropriate. The planning must be done well in advance to achieve the following goals:

a. the DMPRC proposal can be presented in a professional manner using media that is readily understandable;

b. experts in various disciplines are on-hand to answer questions and discuss issues in an appropriate manner;

c. the format encourages the public to provide comments in a manner that they can be documented and considered in further project development; and

d. PAO escorts media and coordinates any interviews or statements.

4.1.1. Scheduling the scoping meeting. Estimating the date of the public scoping meeting may be challenging given the dependency on approval and publication of the NOI. The NOI will normally indicate a scoping meeting is planned. Fort Benning's draft NOI states that scoping meeting(s) will be held, but does not set a specific time or place. Further notices through local media, Fort Benning's website, as well as mailing to those affected or interested will be required once the location, date and time are finalized. Scoping meetings should be held no sooner than 15 days after the notices have been published in the local newspapers and publication of the NOI. The comment period will be no less than 30 days from the publication of the NOI.

Fort Benning personnel should make the best estimate of the likely public meeting timeframe and start planning months in advance. Some alternatives currently considered for the DMPRC involve the northeastern portion of the Installation, which is distant from the cantonment area and the nearest large city facilities, or involve Fort Stewart. Therefore scoping meetings may be held in Columbus, Georgia, as well as in Chattahoochee and/or Marion County. The Elizabeth Bradley Turner Center at Columbus State University has worked well for public meetings in the past, and is often used by local government or groups for public meetings. Coordination with Chattahoochee and Marion County offices will assist in identifying available meeting sites. A meeting at Fort Stewart will not be required, although potential impacts to Fort Stewart or the community are anticipated to be minimal at this time.

Displays and visual aids (charts, photographs, video clips, etc.) should be prepared to describe the proposed action; the preferred alternative and other alternatives; the significant potential impacts and mitigation; and public's role in the NEPA process (i.e. opportunity to review DEIS and comment). Layman's terms should be used and acronyms avoided where possible. Displays and media should be content-driven rather than going for glitziness. See AR 200-2 Section 651.50 for more information.

4.1.2. Information dissemination prior to the scoping meeting. Prior to the scoping meeting, either in conjunction with or after the NOI publication, a brochure and news release should be generated to discuss the need for the DMPRC project. This initial communication will lay the framework for later environmental issues, but this is a prime opportunity to address Fort Benning's need for the project.

4.1.3. Conduct of the scoping meeting. Entrance to the public meeting should be made by one route so that all meeting participants pass by a welcome table where each is requested to sign in and is given a comment card. Each person present at the public meeting should sign an attendance list providing full name, address, email, and an indication if they would like to be placed on the regular or email mailing list. Comment cards or forms should be provided for those wanting to make comments at the public meeting, and a Fort Benning POC and mailing address should be included on the form so that those wishing to send in comments later may do so. Prior brochures, mailings or other information sheets may also be provided at the welcome table. The welcome table should have a clearly marked box or container for receipt of comments. Plenty of writing utensils should also be provided. To

accommodate non-writers or those who prefer oral statements, a court reporter may be employed to obtain comments recorded as verbatim transcripts.

On 18 February 2003, a public scoping meeting for the proposed DMPRC was held in Columbus, GA, at the Elizabeth Bradley Turner Center, Columbus State University. The meeting lasted from 6-8 p.m. and consisted of an open house format with displays, a terrain model, and subject matter experts to answer questions from the public. A public scoping meeting was also held at the Marion County Courthouse in the nearby city of Buena Vista on 20 February 2003, utilizing the same displays, terrain model, and subject matter experts. Several written and verbal comments were obtained at these meetings and may be viewed in the DEIS. In addition, comment sheets (given out at the public scoping meetings) were also mailed to Fort Benning by the meeting attendees; these are also included in the DEIS, as are all comments received by phone. No comments, either written or verbal, were received from the Fort Stewart area.

4.1.4. Consideration of scoping meeting comments. Comments may be summarized and grouped by topic. A response to the comment topics will be prepared, and this summary document will be included in the PDEIS. All relevant comments will be considered in drafting of the PDEIS. Individual response to comments is probably not required at this stage, although the content of some comments may warrant an individual response.

5. PREPARATION OF THE DEIS AND THE NOA.

5.1. Involvement in Development of the DEIS. The DEIS is the first full-scale environmental analysis document available for public review and comment in the EIS process. While several partial drafts of the DEIS may be routed for review at the Installation level, the first draft to leave the installation for MACOM and then DA review is the preliminary DEIS (PDEIS). The PDEIS should be the Installation's best attempt to inform the public and incorporate any scoping from the Preliminary Phase into the environmental analysis.

5.2. Preparation of the PDEIS.

5.2.1. PDEIS Drafting. The PDEIS should follow the general format in AR 200-2 although variations can be made as long as all required information and analysis are included. As with the NOI package, generally the Installation may request MACOM informal review of all or portions of the PDEIS before forwarding it for formal review. The PDEIS is not normally made available for the public and should be labeled "For Internal Use Only – Deliberative Process."

Preparation of a PDEIS varies according to information availability and complexity among other factors, but an estimate for the DMPRC PDEIS is approximately 18 months after our first NOI submission to TRADOC. Environmental analysis in the PDEIS requires reliable information regarding the project design. The DMPRC PDEIS cannot adequately analyze the potential environmental impacts of constructing the DMPRC and operating it without having details regarding ground disturbance, stream crossings, hazardous material use, air pollution source, etc. So the DMPRC PDEIS may be delayed if the design or supporting environmental information are not available. The Installation must schedule surveys and information collection to support preparation of the PDEIS. The Environmental Project Manager (EPM) is attempting to have information flow to the PDEIS preparer in stages appropriate for incorporation into the PDEIS over several months. Developing the PDEIS simultaneously with other environmental planning requirements is efficient and credible.

This approach also supports an outreach program that targets certain topics related to milestones in the DMPRC planning. As a certain study or document is prepared, a related news release, brochure or other appropriate information can be generated to keep the public informed during the process. The schedule is fluid and while changes are inevitable, identifying the relative placement of these proactive opportunities in the schedule should assist in planning.

5.2.2. Gathering information. Due to the comprehensive nature of an environmental impact statement, the PDEIS preparer must have access to numerous types and sources of information. Much information can be obtained from existing sources, however additional surveys and/or analysis will normally be required. Coordination with the proponent, Fort Benning stakeholders and external participants should be conducted early to ensure the information is correctly presented in the PDEIS.

5.2.3. Coordinating with other environmental requirements. Several other environmental requirements will involve collecting of data, analyzing potential project impacts, and considering possible mitigation. Information obtained to satisfy other requirements can be incorporated into the PDEIS when available. Often only a summary of the related information is presented, with either a reference to the full document, placing the full document in an appendix, or incorporating by reference. If either referencing or incorporating another document, the full test of the document should be available for public review when the PDEIS is made publicly available (as a DEIS). Also, the PDEIS should indicate how the other related environmental documents and processes relate to the EIS and the NEPA process. If possible, the public involvement activities should be integrated to meet the requirements of NEPA and other requirements to present a complete picture of the project and potential environmental impacts to the public. The main non-NEPA requirements are listed below, however others may arise during the process, so this is not an exhaustive list. Also care must be taken to protect information from some of these sources from public review or distribution (see section below).

5.2.3.1. Endangered Species. The Endangered Species Act, implementing regulations, and Army regulations require consultation with US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) when the project has the potential to adversely impact Federally protected species, either directly or indirectly. Army regulations further require the Installation to consider a project's potential impact on other species of concern, such as State-protected species and those species that may soon be on the Federal list. Coordination regarding the State protected species is primarily with the appropriate State agency, such as the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (GA DNR). The

DMPRC project has the potential to impact the Federally protected red-cockaded woodpecker, as well as some State species such as the gopher tortoise.

Fort Benning is preparing a biological assessment (BA) to identify the possible impact of the DMPRC construction and operation on the RCWs and other protected species. Informal coordination with the USFWS has started early, and information from those discussions can provide useful insights and information for the PDEIS preparation. Certainly, a draft BA in its final stages is an invaluable source of information for the PDEIS portions addressing protected species. The USFWS normally provides a biological opinion (BO) in reply to the BA. Normally at least portions of the BA and BO are releasable to the public under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) or other provision by either the installation or the USFWS. These documents are often included or referenced in the DEIS. Correspondence between the Post and the USFWS or State Agencies may also be placed in an appendix to the EIS. Be sure, however, to carefully review the releasibility of information regarding the locations of protected species that could be harassed or collected, or whose habitat could be damaged. An opportunity to distribute information about protected species arises when the BA is prepared, if not before. Examples of previously used brochures may offer formatting or content aids.

5.2.3.2. Cultural Resources. The main laws that are applicable to most Fort Benning activities include the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), and the Archeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA), although several other Federal and state laws could also apply. Federal regulations implementing the laws are augmented by Executive Orders and Army regulations. These requirements stress that Fort Benning must make good faith efforts to consult with the Georgia State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) as well as any other states that may be involved, and the Federally recognized American Indian Tribes that are associated with the Fort Benning region (Tribes). The Installation must also at least inform the Advisory Council for Historic Properties (ACHP) of consultation actions, and the ACHP may become a consulting party for projects with significant cultural resource issues.

Consultation should start early in the process with an invitation to consult, followed by correspondence, discussions and/or meetings to identify the historic properties, the potential impact to those properties and avoidance or mitigation measures. Information can be gleaned from this consultation process for the EIS, although the consultation process may proceed beyond the timeframe established for the public release of the DEIS. The consultation results are normally documented in a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for the project. The MOA and its attachments may be incorporated or referenced in the DEIS, however care must be taken to identify during consultation the information about specific historic properties that should not be released to the public. An opportunity to acquaint the public and stakeholders with the historic property resources and issues should arise during this process, possibly after the Phase II studies or at least once a draft MOA is being considered.

5.2.3.4. Wetlands Permitting and Mitigation. Projects that involve wetlands disturbance may require permitting by either nationwide permit (less disturbance) or individual permit (more disturbance). The Corps of Engineers (COE) wetlands regulatory branch oversees wetland permits and issues. The DMPRC will most likely require an individual permit and appropriate mitigation. The wetlands disturbance permit, often called a 404 permit, is initiated by Fort Benning submitting a permit application. The permit application should include delineation of jurisdictional wetlands, identification of wetlands and stream impacts, and means to avoid or mitigate those impacts where feasible. The COE will review the application for sufficiency, publish notice of the application and request public input, and finally issue the permit if prudent.

The permit application contains a wealth of information for the PDEIS, and that information should be relatively reliable if Fort Benning has properly coordinate with the COE regulators in advance of submitting the permit application. The resultant permit also contains information important for the DEIS and/or the Final EIS. Public involvement through the 404 permit process does not excuse that information from the public review through the EIS process. When enough information is available for wetlands and stream banks, Fort Benning should prepare and distribute an informational brochure or similar communication to the public and stakeholders. Such communication would be appropriate when a draft permit is available, if not before.

5.2.4. Coordinating with Others: Units & Commands; Installations & MACOM; Cooperating Agencies; and Regulators, Stakeholders & Consulting Parties. Once the PDEIS is draft form, it should be routed through the Army channels prior to release outside of the Army. After the PDEIS is cleared for public release, it is considered a DEIS. The review process to transform a PDEIS to the DEIS can take several months, although thorough coordination and scoping can minimize later revisions. The first stage of PDEIS review should involve Fort Benning and tenant commands, cooperating agencies, and probably some regulators, stakeholders and consulting parties. Simultaneously or next the PDEIS is forwarded to the MACOM, TRADOC for review and comment. AR 200-2 states that only a portion of the PDEIS, a summary document, is required for routing via TRADOC to DA, an then a PDEIS would follow only upon request. If TRADOC received delegation authority to review NEPA documents for the DMPRC, then TRADOC would be authorized to approve the PDEIS; however Fort Benning would still be required to submit at least a process summary to HQDA for review and comment prior to approval for release of the DEIS to the public. See AR 200-2 651.45(d)(2) for more information.

5.2.4.1. Coordinating with Fort Benning Units and Commands. Analyzing the environmental implications of DMPRC is impossible without some understanding of the DMPRC construction and operation requirements. Environmental staff must learn from range designers (DFEL Master Planning, Engineers, COEs, and contractors), users (3rd Brigade, 3rd Infantry Division and others), and range maintenance (DOT Range Division), to name a few. The DEIS must present the need for the DMPRC, describe the construction and operation of the DMPRC, explain DMPRC alternatives and address the associated environmental issues in plain language, i.e. layman's terms.

Once the PDEIS is in draft form, the draft PDEIS (or portions thereof) should be routed to those knowledgeable in DMPRC design, construction, operation and maintenance.

5.2.4.2. Coordinating with other Installations and MACOM. The DMPRC alternatives currently include alternatives with actions at Fort Stewart, Georgia. A trip to gather information from Fort Stewart and follow-up in informal coordination provided much of the basic information required for preparation of the PDEIS. Fort Benning should give Fort Stewart the opportunity to review the PDEIS and make corrections or amend information well before public release of the DEIS. Written record of this coordination will clarify the administrative record and provide a basis for later review and response to queries. During the review and concurrence by Fort Stewart, the PDEIS may be forwarded to the MACOM for concurrent, informal review. Often an informal review allows early informal resolutions and revisions that later speed the formal MACOM review and add certainty to further planning, however, this is not a required step. At this stage also consider the desirability to forward the PDEIS to the Army Environmental Center and/or the Southern Regional Environmental Office for information or informal review if issues are involved of interest on a DOD-regional level or on an Army-wide level.

5.2.4.3. Cooperating Agencies. Early in the process of planning for PDEIS preparation, efforts should be made to determine if Federal, state or local agencies, Tribal representatives or other entities should be invited to be cooperating agencies. Some agencies have responsibilities or involvement in the NEPA process that are required by law or regulation, such as the Environmental protection Agency review of the DEIS. Those responsibilities do not alone support cooperating agency status. Instead cooperating agencies should include those agencies or entities that have some jurisdiction in and environmental matter or resource that could be affected, or if the agency has special expertise in environmental matters related to the proposal. Fort Benning should identify possible cooperating agencies, send a request for participation to those potential cooperating agencies, and include enough information in the request to identify the proposal and a suggested means of the potential cooperating agency participation. Provide enough time for response and extend the option of the agency joining in as cooperating a later time even if the request is initially refused. Fort Benning should document every cooperating agency status with a memorandum of agreement (MOA) that described the proposal, the responsibilities of the cooperating agency and any logistical terms (review timeframes, etc.). Note that cooperating agencies generally do not include other Army agencies or entities, except when they have a regulatory role over Fort Benning's actions.

For the DMPRC proposal, preliminary scoping indicates that primary candidates for cooperating agency status include:

a. USFWS for assistance with proactive planning to minimize protected species impacts and to identify reasonable mitigation options, specifically for RCWs and habitat; and

b. COE (Wetlands Regulatory Branch) for assistance with proactive planning to minimize wetlands and stream bank impacts, to identify reasonable mitigation options, and to assist with CWA 404 permitting processing.

Fort Benning will be consulting with each of these agencies to fulfill environmental planning requirements related to the assistance identified above, so cooperating agency status may not be necessary.

Other possible entities that may agree to become cooperating agencies include:

a. Tribes for assistance via consultation and expertise to determine potential impacts to historic properties, and to identify reasonable avoidance or mitigation options; and

b. The Georgia State Historic preservation Officer (SHPO) for assistance via consultation and expertise to determine potential impacts to historic properties, and to identify reasonable avoidance or mitigation options.

While not specifically identified at this time, other possible categories of entities that may be appropriate for cooperating agency status include:

a. State or local agencies or offices that have responsibilities related to Fort Benning's natural resources;

b. Environmental groups that voice concern or interest regarding Fort Benning's resources, potential impacts or mitigation plans, and have expertise to add to the NEPA process for the DMPRC proposal; and

c. Hunters' or fishers' associations with members utilizing Fort Benning's resources.

Fort Benning will be the Lead Agency and will coordinate the DMPRC public and stakeholder participation. Cooperating agency representatives will be invited to join in planning for public scoping, including review of information for distribution and participation at public meetings. Revisions to this Plan can be made if required by Cooperating Agency participation in DMPRC scoping.

5.2.4.4. Coordination of PDEIS with Regulators, Stakeholders and Consulting Parties. Before public review of the DEIS, it may be prudent to ask regulators, stakeholders and/or consulting parties to review the PDEIS, or at least portions of the PDEIS related to their concerns. The goals are to: 1) receive verification of accuracy and further input; 2) present the best information to the public via the DEIS and 3) identify any remaining areas of concern with the regulators, stakeholders or consulting parties. Also, these entities may have a special relationship with Fort Benning that warrant a PDEIS review rather than grouping those entities with the public in the DEIS review process, such as the Tribes.

5.3. Notice of Availability (NOA) and the PDEIS package.

5.3.1. NOA and PDEIS package preparation. The NOA is the official notice that the Army and Fort Benning have prepared a DEIS for public review and comment. The NOA is very similar to the NOI, except the NOA generally includes more information regarding the

environmental analysis and conclusions presented in the DEIS. The NOA indicates where the DEIS is available for public reading and review, and the NOA also generally provides details regarding public meeting(s) and public comment deadlines. The NOA and PDEIS are included in a package which includes additional information for routing and approval, such as the Information for Members of Congress, Response to Correspondents, Press Release and a section of Questions and Answers. The NOA should not be confused with EPA's note of availability of weekly receipts (NWR) of EISs.

The NOA and associated documents should be written in layman's terms, without excessive military or environmental jargon or acronyms. Recent examples of NOA packages and the format suggested in AR 200-2 may be helpful in preparation. While the proponent is responsible for the NOA package, the environmental office usually prepares the documents. The proponent should coordinate the NOA package with the relevant units and office on Post, which includes the Public Affairs Office and the Staff Judge Advocate's Office.

5.3.2. Notice and Distribution of NOA package. After other coordination steps, the MACOM will forward the NOA and the PDEIS to DA for review and comment or revision. DA will coordinate with EPA and notify Congress in a manner similar to that used for the NOI (see paragraph 3.2.2 above and AR 200-2 for detailed information). The NOA will be published in the FR, and simultaneously should be published in the Bayonet, the Columbus Ledger-Enquirer, the Chattahoochee newspaper, and any other suitable media. The Fort Benning website should include the NOA text and at least any summary of the DEIS once approved for release, i.e. after publication in the FR. Because the DEIS may be relatively long, a summary of the DEIS may be distributed in accordance with AR 200-2 Section 651.45(d). News releases should precede the public meeting by at least 15 days, and minimum of 45 days should be allowed for public comment following the news releases or FR NOA publication. EPA also will publish a notice of availability of weekly receipts (NWR) of the DEIS in the FR.

In addition to the announcement of the NOA in various media, Fort Benning is required to make the DEIS available for review. Distribution of the complete DEIS is required unless it is unusually long, in which case a summary of the DEIS may be circulated with an attachment listing the locations where the entire DEIS may be reviewed. At a minimum, the Post will need enough copies of the DEIS for key Installation personnel and for several local libraries, including libraries on and off post. For the DMPRC proposal, libraries that should have the DEIS for review include the Main Post library; the main Columbus Library (Bradley Library or replacement) plus the South Branch; and at least one library in Marion County, which would be closer to the proposed site of the DMPRC on Fort Benning. See AR 200-2 for listing of other entities that may be included in the DEIS or summary distribution. Any person requesting the complete DEIS must be provided with a copy.

5.4. NOA and Public Meeting. Planning for the public meeting should involve a interdisciplinary team which must include the PAO representative, the proponent, environmental specialists, cooperating agencies (if any), and others as appropriate. The planning must be done well in advance to achieve the following goals:

a. a summary of the main DEIS results can be presented in a professional manner using media that is readily understandable;

b. experts in various disciplines are on-hand to answer questions and discuss issues in an appropriate manner;

c. the format encourages the public to provide comments in a manner that they can be documented and considered in further project development; and

d. PAO escorts media and coordinates any interviews or statements.

Be prepared at this public meeting to summarize the comments received from the initial scoping meeting and how those comments were considered in the DEIS preparation.

5.4.1. Preparing for the public meeting. Estimating the date of the public meeting may be challenging given the dependency on approval and publication of the NOA. Fort Benning personnel should make the best estimate of the likely public meeting timeframe and start planning months in advance. Locations and dates for a single or multiple meetings should be determined just as for the scoping meetings in paragraph 4.1 above. The comment period will be no less than 45 days from the publication of the NOA.

Displays and visual aids (charts, photographs, video clips, etc.) should be prepared as described in section 4.1. above for scoping meetings. Graphics should be content-driven and should describe the proposed action; the preferred alternative and other alternatives; the significant potential impacts and mitigation; and public's role in the NEPA process (i.e. opportunity to review DEIS and comment. Layman's terms should be used and acronyms avoided where possible. Complete copies of the DEIS should be available for review, as well as any DEIS summaries, appendices, and referenced documents.

5.4.2. Conduct of the public meeting. This meeting should be conducted similarly to the initial scoping meeting (see section 4.1. above). Entrance to the public meeting should be made by one route so that all meeting participants pass by a welcome table where each is requested to sign in and is given a comment card. Each person present at the public meeting should sign an attendance list providing full name, address, email, and an indication if they would like to be placed on the regular or email mailing list. Comment cards or forms should be provided for those wanting to make comments at the public meeting, and a Fort Benning POC and mailing address should be included on the form so that those wishing to send in comments later may do so. Prior brochures, mailings or other information sheets may also be provided at the welcome table. The welcome table should have a clearly marked box or container for receipt of comments. Plenty of writing utensils should also be provided. To accommodate non-writers or those who prefer oral statements, a court reporter may be employed to obtain comments recorded as verbatim transcripts.

5.4.3. Consideration of scoping meeting comments. All relevant comments will be considered in revising the DEIS. Comments may be summarized and grouped by topic. A response to the comment topics will be prepared, and this summary document will be included in the Final EIS (FEIS). Individual response to comments may also be prudent at this stage. This step may also provide another opportunity for outreach to the public and

stakeholders, i.e. significant issues or recommendation raised by comments could be discussed in a brochure or other media.

6. THE FINAL PHASE. After the close of the timeframe for public comment on the DEIS, the Final Phase begins. Comments requiring DEIS revisions must be incorporated, either by errata sheets for minor revisions or complete revision and production of an FEIS for more comprehensive changes.

6.1. Finalizing the EIS. Preparation, coordination, approval, filing, and public notice requirements for a FEIS are the same as for the DEIS in section 5 above. FEIS distribution will include any person or entity that submitted substantive comments on the DEIS. EPA will publish a NWR in the FR.

6.2. NOA and Record of Decision (ROD). No decision will be made until 30 days after the NWR is published in the FR, or 90 days after the NWR of the DEIS, whichever is later. The ROD includes the decision (which alternative is selected); a description of alternatives considered; explanation of all factors used in making the decision; and an account of avoidance and mitigation requirements. Fort Benning will prepare an NOA to notify the public and stakeholders that the ROD is available. The NOA processing and approval is the same as for the NOI. The NOA will be published in the FR, and the ROD will be distributed to appropriate entities. See AR 200-2, Section 651.45(j) for more information.

6.3. Mitigation and monitoring. Mitigation measures and monitoring requirements will be identified in the ROD. A monitoring plan and enforcement programs will be adopted and carried out by the proponent. Fort Benning will provide the status of the mitigation and implementation and monitoring results upon request. Mitigation and monitoring efforts may also provide a basis for one last update the public and stakeholders about the DMPRC project even absent a specific request.

Prepared By: Linda M. Veenstra, J.D. DMPRC Environmental Project Manager and Environmental Law Specialist Fort Benning, GA

APPENDIX C

DMPRC NEWSLETTERS AND PUBLIC HAND-OUTS/MAIL-OUTS



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF: Environmental Management Division

3 March 2003

Mr. Darrell Robinson 3229 Pine Knot Road Box Springs, Georgia 31801

Dear Mr. Robinson:

Thank you for your interest in the Proposed Fort Benning Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC) and your attendance at the 20 February public scoping meeting in Buena Vista. I apologize for not having enough of the informational handouts at the meeting for everyone. The additional information that you requested concerning the proposed DMPRC is attached.

In addition, please refer to the following website for electronic copies of this and subsequent newsletters and other related documents: www.benning.army.mil/EMD/Legal&PublicNotices.htm.

For further information, please contact Mr. Rich McDowell, Fort Benning Public Affairs Officer, at (706) 545-2211. Please send your written comments regarding the proposed DMPRC to: Ms. Linda M. Veenstra, DMPRC Environmental Project Manager, Meloy Hall (Bldg 6), Room 309, Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122.

Sincerely,

DAFRC Environmental Project Manager

Enclosures: Proposed DMPRC Newsletter #1 Proposed DMPRC Newsletter #2 General Noise Information



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF: Environmental Management Division

3 March 2003

Mr. Tom Tidd 909 Brighton Road Columbus, Georgia 31906

Dear Mr. Tidd:

Thank you for your interest in the Proposed Port Benning Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC) and your attendance at the 20 February public scoping meeting in Buena Vista. I apologize for not having enough of the informational handouts at the meeting for everyone. The additional information that you requested concerning the proposed DMPRC is attached.

In addition, please refer to the following website for electronic copies of this and subsequent newsletters and other related documents: www.benning.army.mil/EMD/Legal&PublicNotices.htm.

For further information, please contact Mr. Rich McDowell. Fort Benning Public Affairs Officer, at (706) 545-2211. Please send your written comments regarding the proposed DMPRC to: Ms. Linda M. Veenstra, DMPRC Environmental Project Manager, Meloy Hall (Bldg 6), Room 309, Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122.

Sincerely,

Manager

Enclosures: Proposed DMPRC Newsletter #1 Proposed DMPRC Newsletter #2 General Noise Information



ATTENTION OF: Environmental Management Division

3 March 2003

Ms. Betty J. Robinson 6571 Georgia Highway 355 Box Springs, Georgia 31801

Dear Ms. Robinson:

REPLY TO

Thank you for your interest in the Proposed Fort Benning Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC) and your attendance at the 20 February public scoping meeting in Buena Vista. I apologize for not having enough of the informational handouts at the meeting for everyone. The additional information that you requested concerning the proposed DMPRC is attached.

In addition, please refer to the following website for electronic copies of this and subsequent newsletters and other related documents: www.benning.army.mil/EMD/Legal&PublicNotices.htm.

For further information, please contact Mr. Rich McDowell, Fort Benning Public Affairs Officer, at (706) 545-2211. Please send your written comments regarding the proposed DMPRC to: Ms. Linda M. Veenstra, DMPRC Environmental Project Manager, Meloy Hall (Bldg 6), Room 309, Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122.

Sincerely,

DIPRC Environmental Project Manager

Enclosure: General Noise Information



ATTENTION OF: Environmental Management Division

3 March 2003

Mr. C.J. Robinson, Jr. 3225 Pine Knot Road Box Sptings, Georgia 31801

REPLY TO

Dear Mr. Robinson:

Thank you for your interest in the Proposed Fort Benning Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC) and your attendance at the 20 February public scoping meeting in Buena Vista. I apologize for not having enough of the informational handouts at the meeting for everyone. The additional information that you requested concerning the proposed DMPRC is attached.

In addition, please refer to the following website for electronic copies of this and subsequent newsletters and other related documents: www.benning.army.mil/EMD/Legal&PublicNotices.htm.

For further information, please contact Mr. Rich McDowell, Fort Benning Public Affairs Officer, at (706) 545-2211. Please send your written comments regarding the proposed DMPRC to: Ms. Linda M. Veenstra, DMPRC Environmental Project Manager, Meloy Hall (Bldg 6), Room 309, Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122.

Sincerely,

DMPRC Environmental Project Manager

Enclosure: General Noise Information



ATTENTION OF: Environmental Management Division

17 March 2003

Mr. Kenneth Harmon 263 Young Road Box Springs, Georgia 31801

REPLY TO

Dear Mr. Harmon:

Thank you for your interest in the Proposed Fort Benning Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC) and your attendance at the 20 February public scoping meeting in Buena Vista. I apologize for not having enough of the 'informational handouts at the meeting for everyone. The additional information that you requested concerning the proposed DMPRC is attached.

In addition, please refer to the following website for electronic copies of this and subsequent newsletters and other related documents: www.benning.army.mil/EMD/Legal&PublicNotices.htm.

For further information, please contact Mr. Rich McDowell, Fort Benning Public Affairs Officer, at (706) 545-2211. Please send your written comments regarding the proposed DMPRC to: Ms. Linda M. Veenstra, DMPRC Environmental Project Manager, Meloy Hall (Bldg 6), Room 309, Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122.

Sincerely,

Veenstra M

MANAGER MANAGER

Enclosure: DMPRC Newsletter

March 10, 2004

ATZB-JAA (200)

Columbus State University Dr. William Birkhead Department of Biology 4225 University Ave. Columbus, GA 31907-5645

Dear Dr. Birkhead:

Thank you for your interest in the Proposed Fort Benning Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC). The additional information that you requested is enclosed.

Additionally, the newsletters, notices, and Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed DMPRC are currently available at the following website: http://www.benning.army.mil/emd/_program_mgt/legal/index.htm.

For further information, please contact Mr. Rich McDowell, Fort Benning Public Affairs Officer, at (706) 545-2211. Please send your written comments regarding the proposed DMPRC to: Linda M. Veenstra, DMPRC Environmental Project Manager, Meloy Hall, Building 6, room 309, Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122.

Sincerely,

Enclosures: DEIS (Hardcopy)

OMPRC Environmental Project Manager Fort Benning, GA

ATZB-JAA (200)

February 25, 2004

Kurt M. Weigel Senior Environmental, Health and Safety Engineer Concurrent Technologies 7935 114th Avenue Largo, FL 33773-5026

Dear Mr. Kurt M. Weigel:

Thank you for your interest in the Proposed Fort Benning Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC). The additional information that you requested concerning the proposed DMPRC is enclosed.

Additionally, the newsletters, notices, and Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed DMPRC are currently available are posted at the following website: http://www.benning.army.mil/emd/_program_mgt/legal/index.htm.

For further information, please contact Mr. Rich McDowell, Fort Benning Public Affairs Officer, at (706) 545-2211. Please send your written comments regarding the proposed DMPRC to: Linda M. Veenstra, DMPRC Environmental Project Manager, Meloy Hall, Building 6, room 309, Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122.

Sincerely,

151

Enclosures: DEIS (Hardcopy) L. M. VEENSTRA DMPRC Environmental Project Manager Fort Benning, GA ATZB-JAA (200)

February 25, 2004

Mary D. Hassell, CEP Environmental Analysis Project Manager HQ ACC / CEVP 129 Andrews St., Ste. 102 Langley AFB, VA 23665

Dear Ms. Mary D. Hassell:

Thank you for your interest in the Proposed Fort Benning Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC). The additional information that you requested concerning the proposed DMPRC is enclosed.

Additionally, the newsletters, notices, and Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed DMPRC are currently available are posted at the following website: http://www.benning.army.mil/emd/_program_mgt/legal/index.htm.

For further information, please contact Mr. Rich McDowell, Fort Benning Public Affairs Officer, at (706) 545-2211. Please send your written comments regarding the proposed DMPRC to: Linda M. Veenstra, DMPRC Environmental Project Manager, Meloy Hall, Building 6, room 309, Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122.

Sincerely,

Enclosures: DEIS (Hardcopy) L. M. VEENSTRA DMPRC Environmental Project Manager Fort Benning, GA

APPENDIX D

DISTRIBUTION LIST

DISTRIBUTION LIST

I. MUNICIPAL AND COUNTY ELECTED AND APPOINTED OFFICIALS

Honorable Robert S. Poydasheff City of Columbus, Mayor 100 Tenth Street 6th Floor, Government Center Tower Post Office Box 1340 Columbus, GA 31993

Councilor Julius Hunter, Jr. District 3 139 Whippoorwill Lane Columbus, GA 31906

Honorable Ralph Brown Mayor, City of Buena Vista P.O. Box 158 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Ronald Graham, County Commissioner c/o Marion County Courthouse P.O. Box 481 Buena Vista, GA 31803

David M. Gellatly, County Commissioner c/o Chatham County Courthouse P.O. Box 8161 Savannah, GA 31412-8161 Chairman, Chattahoochee County Board of Commissioners Mrs. Dallas P. Jankowski Post Office Box 299 Cussetta, GA 31805-0299

Councilor Evelyn Turner Pugh District 4 325 Jefferson Drive Columbus, GA 31907

Myron Wells Chairman, Marion County Commission 240 Cool Springs Road Buena Vista, GA 31803

Ronnie Morgan, County Commissioner c/o Marion County Courthouse P.O. Box 481 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Billy Hair Chairman, Chatham County Commission c/o Chatham County Courthouse P.O. Box 8161 Savannah, GA 31412-8161

II. TRIBAL, STATE, COUNTY, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Honorable Tarpie Yargee Chief Alabama/Quassarte Tribal Town P.O. Box 187 117 North Main Street Wetumka, OK 74880

Honorable Kevin Battise Tribal Council Chairman Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas Route 3, Box 640 Livingston, TX 77351 Honorable Lovelin Poncho Chairman Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana 1940 Bell Road P.O. Box 818 Elton, LA 70532

Honorable Lowell Wesley Mekko Kialegee Tribal Town 108 N. Main Street P.O. Box 332 Wetumka, OK 74883 Honorable Bill Anoatubby Governor Chickasaw Nation 124 South Broadway American Building, 3rd Floor P.O. Box 1548 Ada, OK 74821

Honorable R. Perry Beaver Principal Chief Muscogee (Creek) Nation of Oklahoma P.O. Box 580 HWY 75 & Loop 56 Okmulgee, OK 74447

Honorable Eddie Tullis Chairman Poarch Band of Creek Indians HCR 69A, Box 85B Tribal Offices 5811 Jack Springs Road Atmore, AL 36502

Honorable Kenneth Chambers Principal Chief Seminole Nation of Oklahoma P.O. Box 1498 Wewoka, OK 74884

Rep. Debbie Buckner District 109 Georgia House of Representatives Route 1, Box 76 Junction City, GA 31812

Rep. Carolyn Hugley District 113 Georgia House of Representatives 4019 Steam Mill Road Columbus, GA 31907

Congressman Mac Collins 8th Congressional District 1131 Longworth HOB Washington, DC 20515-5901 Honorable Billy Cypress Chairman Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida P.O. Box 440021 Tamiami Station Miami, FL 33144

Honorable Max B. Osceola Acting Chairman Seminole Tribe of Florida 6300 Stirling Road Hollywood, FL 33024

Honorable Bryan McGertt Mekko Thlopthlocco Tribal Town P.O. Box 188 Okemah, OK 74859

Honorable Archie Mouse Assistant Chief United Keetoowah Band of the Cherokee Indians of Oklahoma 2450 South Muskogee Avenue Tahlequah, Oklahoma 74464

Rep. Calvin Smyre District 111 Georgia House of Representatives 1103 Glenwood Drive Columbus, GA 31906

Rep. Vance Smith District 110 Georgia House of Representatives 5221 Hopewell Church Road Pine Mountain, GA 31822

Rep. Tom Buck District 112 Georgia House of Representatives 2219 Slate Drive Columbus, GA 31906
Rep. Jimmy Skipper District 116 Georgia House of Representatives 1010 South Lee Street Americus, GA 31709

Governor Sonny Perdue State of Georgia 203 State Capitol Atlanta, GA 30334

Senator Ed Harbison District 15 Georgia State Senate Post Office Box 1292 Columbus, GA 31902

Congressman Sanford D. Bishop, Jr. 2nd Congressional District 2429 Rayburn HOB Washington, DC 20515-3631

Congressman Phil Gingrey 11th Congressional District 1118 Longworth HOB Washington, DC 20515-2931

Columbus Chamber of Commerce (Attn: Mr. Biff Hadden) 901 Front Avenue Columbus, GA 31901 Rep. Bob Hanner District 133 Georgia House of Representatives 9610 Plains Highway Parrott, GA 31779

Senator Seth Harp District 16 Georgia State Senate Post Office Box 363 Midland, GA 31820

Senator Geroge Hooks District 14 Georgia State Senate P.O. Box 928 Americus, GA 31709

Congressman Jim Marshall 3rd Congressional District 502 Cannon HOB Washington, DC 20515-6531

Senator Saxby Chambliss 416 Russell Senate Office Building Washington DC 20510

Mr. Dick Ellis Community & Economic Development Columbus Consolidated Government Columbus, GA 31809

III. LOCAL AND REGIONAL ADMINISTRATORS, FEDERAL AGENCIES, OR COMMISSIONS WITH REGULATORY INTEREST

Augustine Asbury Cultural Preservation Specialist Alabama/Quassarte Tribal Town P.O. Box 187 117 North Main Street Wetumka, OK 74880 Ms. Phyllis Nichols Tribal Administrator ATTN: Hugh Cunningham Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana 1940 Bell Road P.O. Box 818 Elton, LA 70532 Debbie Thomas Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas Route 3, Box 640 Livingston, TX 77351

Rena Duncan Director of Cultural Resources Chickasaw Nation 124 South Broadway American Building, 3rd Floor P.O. Box 1548 Ada, OK 74821

Joyce Bear Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Muscogee (Creek) Nation of Oklahoma Cultural Resources P.O. Box 580 HWY 75 & Loop 56 Okmulgee, OK 74447

Robert Thrower Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Poarch Band of Creek Indians Environmental Department 5811 Jack Springs Road Atmore, AL 36502

Emman Spain Historic Preservation Coordinator Seminole Nation of Oklahoma Seminole Nation Historic Preservation Office P.O. Box 1768 Seminole, OK 74868-1768

U.S. EPA Attn: Dr. Gerald Miller Atlanta Federal Building 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, GA 30303-3104

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service North Georgia Office 247 South Milledge Avenue Athens, GA 30605 Melissa A. Harjo Heritage/Culture Director Kialegee Tribal Town 108 N. Main Street P.O. Box 332 Wetumka, OK 74883

Steven Terry Land Resources Manager Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida P.O. Box 440021 Tamiami Station Miami, FL 33144

Billy L. Cypress Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Seminole Tribe of Florida c/o W.S. Steele AH-THA-THI-KI Museum HC-61, Box 21-A Clewiston, FL 33440

Charles Coleman Representative Thlopthlocco Tribal Town P.O. Box 188 Okemah, OK 74859

John Jensen State Herpetologist Georgia Dept of Natural Resources Wildlife Resources Division Nongame Wildlife/Natural Heritage Division 116 Rum Creek Drive Forsyth, GA 31029-6517

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Region IV Room 3T41 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, GA 30303-8909

Commander, U.S. Army TRADOC HQ Attn: ATBO-GE (Mr. Anderson) 5A North Gate Road Fort Monroe, VA 23651 HQ TRADOC ATTN: ATBO-GE (Dr. Damron) 5A North Gate Road Fort Monroe, VA 23651

HQ TRADOC ATTN: ATBO-GI (Mr. David) 5E North Gate Rd. Fort Monroe, VA 23651

U. S. EPA Attn: Waste Management Division Atlanta Federal Building 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, GA 30303-3104

Mr. Don Klima Advisory Council on Historic Preservation 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.E. Washington, DC 20004

U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Post Office Box 18 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Mr. Joe Tanner Department of Natural Resources 205 Butler Street SE, Suite 1252 Atlanta, GA 30334-4910

Michael Harris GA Department of Natural Resources 2070 Highway 278 SE Social Circle, Georgia 30025

Mr. Mark Edwards Georgia DNR, Historic Preservation Officer 205 Butler Street Atlanta, GA 30334-4910

Georgia DNR, Hazardous Waste Mngt. Branch Floyd Towers East, Suite 1154 205 Butler Street Atlanta, GA 30334

Georgia DNR, Erosion and Sedimentation Control 205 Butler Street, SE. Suite 1038, Floyd Towers East U.S Army, Northeast Region Office ATTN: SFIM-NE-ER (Mr. Boswell) 5A North Gate Road Fort Monroe, VA 23651

U.S Army, HQ TRADOC ATTN: ATJA (MAJ Bobrick) 11 Bernard Road Fort Monroe, VA 23651

Commander, Savannah District COE Attn: CESAS-PD-EC (Mr. Coleman) Post Office Box 889 Savannah, GA 31402-0889

Georgia Area Planning and Development Comm. Lower Chattahoochee APDC Post Office Box 1908 Columbus, GA 31994-1399

Georgia State Clearinghouse Ms. Deborah Stephens, Administrator Office of Planning and Budget 270 Washington Street, SW. Atlanta, GA 30334-8500

Mr. Keith Parsons Georgia DNR, Environmental Policy Division 205 Butler Street Atlanta, GA 30334-4910

Jim Ozier GA Department of Natural Resources 116 Rum Creek Drive Forsyth, Ga 31029

Georgia DNR, EPD Air Protection Division 4244 International Parkway, Suite 120 Atlanta, GA 30334

State Soil and Water Conservation Commission Post Office Box 8024 Athens 30603

Columbus Consolidated Government Planning Division Government Tower – West Wing Atlanta, GA 30334 Columbus/Muscogee Cty. Soil Cons. Service Government Center – East Wing Columbus, GA 31993-2399

EPA Region IV, Wetland Section Attn: Bob Lord Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth St-SW Atlanta, GA 30303-8960 Columbus, GA 31902 Mr. Carmen Cavezza, City Manager Government Center – West Wing Columbus, GA 31901

John Jensen GA Department of Natural Resources 116 Rum Creek Drive Forsyth, Ga 31029

IV. CITIZEN ADVISORY GROUPS AND LOCAL INTEREST GROUPS OR PERSONS

Mr. Frank Schnell Staff Archaeologist, Columbus Museum 1251 Wynnton Road Columbus, GA 31906

Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation Attn: Mr. Greg Paxton 1516 Peachtree Street, NW. Atlanta, GA 30309

Chattahoochee Nature Center 9135 Willeo Road Roswell, GA 30075

Sierra Club, Georgia Chapter 1447 Peachtree Street N.E. Suite 305 Atlanta, GA 30309

National Wildlife Society 1401 Peachtree Street N.E. Suite 240 Atlanta, GA 30309

Georgia Association of Conservation District Supervisors 3309 Sylvester Road Albany, GA 31705

Georgia Trappers Association, Inc. Rural Route 1, Box 204A Lutherville, GA 30251

Wildlife Society, Georgia Chapter 2150 Dawsonville Highway Gainesville, GA 30501 Georgia Forestry Association, Inc. Attn: Claude Yearwood 505 Pinnacle Court Norcross, GA 30071-3634

Dr. George Stanton College of Science, Columbus State University 4225 University Avenue Columbus, GA 31907

The Nature Conservancy Post Office Box 2452, Ft. Benning Branch Columbus, GA 31905-2452

Audobon Society of Columbus P.O. Box 442 Hamilton, GA 31811

Georgia Wildlife Federation 11600 Hazelbrand Road Covington, GA 30014

Georgia Bass Chapter Federation 11575 Northgate Trail Roswell, GA 30075

The Chattahooche Riverkeeper Post Office Box 1492 Columbus, GA 31902

The Georgia Conservancy, Inc. 1776 Peachtree St. NW, St. 400, South Tower Atlanta, GA 30309 Partners In Flight Attn: E. J. Williams Georgia Dept of Natural Resources Wildlife Resources Division Nongame Wildlife/Natural Heritage Division 116 Rum Creek Drive Forsyth, GA 31029-6517

Columbus State University William Birkhead PhD. Department of Biology 4225 University Ave. Columbus, GA 31907-5645

James J. Force 1881 Tiperary Lane Newbury Park, CA 91320

Gaddy Developments, Inc. 6824 Chaucer Lane Box Springs, GA 31801

David A. Wiese 133 Buck Lane Box Springs, GA 31801

Daniel Hudson (**prefers email contact; 92 Spike Place see labels for email) Box Springs, GA 31801

Shirley Prophitt P.O. Box 242 Box Springs, GA 31801

La Dema M. Graves 67 Lee Road, #224-A Smiths, AL 36877

William L. Douglas 2021 Westlake Drive, SE Lacey, WA 98503-6937

James Trivett 120 Fawn Drive Box Springs, GA 31801

Jackie E. Thomaston 62 George Cannon Road Box Springs, GA 31801 Partners In Flight Attn: Laurel Moore-Barnhill USDA Forest Service, Savannah River P.O. Box 700 New Ellenton, SC 29809

William W. Warren P.O. Box 287 Box Springs, GA 31801

Charles Bullard 31 Buck Lane Box Springs, GA 31801

Charles A. Francis 89 Buck Lane Box Springs, GA 31801

Lisa A. Culpepper P.O. Box 271 Box Springs, GA 31801

Robert L. Smart Route 3, Box 209 Buena Vista, GA 31803

David T. Costine 265 Fawn Drive Box Springs, GA 31801

Clarence M. Trivett 90 Fawn Drive Box Springs, GA 31801

Betty Jo Robinson 6571 GA Highway 355 Box Springs, GA 31801

Paul Bourff 408 George Cannon Road Box Springs, GA 31801

Bert A. Veal 56 George Cannon Road Box Springs, GA 31801 Murray and Grace Stone 9034 Lee Road 246 Smiths Station, AL 36877

James Hamer Cannon 435 George Cannon Road Box Springs, GA 31801

Terry Glen Mann P.O. Box 150 Box Springs, GA 31801

Michael and Joyce Sheats 341 George Cannon Road Box Springs, GA 31801

Kennth William Clayton P.O. Box 55 Box Springs, GA 31801

Charles L. Cannon 435 George Cannon Road Box Springs, GA 31801

Charles P. and Gennie L. Gartland 267 Pine Knot Loop Buena Vista, GA 31803

Charles and Jane Bentley Route 3, Box 211 AA Buena Vista, GA 31803

Stanley R. Bullard Route 3, Box 213 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Felix Rivas 2113 Amber Drive Columbus, GA 31907

Hyun Cha Childers 2521 Cornell Avenue Columbus, GA 31903

Yvonne L. Wessner 5802 High Point Drive Columbus, GA 31909 Elizabeth Turner and Dorothy Carson 403 George Cannon Road Box Springs, GA 31801

Deborah S. Pearce c/o Synovus Trust Company P.O. Box 120 Columbus, GA 31903

Kevin Van and Carmen Owens 295 Leisure Cove Drive Lagrange, GA 30240

Michael Eugene Strickland 498 Young Road Box Springs, GA 31801

Karl Antonio Wright 1627 12th Place Phenix City, AL 36867

Randy and Debbie Addison 3841 Georgia Highway 355 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Doris and Linon Wilson (** prefers email contact: <u>dwilso_blan@yahoo.com</u>)

Gordon D. Pope Route 3, Box 214 AA Buena Vista, GA 31803

Joanne P. Horne Route 3, Box 124 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Kenneth Bullard 3925 Council Ct. Columbus, GA 31909-3711

William J. Warren P.O. Box 287 Box Springs, GA 31801

Wayne and Sandra Church P.O. Box 157 Box Springs, GA 31801 Daniel Underwood 2305 Austin Drive Albany, GA 31707

Clarence, Betty, Michael, & Darrell Robinson 6571 GA Highway 355 Box Springs, GA 31801

William Earl Turner 236 George Cannon Road Box Springs, GA 31801

William and Bethany Beasley 531 Young Road Box Springs, GA 31801

Druid Preston 5784 Kentucky Downs Drive Macon, GA 31210

Louie Willett 6607 Widgen Drive Buena Vista, GA 31803

Kenny Powell 2501 Techwood Drive Columbus, GA 31906

Congressman S.D. Bishop Attn: Elaine Gillespie 18th Ninth Street Columbus, GA 31901

Matt Lord 7253 East Wynfield Loop Midland, GA 31820

Theo and Mary Taylor Parker 324 Oliver Street Buena Vista, GA 31801

David R. Taylor 555 George Cannon Road Box Springs, GA 31801

Cathy Fussell P.O. Box 553 Buena Vista, GA 31803 Jeannette Weaver Icard 73 Pecan Place Buena Vista, GA 31803

Louis L. Willett, Jr. 4168 Windtree Lane Columbus, GA 31907

Mark Allen Cogar P.O. Box 191 Box Springs, GA 31801

Mead Control Board, Inc. C/o Roger Presnell P.O. Box 44 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Robert Ferrell, Jr. 3504 Vernon Drive Columbus, GA 31909

Tom Tidd 909 Brighton Road Columbus, GA 31904

Jeff Robinson 3120 Pine Knot Road Box Springs, GA 31801

Congressman S.D. Bishop Attn: Marvin Cohen 18th Ninth Street Columbus, GA 31901

Kurt R. Schmitz 4731 Champions Way Columbus, GA 31909

Jim and Joan Johnson 1265 Pine Knot Road Buena Vista, GA 31801

Residents 4105 Georgia Highway 355 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Paul Anthony 2543 Backbone Ridge Buena Vista, GA 31803 James Haas 133 Pond Road Buena Vista, GA 31803

Elizabeth Murray P.O. Box 503 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Linda Wilkins 85 Pond Road Buena Vista, GA 31803

Velma Bentley 7101 Georgia Highway 355 Box Springs, GA 31801

William McCarter 273 Country Trail Box Springs, GA 31801

Bobby and Ginger Swint 1141 Georgia Highway 41 North Buena Vista, GA 31803

Faron Gosner 261 J.P. Hudson Road Box Springs, GA 31801

Steve Robinson 2991 Pine Knot Road Box Springs, GA 31801

Vernon and Sherrill Prior 611 Hilyard Road Buena Vista, GA 31803

Benny Ramsey 434 Sunnyside Drive Box Springs, GA 31801

JoAnne Watson 703 Mauk Road Mauk, GA 31058

Helen Dillard 327 Oliver Street Buena Vista, GA 31803

Ralph Forsyth 6642 Georgia Highway 355 Box Springs, GA 31801 Lonnie Hale 5575 Georgia Highway 41 North Mauk, GA 31058

Deborah Robinson 6739 Georgia Highway 355 Box Springs, GA 31801

Gayle Miller 266 Georgia Highway 137 West Buena Vista, GA 31803

Joanna Nobles 5771 Georgia Highway 355 Box Springs, GA 31801

Jeanette Forsyth Route 2, Box 33-D Ellaville, GA 31806

Martha Hall 1215 Georgia Highway 41 North Buena Vista, GA 31803

Timothy and Sandra Brown 58 George Cannon Road Box Springs, GA 31801

Harry Winters 43 Smoke Street Mauk, GA 31058

Mark Wray 333 Doe Drive Buena Vista, GA 31803

Chris Thomas 35 Pond Road Buena Vista, GA 31803

Betty Cotton 533 Howard Ackiss Road Buena Vista, GA 31803

Mary and Crystal Thomas 156 George Cannon Road Box Springs, GA 31801

Resident 361 J.P. Hudson Road Box Springs, GA 31801 Frank Lee 551 Jim Allen Road Box Springs, GA 31801 Resident 120 Miller Road Cussetta, GA 31805

R.S. Mattson 3466 Georgia Highway 26 West Buena Vista, GA 31803

Irene Thomas 53 Pond Road Buena Vista, GA 31803

Lewis Fokes P.O. Box 8 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Drew and Mary Weed 6001 Georgia Highway 355 Box Springs, GA 31801

Robert and Amy Price 4265 Georgia Highway 355 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Frank Hendricks 27 Parkers Mill Road Buena Vista, GA 31803

Matthew and Tracey McKenzie 420 Dr. Brooks Road Box Springs, GA 31801

Carol Murray 214 Crawford Street Buena Vista, GA 31803

Kenneth Harmon 263 Young Road Box Springs, GA 31801

Joseph Nash 185 Broad Street Buena Vista, 31803

Jacqueline Costine 265 Fawn Drive Box Springs, GA 31801 Mr. And Mrs. Charles C. Goodwin 119 Gordy Mill Pond Road Cussetta, GA 31805 Resident 363 J.P. Hudson Road Box Springs, GA 31801

Patricia Roth 2921 Georgia Highway 355 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Resident 5522 Georgia Highway 355 Box Springs, GA 31803

Sam and Carol Rigdon 320 Oliver Street Buena Vista, GA 31803

Werner Schurr 26 Schurr Lane Buena Vista, GA 31803

Stan and Catherine Goodroe 4100 Georgia Highway 355 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Catherine Preston 1669 Georgia Highway 355 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Larry Harper 3300 Georgia Highway 355 Buena Vista, GA 31804

Resident 3752 Georgia Highway 26 East Buena Vista, GA 31803

Dennis and Norma Parker 4461 Georgia Highway 41 North Buena Vista, GA 31803

Marion Matthews 922 Pine Knot Farms Road Box Springs, GA 31801

Debra Herrin 101 Michelle Lane Buena Vista, GA 31803 Edward and Verna Rumph 171 Red Oak Drive Box Springs, GA 31801

Steve Golden 900 Country Trail Box Springs, GA 31801

Mickey L. Aviritt (** prefers email contact: mla55@earthlink.net)

Resident 1306 Georgia Highway 355 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Darrell Robinson 3229 Pine Knot Road Juniper, GA 31801

JoAnn Schmidt 2460 Georgia Highway 355 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Tina Ramsey Route 2, Box 38 Ellaville, GA 31806

Steve Catrett 816 Country Trail Box Springs, GA 31801

Earl Harbuck 4749 Georgia Highway 352 Box Springs, GA 31801

Hugh Westbury USAIS ATSH-OTR Fort Benning, GA 31905

Rick Morris 1244 L. Glass Br. Road Lagrange, GA 31240

Brianna Veenstra 7835 Gray Shoals Drive Columbus, GA 31904-2121 Kevin Brown P.O. Box 138 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Luther A. North 185 Pine Knot Loop Buena Vista, GA 31803

Cathy Robinson 2991 Pine Knot Road Box Springs, GA 31801

David Fielder 138 Pond Road Buena Vista, GA 31803

Ken Kahler 273 Hickory Nut Hollow Box Springs, GA 31801

Marcus Turner 60 George Cannon Road Box Springs, GA 31801

Donna Scott 145 South Broad Street Buena Vista, GA 31803

Sammie L. Hall Buena Vista Police Department P.O. Box 384 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Bobby Gray 4749 Georgia Highway 352 Box Springs, GA 31801

Bill Goran SEMP Project Manager (** prefers email contact: william.d.goran@erdc.usace.army.mil)

Ann Grieger 71 Jonquil Lane Box Springs, GA 31801-4216

Tyrone Ragan (** prefers email contact: ragant@benning.army.mil) Doug Linden (** prefers email contact: doug.linden@benning.army.mil)

Doyle Simmons 2498 Georgia Highway 355 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Harry Franklin 2456 Elm Drive Columbus, GA 31907

Catherine Prepton 1669 Georgia Highway 355 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Kurt M. Weigel Senior Environmental Specialist Health and Safety Engineer Concurrent Technologies 7935 114th Avenue Largo, FL 33773-5026

WRBL TV 3 (CBS) Attn: Legals 1350 13th Avenue Columbus, GA

WTVM TV 9 (ABC) Attn: Legals 1909 Wynnton Road Columbus, GA 31994

WXTX TV 54 (FOX) Attn: Legals 6524 Buena Vista Road Columbus, GA 31994

WDAK (540 AM) and WSTH (106 FM) Attn: Legals 1236 Broadway Columbus, GA 31901

WOKS (1340 AM) and WXFE (105 FM) Attn: Legals P.O. Box 1998 Columbus, GA 31902 Folke Ahlquist (** prefers email contact: folke.ahlquist@sas02.usace.army.mil)

Resident Route 2, Box 298 Butler, GA 31006

Bascom and Myra Parker 4105 Georgia Highway 355 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Windell and Wendy Timms 323 Country Trail Box Springs, GA 31801

Mary D. Hassell, CEP Environmental Analysis Project Manager HQ ACC/CEVP 129 Andrews Street, Suite 102 Langley AFB, VA 23665

V. LOCAL NEWS AND MEDIA

WPNX (1640 AM) and WVRK (103 FM) Attn: Legals 1501 13th Avenue Columbus, GA 31901

WGSY (100 FM) Attn: Legals 1501 13th Avenue Columbus, GA 31901

WAGH (98 FM) Attn: Legals 3015 University Avenue Columbus, GA 31906

WKCN (99.3 FM) Attn: Legals 1253 13th Avenue Columbus, GA 31901

Ledger Enquirer/Benning Leader Attn: Legals Post Office Box 711 Columbus, GA 31994 WRCG (1420 AM) and WCGQ (107.3 FM) Attn: Legals 1327 Warren Williams Road Columbus, GA 31906

Columbus Times 2230 Buena Vista Road Columbus, GA 31906

Tri-County Journal P.O. Box 850 Buena Vista, GA 31803

Savannah Morning News P.O. Box 1088 Savannah, GA 31402-1088 Advertiser Company Attn: The Bayonet 1819 South Lumpkin Road Columbus, GA 31903

Mellow Times News 2904 Macon Road Columbus, GA 31907

WSAV-TV 1430 East Victory Drive Savannah, GA 31404

Savannah Business Report and Journal 5 Oglethorpe Professional Court Suite 100 Savannah, GA 31406

WHRQ Radio 1102 East 52nd Street Savannah, GA 31404

VI. FORT BENNING and FORT STEWART OFFICIALS

BG Benjamin C. Freakley Commanding General Infantry Hall (Bldg 4) Fort Benning, GA 31905

Colonel (P) Stephen P. Layfield Deputy CG/Assistant Commandant Infantry Hall (Bldg 4) Fort Benning, GA 31905

Commander, U.S. Army Infantry Center Attn: ATZB-IM Fort Benning, GA 31905

Commander, U.S. Army Infantry Center Attn: ATZB-JA Fort Benning, GA 31905

Commander, U.S. Army Infantry Center Attn: ATZB-AG Fort Benning, GA 31905

Commander, U.S. Army Infantry Center Attn: ATZB-PA Fort Benning, GA 31905-0798 Commander, U.S. Army Infantry Center Attn: ATZB-OT Fort Benning, GA 31905

CERL-ERDC ATTN: Paul Loechl P.O. Box 9005 Champaign, IL 61826-9005

Commander, 3rd Brigade, 3rd Infantry Division Building 9050 (Kelley Hill) Fort Benning, GA 31905

Commander, 29th Infantry Regiment Building 5500 (Harmony Church) Fort Benning, GA 31905

Commander, 11th Infantry Regiment Building 2749 Fort Benning, GA 31905

Commander, 36th Engineer Group Building 2827 Fort Benning, GA 31905 Commander, U.S. Army Infantry Center Attn: ATZB-PS Fort Benning, GA 31905

Commander, U.S. Army Infantry Center Attn: ATZB-PSF Fort Benning, GA 31905

Commander, 75th Ranger Regiment Building 2834 Fort Benning, GA 31905

Commander, 2nd Brigade 1009 Gulick Avenue, Ste 100 Fort Stewart, GA 31314-4433

Naresh Kapur HQ FORSCOM (AFEN-ENE) 1777 Hardee Ave NW Ft McPherson GA 30330-1062 Commander, Ranger Training Brigade Building 5024 (Harmony Church) Fort Benning, GA 31905

Commander, Infantry Training Brigade Building 3410 (Sand Hill) Fort Benning, GA 31905

Myra Todd-Tlacuatl Environmental Specialist Environmental Branch Directorate of Public Works Fort Stewart, Georgia 31314

Edward W. Hill NEPA Manager HQ FORSCOM (AFEN-ENE) 1777 Hardee Ave NW Ft McPherson GA 30330-1062

Installation Management Agency Operations Division, Environmental & Natural Resources Branch ATTN: SFIM-OP-E (Pamela Whitman) 2511 Jefferson Davis Highway Arlington, VA 22202

APPENDIX E

COMMENTS RECEIVED THROUGH 6 APRIL 2004

COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE FORT BENNING DMPRC

The Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was published in the Federal Register on 31 January 2003 to formally start the public scoping process, which lasted until 7 March 2003. The NOI, in addition to notices of meeting, were also published in local area newspapers, including the *Columbus Ledger-Enquirer*, the *Tri-County Journal*, and the *Savannah Morning News*. Fort Benning's other requests for comments were presented in newsletters and on the Installation website. Many comments were received in response to these public outreach and involvement efforts. Public scoping meetings for the proposed Fort Benning DMPRC were held on 18 and 20 February 2003 in Columbus and Buena Vista, GA, respectively. More than 100 people were present for these meetings and many submitted verbatim or hand-written comments concerning the proposed DMPRC; the comments received are enclosed in this appendix.

The notice of availability (NOA) for review of the Draft EIS (DEIS) for the DMPRC was published on 13 February 2004 in the Federal Register, on the Fort Benning web page, and in the following local newspapers: *The Columbus Ledger-Enquirer* (Columbus), *The Tri-County Journal* (Buena Vista), and *The Bayonet* (Fort Benning). The NOA also invited participation by either submitting comments or attending public meetings. In addition to notices published in the Federal Register and the local newspapers, copies of the NOA were sent to a list of agencies and individuals on the Distribution List for the proposed DMPRC. Due to the prior lack of comments from the Fort Stewart community and surrounding areas, the NOA was not published in its local newspapers; however, the NOA was mailed to agencies and individuals on the Distribution List for the proposed DMPRC who are located in or represent the Fort Stewart area.

The entire DEIS was posted on the DMPRC website indicated above and either a summary or the full text of the DEIS was mailed to each of the persons/agencies on the Distribution List. Additional meetings were also held on 2 and 4 March 2004 at Columbus State University and Marion County Middle School, respectively, for review of and comment on the DEIS during the public review period (13 February through 29 March 2004). Comments obtained at these meetings, by phone, and by mail were collected and may also be viewed in this appendix. No comments were received via the website.

Fort Benning has considered all comments received (via telephone, mail, and email) as of 6 April 2004 in the preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the DMPRC, as summarized in the paragraphs below by media and as indicated in the document responses. Comments on the DEIS received from two regulatory agencies (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) and one local interest group (The Riverkeeper) were addressed through response letters; these maybe viewed in this appendix in their entirety. The Georgia State Clearinghouse also sent a reply letter indicating the DEIS is consistent with Georgia plans and programs, and this letter is also in this appendix. One individual provided a verbatim comment on the DEIS at the public meeting on 2 March 2004 at Columbus State University. This comment focused primarily on soil erosion and water quality, related to sedimentation of adjacent surface water (ponds) on his property as a result of Installation road maintenance near the northeastern boundary line, where his property is located. Information regarding soil erosion and water quality, including how it relates to maintenance of Installation roads, may be found in Section 4.1-4.3 of the FEIS.

Concerns regarding noise levels, both existing and future, potentially impacting communities near Fort Benning generated the most comments from the public, resulting in 18 separate comments during the initial public scoping. Information on existing and potential future noise levels, to include a definition and explanation of how noise is measured, is in Section 3.2.9 of the FEIS. The potential environmental consequences (effects) of noise resulting from each of the three alternatives addressed in the FEIS is presented is Section 4.12. Fort Benning also analyzed the potential cumulative effects of noise in Section 5.4.6.

Concerns regarding other media were also received during public scoping and addressed in the same manner as above. Three comments were received regarding public health and safety; information on this issue is presented in Sections 3.2.13, 4.13, and 5.4.7. Two comments were received regarding land use concerns; this information is presented in Sections 3.2.2 and 4.8. One comment was received concerning wetlands and water quality; information on this issue is presented in Sections 3.1.3 through 3.1.4, 4.2 through 4.3, and 5.4.2 through 5.4.3.

Public and stakeholder involvement and comments are ongoing. Comments received after during the 30-day review period for the FEIS will be considered when received and used in preparation of the Record of Decision (ROD) for this proposed action.

PHONE CALL LOG

FOR COMMENTS ON

THE DIGITAL MULTI-PURPOSE RANGE COMPLEX

		A	rea of concern		
	Wetlands		Cultural Resources		Land Use
	Protected Species		Noise		Erosion
¢	Other: Lives no	ear	Hastings Rang	ge.	
Caller Caller	r's Name: <u>Joanette</u> U r's Address: <u>73 Pesez</u>	n Pla	<u>cert</u> Date of Call: <u>1</u> ace, Brena Vista	us, 2 1803	200002
Caller	's Email address (optional):				
	Received 1st Jenow when herd and (no sh # gi Update addre	Men when ss to	Comments 15/eHer. [10 1.c meering 10. all Br 10. that given	ant: will sen abor	s to 1 be d info: e.
Īa	ken by : Linda	Veens Then com	Ha, ON VOICE,	mail	message
		THE PURCHASE	restant, result is porting the		

Ms. Melissa B. Kendrick, R.E.M. Environmental Management Division Meloy Hall (Bldg 6), Room 310 Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122

NOISE

*

PHONE CALL LOG

FOR COMMENTS ON

THE DIGITAL MULTI-PURPOSE RANGE COMPLEX

		A	ea of concern		
	Wetlands		Cultural Resources		Land Use
	Protected Species	R	Noise		Erosion
Ø	Other: LISUES WI RANGE ON	the noise	E 4 VBRATION FROM R AREAS'.	<u>n Has</u> t	ittes.
Calle	r's Name: DANELE	Huose	Date of Call:	24 00	1300
Calle	r's Address: 92 St	1KE PCA	HE	1801	
Calle	r's Email address (options	ی <u>ہ (</u>	HUDSOUL W INTE	KMET.	COM
	TUE JAG J	1~1	Comments		
u	HOULD LIKE	NOTICE	FOR FLAST	r puk	SUC
_	MESTING U	IA E	MAIL, SEEMS	S AHOYE	EN AT
_	THE PROSPECT O	DFAR	AHGE NEAR H	IS PK	lop
_	HE MAY CONTA	CT OT	HER ILLTERESTED	TROTE	ETY HADERS'
1	WHO SHARE]	tis: C	PINION .		
				51.	CREAT

When completed, return form to:

Ms. Melissa B. Kendrick, R.E.M. Environmental Management Division Meloy Hall (Bldg 6), Room 310 Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122

PHONE CALL LOG

FOR COMMENTS ON

THE DIGITAL MULTI-PURPOSE RANGE COMPLEX

		An	ea of concern		
	Wetlands		Cultural Resources		Land Use
	Protected Species	х□	Noise		Erosion
	Other: _Location of propos	ed range			
Calle	r's Name:_Chuck Garland _		Date of Call: _3	1 Octobe 2	002
Calle	r's Address: Shamanski Rd/H	łwy 355	, Marion Co		
Callo	er's Email address (optional):				

Comments

Mr. Chuck Garland who resides in rural Marion County, very near the installation boundary at the bend of Shamanski Rd/Hwy 355, across from K17/K19 training areas, where Pine Knot Creek crosses the installation boundary. Mr. Garland said that he had received the DMPRC newsletter and wanted to know if the proposed range was going to be constructed near his house - directly accross the boundary. 1 answered that to my knowledge, the proposed range location was much further away, inside the installation, approximately the same latitude but west of Buena Vista Rd. approximately 4 miles away from his residence. He asked if the loud firing that takes place directly across the boundary and rattles his house from times to times was going to continue after the range is constructed. I told him that I couldn't answer that for sure. I told Mr. Garland that another newsletter with more detailed information was coming out in the next few weeks. I mentioned to him that any comment or concern he may have about this project were welcomed and I even encouraged him to "stay in touch." I clarified, however, that the preferred way to get in touch with us was through the Public Affairs Officer whose name appears on the newsletter. He said he had tried to reach Mr. McDowell but his office told him that he was out.

When completed, return form to: Ms. Melissa B. Kendrick, R.E.M. Environmental Management Division Meloy Hall (Bldg 6), Room 310 Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122

Kendrick, Melissa B-Contractor

From:	Veenstra, Linda
Sent:	Friday, November 01, 2002 9:16 AM
To:	Chauvey, Patrick P; Kendrick, Melissa B-Contractor
Cc:	Brent, John J; Weekley, Fredrick E. Jr.; McDowell, Richard J
Subject:	RE: DMPRC Newsletter

Patrick, good summary of your discussion. It's great to know that people are getting our newsletters and reading them!! From the few calls that we've received we should anticipate further questions and concerns from the neighbors along our NE boundary.

Everyone should remember to encourage folks to send in written comments and attend the public meetings now tentatively planned for mid-January. Also, please use the phone call sheet that Melissa generated as an easy way to record and keep track of comments by phone. See attachment. Those should go to Melissa, but let me know of any issues raised, as Patrick did here.

Melissa, attaching Patrick's email to a phone record sheet would probably be easiest. Thanks,

Linda V. Linda Veenstra Environmental Project Manager - DMPRC Bldg 6, Room 310 (ATZB-JAA) Fort Benning, GA 31905-5000 706-545-8072 (x58072 for messages)

PhoneCall log.doc

Original Mes	sage
From:	Chauvey, Patrick P
Sent:	Thursday, October 31, 2002 11:58 AM
To:	Veenstra, Linda; McDowell, Richard J
Cc:	Brent, John J; Weekley, Fredrick E. Jr.
Subject:	DMPRC Newsletter

Linda/Rick:

Today I received a telephone call form Mr. Chuck Garland who resides in rural Marion County, very near the installation boundary at the bend of Shamanski Rd/Hwy 355, accross from K17/K19 training areas, where Pine Knot Creek crosses the installation boundary.

Mr. Garland said that he had received the DMPRC newsletter and wanted to know if the proposed range was going to be constructed near his house - directly accross the boundary. I answered that to my knowledge, the proposed range location was much further away, inside the installation, approximately the same lattitude but west of Buena Vista Rd. approximately 4 miles away from his residence.

He asked if the loud firing that takes place directly accross the boundary and rattles his house from times to times was going to continue after the range is constructed. I told him that I couldn't answer that for sure.

I told Mr. Garland that another newsletter with more detailed information was coming out in the next few weeks. I mentioned to him that any comment or concern he may have about this project were welcomed and I even encouraged him to "stay in touch." I clarified, however, that the preferred way to get in touch with us was through the Public Affairs Officer whose name appears on the newsletter. He said he had tried to reach Mr. McDowell but his office told him that he was out.

Patrick Chauvey Chief EPMB

PHONE CALL LOG

FOR COMMENTS ON

THE DIGITAL MULTI-PURPOSE RANGE COMPLEX

		<u>A</u>	rea of concern		
	Wetlands		Cultural Resources		Land Use
	Protected Species		Noise		Erosion
\$	Other: <u>£15</u> e	nquir	4		
Calle Calle Calle	rr's Name: <u>not give</u> rr's Address: <u>not</u> rr's Email address (optiona	- <u>Zive</u> - <u>Zive</u> 1):N	<u>th Tech</u> Date of Call: <u>M</u> 21	13 Feb	@3
(4 4 4 1 1	all was to a ontracted to do vas in-house, vas no chance	EIS ! they to get	<u>Comments</u> no fit anyone ho for DMPRC. L <u>Hanked me of</u> <u>a name and</u> Takan by: Melis	d beer phen c nung u numb	Stated it 4. There Genelvil

When completed, return form to:

Ms. Melissa B. Kendrick, R.E.M. Environmental Management Division Meloy Hall (Bldg 6), Room 310 Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122

DMPRC Scoping Meeting

18 February, 2003

	Name	Address	Email	Mailing List? (Y/N)
ىد	human Vec	56 George Cannon Rd Box Springs 6A 31801		V
	C any	CSU KARLKENTYCKY DOWNS DA	romaro LARIES. CULS	n-te.exe
	CRUIN PRESTON	MAGON, GA. 31510 3504 Vernov Dr	7 	
K	Maile Kind	Columbus Ga-31900	<u>, </u>	
	Lebh, Addison	3841 GA Hay 355 Buena Viste, CA 31503	addison asowera. net	y y
	Randy Addison	3541 67 Hury 355 Buena Vista GA 31503	uddison@sowega_net	<u> </u>
	Eg Herester	Columbry Ro. 3/904		
	LOUIE WILLETT	Buevavin GA 31803		×
	C. J. Dive	909 Brighton RC GA	·	
*	India	At Box STOTEm	×*	4
¢,	PAULW BOURFF	JUN, PER. MA 31801	limousin (e SauchA.NE	r Y
	KAND: Dulie	(DLS GA 31904 BIZO PINIEKNUT RA		$\frac{N_c}{\sqrt{2}}$
	KONG Para	2501 TECH Was Dr. Charles S Con 3190	OBBC 757516 toc	405
	Britishe Weister		Mothmuse lycos.com	M
	DENSTICHAWE	Ligilicites pr	Squeusel398 youro com	
		······		

DMPRC Scoping Meeting

18 February, 2003

Name	Address	Email	Mailing List? (Y/N)
Jorw Morchs	Lo GRAN By CF Catanda, GA 31801	all all a	7
Mane O Miste	18 NIAM ST (6/5 6/ 390	O Muil. houre. Sa	<u> </u>
16 pazzvin Cohen	Sime as above	hiww mweine Chol. C.	m 1/
Naresh kapu	HQ FORSCOM	Kepny n & forscon.	Ks
JAREN Brown	14911 Claverin GA	1 army mt	κ
Front LENDBFILL	4911 Glanza Dr.		K.
Contract Arts	1239 1139 51 12 19 19 11 64 3 Mar	The the Erel and	
Mat Lord	1753 15 WAATON 40 Misla, CA 31820	mentor \$3 , chick been	<u> </u>
			/ /
	·		

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital technology. The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

(Please print legibly)

X	10150	Ned			 		
					 <u>.</u>	·	<u> </u>
					 NG, 1		···· • • • ···
Name:	NOULE	Mill	ETT				
Address:	4168	WILDTRE	E LA	NE			
	COLU	IMBLIS, G	A. 31	907	-		
Date:					 18-1		

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital technology. The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

(Please print legibly)
No Existing nor norse tevel
proposied noise levels, studies
availably so I am told at the
2 19 12 100 1100
diff-03 meetinge
Name: Jour /idd
Address: 909 Brighton Rdr
$-\frac{19}{2}$
Date: <u>Alle builder aviations @4.0 Dicapasied</u>
ofer please bring existing the propositie
Noise level studies to inclusion
at the BV. Courthouse.

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are technology. inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

(Please print legibly)

Luina O MCK moad 2 win + Chac undation Name: Address: Date:

المراجع والمعرفين والمنافع والمراجع والمنافع

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital technology. The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

(Please print legibly) <u>Sur concerns re: additional noise in the Beaver</u> <u>Run area have peen allevated We have</u> <u>ne problem with this proposed</u> Name: <u>Marta Kundey</u> Address: <u>bbo7 iv dgen The</u> <u>Marta CA 5182</u> Date: <u>Illand CA 5182</u>

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital technology. The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

(Please print legibly)

(i icase prim	(legioly)				
1000	0001	Showl	11 ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	Aan	
	in Un	in lec	in	uta (Stem
120	and	- fearing	<u>(2-3-</u>		New 2011
1 cm	cos tere	stare	- brette		UNS
$c_{\rm c}(0)$	1-0 (Cum	Ce	inen
			2		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		ـــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ		···· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ي يوني من المراجع المراجع من المراجع ال المراجع المراجع
Name: _					
Address:					
Date: _					

February 12, 2003

Richard McDowell Public Affairs Office U.S. Army Infantry Center, Ft. Benning ATTN: ATZB-PO Building 4 (Infantry Hall) Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122

Dear Mr. McDowell,

I'm writing this letter as 1 will be unable to attend either of the public hearings scheduled for next week. I would like to express strong opposition to the placement of another firing range on Fort Benning as is being planned for 2004. This will no doubt lead to the city of Columbus and its residents being subjected to a great deal of noise from this range.

Throughout the last decade or so there has been a great deal of improvement in the level of noise emanating from Ft. Benning that has been audible in the city. We have been able to enjoy some relative peace and quiet under most conditions.

I'm not sure that those on post realize how certain atmospheric conditions affect the city. An easterly or southeast wind sends the sound waves right over the city and this can be very loud and disruptive. The prevailing wind direction is easterly for a good part of the year here. Certain temperature inversions in calm conditions can do the same thing. Aside from the noise, one would also have to consider potential for structural damage done by the bombardment of sound waves.

As a resident of Columbus, I would hope that the Army will consider another site some distance away from Columbus and other cities of this size. I will also pass this along to my U.S. Representative in Congress.

Sincerely,

Kurt R. Schmitz

4731 CHAMPIONS WAY Columbus, GA 31909

Please Pout

DMPRC Scoping Meeting

20 19 February, 2003

	Name	Address	Email	Mailing List? (Y/N)
6	theo & mary	324 Deven St GA.		
	Johnson	1265 Pive Knot Rd. Box Spring 31801	Tindi Quat met	
.	DR. John &' Lydin Rogers	POBLY 388-3330/1100 ST		Y
I	DAVID R. TAXIO	555 George Cianon Rd. 31801	+ 1100	
	CATHY FUSSELL	F.O. Box 553 Buena Visita, GA 31803	artsouth@sowega, ne	У
	anitaLeuis	mayk Go 31058		14
ļ	LONIE HALE	Mark, Ga. 31055		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	AUCANTHUN	2543 BACKBONE ROGE	BUENAJISTA GA	31813
-	4. Make Stucklass	498 Young Rd	At a cid	31801
4	Laula Strickle	0 498 Young BO.	Bex Springs (64	31801
Æ	Finik	3524 Vernad Pr Cols 31909	\ 	1/22
,	Bolela Jean	B Pecon Place		
	Jeanette Scar	\$ 73 Pecon Place, Bu	ena Vista, Ga, 31803	Yez
	amo Ethan	a 133 PONO Rel. Bue	NAUISTA SUZIERSANG	YES GANET
* 2	Indell Tim	323 COUNTRY TARIL	Butman 2 (2) Sewey H. ne	- te.5
Č	ligator mura	P.O. Box 503 Brung unter	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Yes
Į	zburgh Tubinson	6739 Giltwy 355 Bol Spring Sco	31801	405
, 	inda Wilkins	85 Ponel Rel Bure Vata (+13)82	B Uniterins (@ gradinet	465
/	Daufe Millen	266 134 Newy 13700 B. 67 31563		
Ĺ	elma Bentle	Y Box SPring Gu 3130	/	Yes

Name Joanna Nobles William McCarton Hanelle Forest Bobby Swint Gineer Swint Malha Hall Faron Gosner Sandra D. Brown Timothy J. Brown Mc. H. Hill AN

Add to Newsteller (V/N) 1/85 Address 5771 Ga Hury 355 /Box 5771 Ga Hury 355 /Springe Ga 31801

273 Country Trail Box Springs 6+31801 Jes Route 2 Boy 33-D Elloudle La 1141 Ga Huy HIN Buena Vista, EA yes 1141 Ga Huy 41N Buena Vida 1215 Ga Huy 41N Buena Vista Yes



Please Print-

DMPRC Scoping Meeting

20 18 February, 2003

	Name	Address	Email	Mailing List? (Y/N)
,	HARY WINTERS	43 SMOKE St- MAUK, GA 31058	AWING Sowger Not	Y
	ling fine	C GIL HAYLARK	}	X
	Sherill Price	611 Hilyard Rd. Vista	12,1803	Ĵ
* }	Popor Hola	140 Cont Man 31803 Bran Finth, By 31803		<u>6</u>
Xon.	Stee- Robinson	2941 Pinekait Rd.		Yes
19 S.	MAR ALLANY	333 DOE DR	M-WERY@ hot now COU	Yes
	Benny Ramsey	434 SUNNYSIDE Dr Box Springs GA		yes
Ć	his chemas	Buena Vista GA		×
	JOANNE WATSON	MAUK, 64 31058		yes
	Mr. Mr. R. Harry	514 Doder Borrow Rol Basen A. Uninga		No
	Beth Cothin	533 HOW ALL ACK. SS RO BV		YES
	WALTER BAtton	533 HOWARD HUKISS RUDU		100
	Jeles Dellaid	327 Oliver St b.V. k.		tjes
	Mary Thomas	156 George CANNON 1 + Box Spring	5	~
	Cirstal Thomas	156 Beije CHANNIN RABO SAM		~
ġ	Deit Thunces Vie	il 56 George Connon Rd K	oxprings (A SHU)	
	fandy (zodra.	4444 GA Highway 355	bsgoodruee hormaille	
	Brad boodia		× ~	
	Whit Provo	4105 GA Huy 3.55	Burn V. 344, CA. 31883	
	Mypt PAdes	, 1	11	-

Mailing Emil Address Name P.O. Box 69 410 GA HWY 355 Vickie Schweinfuith Buena Vista GA3180 BOX SPORASG 6642 GA HWY 355 RALPH Forsyrd Box 501 / Box 501 Nes 0 31801 55) Jim ALLEN RD FRANK LER Annah machadhering 119 gardy niel pand a Charlie C. Clisseta, Ja. 318 25 yes yes. 120 miller Rd Jami Lujam Cusseta, Ja 31805 Johny & Lnglinot 365 JPHUdson RD But SPINS 50 31301 John w/m. maney Julesa 3G13PHudson Rd. 3/801 WSP31479 QNeteenier Jes 319 JPHUGOn Rd WJLascie

Please Print

DMPRC Scoping Meeting

20 18 February, 2003

Name	Address	Email	Mailing List? (Y/N)
RS. MATTSON	3466 Go Hwy26 W.		
Patricia Roth	2921 GA HWY. 355 BUENO VISTO, GA 31803	plroth@sowega.net	V
JRENE THOMAS	53 Dona Rad Buena Vista Ga 31803		
Earlene atto	Prox Spring 3150		
Lewis Foker	PURAS Buena Vuta 6a 31803		
Robert KURTL	528 Nousen Heriss RD 31803		H.
Toyce KuErz	528 How DEN ACRISS RU 31843		<u>n/.</u>
Spin T. C.com	320 Cliver St	Stree BSCINGD. M	pr L
CARO! Rigdon	370 Cliver St.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	×
MARY Weed	6001 the 355 BOX Spring	s Ca 31801	·Y
Drew Weed			Y
WEANER SCHU	PR 26 SCHURR LA BUELAVIST		V
D.S. HUDJON	92 Spike Place Acrospice	3180 Studiow D'Witerman	NOM Y
Amythice	4265 Gra Huy 355	acgprice (whot mail.c	<u>cm //</u>
Rubert Arice	k.		
Catherine Goodroe	4100 Mr. Hwy 355		У
Stan Goodne	4100 Buena Vister	Sgoodroe@hotmilcom	
Frank Hailra	4227 Perkers mill Bell	Ś. V.	
C trash Jething	3306 Bronlloy RO		
athering Prestin	144974104355		F

M. lighist , Emil Nume Address Early Margine Tunner 236 George CANNERRA Box SPA. 125 GA. 31801 Jes s Jracey & Matthew Mckenzie 420Dr. Brooks Rd Box Springs GA 31801 LARPY HAPPED 3300 Highwar 355 BV 31804 yes yes (Evol Murray, 1214 (Grounfords). BV31803 HORACE GOTHER 3752 HIL 26 East B.V. 3000 PAUL SOURFI 408 LICANNON PD SASINOT Kennel HARMON 263 YOUNG RD 31801 Je 2 limousin & SowEGA, NET yes Need monshelter Tes A/ - send both newsletters to him) Domis 20 Regnetrades 44461 La Hunger IN, BY 31803 Joseph Nash 185 Broad St Tes BV Ves 922 Pineknot, Farms Rol Boxs 195 GA Manon Matthews yes Tour Tide Tour Tide DRUID N. PRESTON Jacque line Costine Box Springs, Ga 31801 YES Jacque line Costine Yas. Nelezo Herrin 101 Michelle Same yes

Nume Email Miling List T/N Address 171 Red Oak Dr. Boy Springe, De. 171 Red ORA DRIVE 31801 Box SPRINGS, Got. 31501 Verna Rumpl-Edyard Kuruph P.O. Box 138, Brenchite, CA 31403 brownke sowoja.net 900 Country Trail Bun Springs golden 5/3130 Hotmilicon Neven Brown Steve Golden Luther A. North 185 Prive Knot Loop Buena Vista Mickey i Avseer 5744 GANing 355 Box Springs Gut 31801 miass e entration intry es isn's early with the hard of the power of Dout Tet 1306 Huy 355 Buendista 64 31800 Gennie Gartland 267 Pine Knot Loop, Buene Vista, GA 31803 43 DAUID FIELDER 138 POND Rd BUENAUSTA FA 31503 DArrell Robinson 3229 Pineknot Rd. Juniper, GA. 31FOI Ken Kahler 273 Hickory Nut Holler Box 51801 Fes John Schmidt 3466 GA. HWY 355 Buch VIXA, GA. 31703 Marcus Lurner 60 George Cannon Rd. Box Springs Ga 31801 Yes JACKIETEDMASTON 626000ge CANNONBABOX Springs GASIBON Yes
MalyList June Ramsey R.J. 2 Boy 38-Ellainle, 34 [Email Y/N Jammic Shomas 53 paral Rel Buena Vista GA Donna Scott 145 South Broad St. Buenavista, GA. Sten Catrett 816 Country Trail Box 31801 SAMMill, Hall Buena Jiste power Datt FARI HARRick 4749 Con 11/4, 352 Box Springs 31801 Bolling May 4749 MAHUY 352 Box Springs 31801 *УЕ*З 918 -1 Berry J. Robinson 6571 GANWY 355 Bex Springs, GA

Esson, John A - Contractor

From:	Damron, John E (Contractor)
	[jack.damron@monroe.army.mil]

Sent: Monday, November 25, 2002 1:40 PM

To: Esson, John A - Contractor

Subject: RE: addresses for newsletter

Damron and Anderson at:

HQ TRADOC DCSPIL ATTN: ATBO-GE 5A North Gate Rd. Fort Monroe, VA 23651

Boswell at:

U.S Army Northeast Region Office ATTN: SFIM-NE-ER 5A North Gate Rd. Fort Monroe, VA 23651

David at:

HQ TRADOC DCSPIL ATTN: ATBO-GI 5E North Gate Rd. Fort Monroe, VA 23651

Bobrick at:

U.S Army HQ TRADOC ATTN: ATJA H Bernard Rd. Fort Monroe, VA 23651

-----Original Message-----From: Esson, John A - Contractor [mailto:John.Eson@Benning.Army.Mil] Sent: Monday, November 25, 2002 9:16 AM To: damronj@monroe.army.mil Cc: anderso7@monroe.army.mil Subject: addresses for newsletter

Jack

Would you please provide the mailing addreses for:

Dr. Jack Damron Mr. Malcom Boswell Bob Anderson Douglas David MAJ Michael Bobrick

We'll get everyone on the DMPRC EIS newsletter mailing list.

Thanks

John Esson

ECW Environmental Group, LLC serving Fort Benning DFEL Env. Mgt. Div. 706-545-4766 (Fort Benning cube) 757-727-7897 (ECW office)

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital technology. The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

(Please print legibly)

rdan. TITIE on Dori Cern Name: Address: 31803 -72 et () Date:

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital technology. The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

(Please print legibly)

a resident on Hwy.355 115 I sersonall Alternative 3 would Ch the meeti to si re therine CMN Name: Hours Address: 31803 ON: SD_1 70-03 Date:

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital technology. The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

(Please print legibly)
Thave concerns about whether the impact
will affect our water - my pond. How much
difference in the amount of noise and rating
usindows.
Name: Patricia Roth
Address: P.O. Box 1106
Buena Vista, GA 31803
Date: 2-20-03

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital technology. The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

(Please print legibly)

t do support The Military EFFort in TRAINING Noise abotement is Necessary For The Neighboring Residences, Suggested Limiting Hours FIRING Not LATER THAT 10:00pm FOR Night MANDOVERS And Limited FRING ON Weekends To ENSURE PEAR AND quiet OURING Church Denvices AND FAMIly RECADATIONS ANNE WATSON Name: 703 MAUK Rd Address:

31058

MALK. GA

2-20-03

Date:

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital technology. The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

(Please print legibly)

-Ne	ise level to high - Shakes house Iwindo	John
Now	. Time limit for training needed.	
Nome	Donna Scott	
Address:	145 South Broad St.	
	Buena Vista GA. 31803	
Date:		

ا م. ا

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital technology. The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

(Please print legibly) <u>Also</u> we would like it to go Sime where else <u>Also</u> we would like it to go Sime where else <u>Also</u> we would be in our your yourd Almest Name: <u>Robert + Joyce Kurtz</u> Address: <u>SD8 Howard Ackiss Kd</u> <u>Buline Vista, Ga 31803</u> Date: <u>Diplo3</u>

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital technology. The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

(Please print legibly)

Aft	er looking over the proposals,
Pro	posal # 3 Looks best to me . My
_ big	concernisto Keep the Noise level at
,	Minimum.
Name:	Benny L. Ramsey Jr. L+ Col Retired (USAF)
Address:	434 Sunnyside Drive
	Box Springs GA 31801
Date:	20 Feb 2003

Kendrick, Melissa B-Contractor

From:	Brent, John J
Sent:	Monday, March 03, 2003 8:57 AM
То:	Veenstra, Linda; Kendrick, Melissa B-Contractor
Subject:	FW: Mary Thomas
Follow Up Flag:	For Your Information

Completed

FYI - John

Flag Status:

Original M	lessage
From:	Brent, John J
Sent:	Monday, March 03, 2003 7:49 AM
To:	Taylor, Craig
Cc:	Larimore, Robert K; Strumpler, Ken
Subject:	FW: Mary Thomas

Craig, you may want to check this out before it becomes a problem. I met the women at the public hearing for the DMPRC. Her phone no. is 229 649-6708. John

-----Original Message-----

-	-
From:	Greenlee, Jack M
Sent:	Friday, February 28, 2003 3:29 PM
то:	Brent, John J
Cc:	Larimore, Robert K
Subject:	Mary Thomas

John,

I met with Mary this afternoon. Her and her brother's (Jackie Thomaston) property extends north across Turrentine Road about 10' and 300' in length. This is according to the new survey that is marked with orange stakes at each corner. She said the army had surveyors surveying the line the other day, but they didn't speak to her. She would like to know the outcome of this survey for her records. If her and her brother decide to fence in their property Turrentine Road will have to be re-located. Turrentine Road is the main road on the boundary going to Hastings Range. It is not a firebreak. Roads and Pavements or Range Maintenance maintains this road. Mary has your phone number but would like you to call her with the outcome of the survey. She would like a POC because she seemed to be annoyed that the surveyors didn't talk to her about the survey.

Jack

Telluham it may Concern

is it is amine the foots and not Sure that This would be a step in our best interest. Lie have been hiving next to ft. Benning for 38 yrs live have cracked wants, Windows and cur five place from the impact of what is incut taking place. We have to deal with fre, smoke and tanks which at times get off identities. The potential Environmental impacts of loud Decises and the impact on own earth ground in which its than us. Clur foundation of our homes I've been jur. This is Sandy land? what would this de te cur liater also eur sener? God has created Cally a contain Amount of land and this is cars. Transay can be taught in class room. Consider aut Themes families and children Would this be a Date place for them. Please Consules the other levation, Thanks for listen.

A. Dien & MARY Liend

Rec & may 03

FORT BENNING Digitizion Digitizion Multi-Purpose Range Complex VOLUME 1 Neu For a New Range

Fort Benning is the Home of the Infantry. Its missions are: to provide the nation with the world's best infantry soldiers and trained units; to provide the nation with a power projection platform capable of deploying soldiers and units anywhere in the world on short notice; and to provide the nation with the Army's premiere installation and home for soldiers, families, civilian employees, and military retirees.

In order to meet the mission, Fort Benning provides training facilities for several go-to-war units. To remain combat ready, these elite units require up-to-date ranges that allow the latest weapons technology to be employed. Today's Army includes mechanized infantry units with both Bradley fighting vehicles and Abram tanks. Soldiers must be capable of deployment world-wide to support a wide range of operations. To maintain deployment readiness and training efficiency, the units must train on ranges that challenge their skills and abilities.

The existing ranges do not provide the challenges required. Because of advancés in weapons technologies and training requirements, the current ranges are outof-date and the units must train at a modified level. Fort Benning needs an updated range with new technology that is realistic to today's fighting. Fort Benning proposes to construct, operate, and maintain a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC), which will provide a state-of-theart range facility. The DMPRC will meet the Installation's training needs for conducting effective gunnery training in support of your current and future Army.

Hastings Range is the primary facility used to support the gunnery requirements on Fort Benning. Currently, however, Hastings Range can only support a modified version of gunnery qualification training because of the short length of the range. In addition, Hastings Range is not digitized. The digital component of the proposed Fort Benning DMPRC will enhance training by providing real time monitoring to increase safety and to provide After Action feedback for Reviews. Hastings Range will continue to be used as a "feeder" range for the proposed DMPRC.

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital technology. The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

Name: A.DRELV + MARY LVEEDName: A.DRELV + MARY LVEEDAddress: CCCI + HU 355 BCV - 5pring 6, CCG. - 31801Date: -2/21/C3

(Please print legibly)

🛋 🐂 🕶

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital technology. The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

(Please print legibly) We are against this project. the training that MCCULU - $\sqrt{}$ Ronce we mared HENCE WIG UWS (O -ha, Wher Ind an iQua nat our brick are atraid wit Crock (others houses have a 11au offen, will the govern Crit WILLS Name: ччнч Address: Ga 31801 March

Date:

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital technology. The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

(Please print legibly) T (ive within 1/2 mile from blastings Range. My house has took alot of abuse due to firing. The doors do not stut properly, the siding is falling. Off (Just had new siding installed). New I need to Ye level my home because the foundation is unlevel. My children are disturbed due to odd hours of firing. aswell as myself & my wife. I also concerned about when the control burns come within Frets from my home my home can not with shand any more abuse. Name: William McCarter. Address: 273 Country Tirail Box Springs Gra. 31807 Date: 3/3/03

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital technology. The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

(Please print legibly)

My property ajoins Fort Benning Reservation and I am at 1/2 mile from Hastings Range. My house rattles and shakes now with the firing that is done at Hastings Range. It You build quother firing pange this will increase the damage to A U home It My pipes + damages my drain line. I constantly have to repair these. Windell & Sara Imms Name: Address: 323 Country Trail Box Springs GA 31801 5-03

Date:

February 25, 2003

Mickey L Avirett 5744 GA Hwy. 355 Box Springs, GA 31801

Ms. Linda M Veenstra Meloy Hall (Bldg. 6), Room 309 Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122

Dear Ms. Veenstra,

I am writing to express my comments for the construction of the Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex. I attended your meeting in Buena Vista the 18th. of February. I did not know anything about this meeting until the morning of the 18th. on a local news broadcast. Some residents I understand received mail notices of the meeting the same day of the meeting. These mailings were post marked the 17th. the day before. Is it just me or do you not think folks would have appreciated a little more notice of the meeting. I did not receive any notice. Therefore, I am requesting that you add my name to your future mailings.

Now my, comments on the new range. Being a veteran of the Army, (infantry 11C) 1983-1987, 1 understand and appreciate the need for the best possible training available to the men and women of our armed forces. However, I do not want and will not tolerate any additional noise created by changing the range's on your post. If you increase the amount of tank firing on Hastings Range, I will take ever action in my power to stop you. If you want to be a good neighbor and decrease noise for all residents, I don't think there is anyone in the community that will not agree to that.

I am very concern about Hastings Range and the impact on my peace and enjoyment, the peace and enjoyment of the natural wildlife and the value or loss of value due to your possible decisions to increase noise on Hastings range.

Please, keep me informed.

Sincerely Avirett

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital technology. The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

(Please print legibly)

<u></u>	
·····	
Name:	MICKEY L AVIRETT
Address:	5744 GA Huy 355
	BOX JONNAS 64 31801
Date:	2/35/2023

25 FEB 2003 Nickey Avirert 5744 CA Huy355 Box Spruge CA 31801

NS. LINDA NI. VEENSTRA DMPRC ENVIRONMENTRE NY. Meloy HALL BLEG. 6 ROW309 NIELOY HALL BLEG. 6 ROW309 NIELOY HALL BLEG. 6 ROW309

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital technology. The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

document. I oppose the Proposed tank range for these (Please print legibly) hearous: DCost of coust nuction nunge; DW cheased Noise levek 3 Destruction of wild life hubital's (Eroinon of Sandy soils , o area; @ wereased air pollution 5 (Decreased Values of surrending property; of misained shells hitting off post. @ De struction of ~ antifacter of the area; Face pollentantientug ground wa ter system that local residents off post depend on for their drink-INg wa ter. Move range to Et. Stewart II Name: Address: <u>35</u> Da 20 noN 10/um bus Gre 31909 7065615483 -19-03 Date: operty owner close marion county

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital technology. The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

(Please print legibly)

We are Marion County residents and are concerned about the volume of noise that would be generated by the new facility. If it is -art, we are concerned that other units Benning to use it and there would Navel equent noise problems.

Rick and Ran Garner Name: Address: <u>514 O ochee Bottom Rd</u> Bring Vista GA 31803 2/20/03 ____ Date:

p-9- 00

Public Scoping Meetings 18 and 20 February 2003

Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DPMRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for Soldiers to conduct advanced gunnery courses in a realistic training environment using digital technology. The current facilities (ranges) do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full advanced gunnery qualification, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training. The project would include establishing three training lanes with associated targetry, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. Training on other Fort Benning ranges would continue but would be redistributed to incorporate the DMPRC. The proposed DMPRC would ensure Soldiers are fully combat ready.

Please take time to review the documents and exhibits and feel free to ask questions of the Army representatives. Fort Benning will consider all written comments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. You may leave your written comments with an attendant at this meeting or mail them for receipt no later than March 7, 2003, to the address provided on the reverse side of this document.

Please hespond with a written beply to the following: (Please print legibly) What is the exact and Number of the impact area Eshells will land when I hed vanice? @ Will the New vange in part area Ben benned to replace the Vipques Wand bombing hange that the Ther to kico opeople have forced the U.S. Militar to leave ? Her the Fighter its Fly 10 thom east, make a bomb run 1", veen upward, circle around and Name: Address: 3504 VerNow Blue Kins Ga 31909 706-5615785 2-22-03 Date: Fly back east. I can hear bombs explored as the To veenupward! they Fly right over my property. Move. it to Ft. Stewart!!.

Melussa 1 Copy FY Reads Ancle



Gauging a range of noise

o hear nearby residents describe it, it sounds like the lumbering approach of Tyrannosaurus Rex in the movie "Jurassic Park" — a deep reverberation that shakes the ground, rattles windows and ripples ponds.

But it's not some movie-dinosaur stomp that staggers Fort Benning's neighbors. It's gunnery training on the Hastings range.

Hastings rests on one corner of the Fort Benning post. It's the firing range for tanks and Bradley infantry vehicles, and it is inadequate, the Army says. It lacks the width and depth needed for advanced gunnery training, and its targets are not digitized, so they lack a high-tech component that would provide a more precise and immediate measure of marksmanship.

So Fort Benning wants to build a new range for this advanced training. It would prefer to put that range deep in the post's interior, away from the borders civilians live near. The 25-year-old Hastings range still would be used, for beginner and intermediate training, but not as often.

Benning officials swear building this new range on their preferred site would not lead to any change in the type of weapons they use or the frequency. The training is essentially the same. They'll still be using tanks and Bradleys. They won't use bigger, louder guns.

The only changes are the location and the sophistication of the target system, they say. And moving most of that training away from the boundary might even lessen the noise Ledger Enquirer Offebo3 But then again, it might nof. And that's really the question, as far as the neighbors are concerned: If Fort Benning builds its new range on its preferred tite, with will there be more noise, less noise or about that same noise? No one knows, yet. So when post officials recently held public hearings about the new range, that issue wasn't settled. They told folks that because of the variables that affect sound travel — humidity, the f contour of the land and the direction of firing --- they weren't sure what effect the range would have. "We've really just started looking at the potential environmental impacts, and one of the things that we're going to do is noise modeling," said Linda Veenstra, an environmental attorney. That analysis will atake about a year. Some neighbors wanted to know if the new range would be redundant. An advanced gunnery range has been built at Fort Hood. Another's being built at Fort Knox. Georgia's Fort Stewart, over by Savannah, is going to upgrade its range, too. Would Fort Benning's range just duplicate Fort Stewart's? "Not truly, because Fort Stewart can barely handle its training load now," said Fred Weekley, Fort Benning's range manager. Stewart has two full brigades and must support reserve units, too, "so their schedule is fairly full," he said. Lf Benning's new range is approved, construction would start in the summer of '04 and take about 18 months to finish, so it would be late 2005 or early 2006 before it released the dinosaur. e for she Contact Tim Chitwood at (706) 571-8508 or tchitwood@ledger-enquirer.com Business C10 Death noticesC2-3

NEWS & FEATURES

THE BAYONET A-3

Fort Benning proposes building new range complex

Public invited to voice concerns

Ptc. Brian Trapp Beyonet staff

Fort Benning wants to build a new range complex.

The range would give soldiers a state-of-the-art facility to conduct gummery courses, said Fred Weekloy, mstallation range manager.

Fort Benning is well behind on modernization of ranges, he said.

The last range modernized

was about 12 years ago. An intent to construct a digital, multipurpose range complex was released Jan. 31 to inform the community about the project.

"We want to get the public involved early, to know what kind of concerns they want us to study," said Linda Veenstra, environmental project manager.

The preferred construction site is at the casterr end of Fort Benning, but other locations are being considered. Officials will assess the potential environmental impacts of the range construction sites.

We look at potential negative impacts through surveys and other collected information to see the impacts on wetlands, endangered species and historical or cultural sites," Veenstra said. "We have to took at any negative impacts to see how to minimize them."

The initial construction cost is estimated at \$30 million, the digitization and instrumentation is estimated at \$20 million and the range is projected to last 20 to 30 years, Weekley said.

"We can train people to be soldiers and send their to war, but without investing in training, we may not be able to bring them back," Weekley said. "In Desert Storm, we didn't lose any tanks to Iraq. I' we can "We can train people to be soldiers and send them to war, but without investing in training, we may not be able to bring them back." Fred Weekley Installation range manager

he said.

show the soldiers what they did,

not what they thought they did,"

Construction of the new

range is slated to start in

summer 2004 with two years of

construction time, and building

the new range will give the post

a chance to take antiquated

ranges and update them for new

go through another war without losing another tank or person, it's worth the money."

The range instrumentation will have the ability to give video feedback, infrared or night vision from the system, which will improve safety on the range, Weekley said.

"The video can be used to

purposes. Weekley said.

Hastings Range, the current gumnery testing range, is well past its expected life span. It was originally built for 12 to 15 years of use but has been in use for 25 years.

There will be two public scoping meetings in connection with the Environmental Impact Statement.

The first will be from 6 to 8 p.m. Feb. 18 at the Elizabeth Bradley Turner Center at Columbus State University on East Lindsey Drive.

The second will be from 6 to 8 p.m. Feb. 20 at the Marion County Court House, 100 North Broad Street, Buena Vista.

M. Issa FYFies (mely/

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2003

C7

ledger-enquirer.com

Word from the homefront

SECTION C





LARSE RINGER Store iidai Teec

- from left, 1st Lt. Alexander Yu of Syracuse, Three members of the Fort Benning-based 317th Engineer Battalion -N.Y.; Alpha Co. commander Capt. Rafael Lopez and 1st Lt. John Yoo of Silver Spring, Md. — take time out from their desert training last week to read letters from home. The combat engineering battalion bas been in the Persian Gulf since early January. Lopez is the only one of the three to have family in this area — his wife and three children live on post.

Benning target for firing range

By S. THORNE HARPER Staff Writer

Pending an Environmental Impact Statement and funding, the Army said it wants to build a \$30 million computerized firing range complex at Fort Benning. The Army also hint-ed that if those plans fall through that it could result in the shift of Fort Benning troops to Fort Stewart.

The range would be built at the eastern end of the 285-square-mile post, a Fort Benning spokesman said. Fort Benning is home to the 3rd Brigade, 3rd Infantry Division (Mechanized) and conducts training for other infantry units that include for other infantry units that include 44 tank crews and 84 Bradley Fight-ing Vehicle crews. In a statement released Tuesday afternoon, the Army said it needed a "state-of-the art"

firing range to accommodate ar-mored training. "Right now we can't train them at the standards they need to be at to go to war," Fort Benning spokesman Rich McDowell said. McDowell declined to comment on what effect the range would play in the upcoming round of Base

See RANGE, Page C3

RANGE | Noise, safety are concerns

From C1

Realignment and Closure in 2005.

However, the Army statenowever, the Army state-ment said Fort Benning must either "modify standards" there or face the prospect of "trans-porting units from Fort Ben-ning to Fort Stewart for the re-mund training "

quired training." McDowell said he did not know if that meant the temporary transport of troops to Fort Stewart or whether Fort Ben-ning would permanently lose troops to the east Georgia post if Fort Benning failed to construct the so-called "Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex.

The 3rd Brigade, 3rd Infan-The 3rd Brigade, an iman-try Division is a tenant unit at Fort Benning. The headquar-ters of the 3rd Infantry Divi-sion, along with its other two brigades, is located at Fort Stewart. In recent years some

Army officials have suggested that the 4,000-soldier 3rd Bri-gade be moved there.

The proposed range, with computerized targets, is tentatively scheduled for construction in summer 2004. It would measure about 15 football fields wide and 45 football

fields long. Some of the concerns in-volved with the range involve noise, ammunition-generated dust blowing into residential areas, effects on Native American archeological sites and en-dangered species — like the red-cockaded woodpecker and the gopher tortoise — and the impact on wetland areas and soil erosion.

WHAT'S NEXT

The Army will host two public meetings regarding its proposed firing range at Fort Benning: 6-8 p.m. Feb. 18 — The

Elizabeth Bradley Turner Center at Columbus State University, East Lindsey Drive.

6-8 p.m. Feb. 20 - The Marion County Court House, 100 N. Broad St., Buena Vista, Ga. Unable to attend a meeting? Mail comments to Richard McDowell, Public Affairs Office, U.S. Army Infantry Center and Fort Benning, ATTN: ATZB-PO, Building 4 (Infantry Hall), Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122.

.

.

•

۴

DMPRC Public Scoping Meeting

February 18, 2003

Elizabeth Bradley Turner Center Columbus State University Columbus, Georgia February 20, 2003

Marion County Court House Buena Vista, Georgia

Per instruction from Ms. Linda Veenstra, the following are statements recorded and transcribed from attendees who wished to make verbal comments on their issues and concerns about the DMPRC Project. We requested name, address, telephone, and email address from each person. We also asked if they wished to be added to the DMPRC Project mailing list, if they were not already on it.

Columbus, Tuesday, February 18

- 1. Mr. Paul W. Bourff, Sr.
- 2. Ms. Frances Veal

Buena Vista, Thursday, February 20

- 3. Ms. Cherry Kersey
- 4. Mr. Robert L. Swint III
- 5. Ms. Deborah Robinson
- 6. Ms. Marion Matthews
- 7. Ms. Jacque Costine

- 1 -

Mr. Paul W. Bourff, Sr.

408 George Cannon Rd Juniper, GA 31801 home 229-649-9932, office 706-568-4887, limousin@sowega.net Currently receives DMPRC Project mailings.

My biggest concern right now is concussion. Because concussion from the weapons that are being fired out there right now are destroying what we have built out there. I am not against them having more training at Fort Benning. I understand that the more training we do here, the better chance Fort Benning as a base has to survive the worldwide cuts in military bases and things of this nature. So I understand that and what it does for the city of Columbus and the ten counties surrounding the area, or whatever. I don't have a problem with that.

The problem I have is, when I bought this place in 1983 you were building Hastings Range. You, being the military, were building Hastings Range. It was supposed to be a 50 caliber range - 50 calibers - rat tat tat tat tat. That's fine doesn't disturb a whole lot. Then they started bringing M60 A1 tanks in there, firing 100 mm cannons. The concussion from those cannons knocks out foundations, causes older homes, like the old house that was on the homestead, you could see the old fireplaces vibrating before they eventually fell down from the concussion from the cannons. We upgraded to an M60 A2 or M60 A3 tank with a 120 mm cannon on it; the concussion got worse. I've got an 8,000 sq ft house out there that sheetrock is cracking on. You can repair it. They'll go out there and fire for a week in a _____ again. Ok, you can say well maybe your foundation isn't good enough. Well, we're on sand. Everybody has to build a foundation good enough to be on that sand. We know that. Cabinet doors open. Glasses fall out of cabinets. Pictures fall off the walls. I've had smoke detectors shaken out of the ceilings to where they just pop out, even though they've got plastic anchors in the sheetrock. So we've got some real problems and those problems need to be addressed. They've never been addressed before. It's always, "We'll look into it."

I've had Fort Benning run in to my fences. Let me say I'm sitting there on 300some acres and I've got a cattle operation out there. So everything is fenced and crossfenced. I've had to go get my cows off Hastings Range at 3:00 or 4:00 o'clock in the morning because the army has called up and said, "Your cows are out here. We've got to stop firing." Well, then you go out there and find out where some military vehicle swiped the corner, took the corner of the fence out. That's why the cows are out there, you know? And so I've got to get out there and get the cows back because they can't drive. A little bit of an irritation there.

I've been promised a berm. They were going to build a berm. They never built it. They were going to put trees, and plant trees out there to kind of cut down some of the noise. The trees never got planted. They were going to build a fence all the way around the back side to keep the GIs from coming over there. I had to get out there one time and hold some of them at bay until the MPs got there. And I was younger then, and probably wouldn't do that today. And they had to get the sheriff and everything else, because they were taking my fence posts and using them to make fires with. I mean, Fort Benning won't allow them to cut the pine trees down. They put them in jail for that. So they shake your fence posts out of the ground and use them for firewood.

Fort Benning is not always a good neighbor. Sometimes they've been a good neighbor. Other times they've been a terrible neighbor. And I'm concerned with what they are going to do with Hastings Range if they go with this alternative.

Right now it looks like that Alternative III would be a lot better for me as an individual because I'm sitting a half mile from Hastings Range. In fact, my actual back fence is Hastings Range. I'm a half mile from the tower. And from the pad that they are firing from up on top, I'm probably less than a half mile. My house is only maybe a mile or mile and a quarter from that pad. And they fire back toward me, so I get a lot of concussion blast as they fire southeast on the post.

If they go with Alternative III, and we know that they are going to have 120 mm main cannons out there, for me as an individual, if they would go back to firing only 50 calibers at Hastings and do all the heavy firing at Alternative III, that's good for me, as an individual, as a person living where I live right now. Now how it's going to affect other people living down off of 137 and so forth, that's another question.

But are they going to do the same thing they did with Hastings Range? Are we going to say we're going to fire 120 and 130 mm cannons and in reality, the next thing we know, we got "big babe" out here – you know, the biggest artillery piece that the army might have. Are we firing it then? The concussion is going to be much greater from it – probably similar to a 500 pound bomb instead of a 120 mm main cannon. So those are issues.

Another issue is, right now they fire southeast away from me. If they take this Alternative III or IV, they're going to fire right at me. The next question is, what's the maximum range on these pieces? Do they have the capability to reach me? I have six kids out there, and 200-300 cows out there. I'd rather lose the cows, the dogs, the horses, and things of that nature than I would the children, but I want to know, are my children safe playing out there? The youngest one is 11 years old. He's going to be there 7 more years. Are my wife and I going to be safe in the house? I've had a bull killed out there. The army paid us \$18,000 for a bull that some GI shot riding through the woods. He just ripped off a magazine and happened to hit a bull. I had to go to the crime lab. I had to get help from the State of Georgia to come down there and prove that it came out of a military weapon – what issue, what year that weapon was made. If I hadn't been on the

police department at that time I might not have had the contacts to get everything done, but we got the Georgia State Crime Lab involved and they worked it all out and the army paid us for the bull. So I know there are things that can happen. There are dangers.

I've had to call the MPs out there. They've had to bring out their bomb squad and pick up munitions that have been dumped on my property because they didn't want to take them back to Fort Benning. I've picked up 50 caliber rounds in belts – maybe 100 to 150 rounds in belts. I've had all kinds of problems with flares and everything else out there. It's just a constant thing in our lives. So if we're going to make changes, I want to make sure those changes are for the good if I can. At least get our opinion in.

If I went on and on and on, you and I could sit here until that tape ran out. I mean I could tell you all the things we've had in the last 20 years. How many times I've been up there to Rich McDowell's office. He used to be a colonel before he was a civilian. I used to make a trip up there every week and dump out an FRM feedbag sack full of stuff that I picked up that was being thrown over the fence by the GIs going up and down.

We've lived with this for 20 years. I don't want it to get worse. If they are going to build this area so that the GIs don't have to go to Stewart, I understand that. I understand the impact on Columbus. I understand that base closings is an issue, but I'd like a little more peace out there and a little more cooperation out of the government with what they are doing. And a little more truthfulness as to what their plans are. If we started Hastings Range as a 50 caliber and we're firing 120 mm main guns out there, and everybody goes along with this Alternative III, and they start firing artillery pieces, and they still use Hastings Range to fire 100 mm and 120 mm guns, my situation has gotten no better – it's gotten worse. If they build this Alternative III, they say they can only do limited firing now at Fort Benning, and that's true. Hastings Range only gives them limited capabilities. But once they build this new range, they might be firing seven days a week – where now they fire a couple times a month, heavy, usually after 11:00 o'clock.

And that's another thing; when Gen. White was here he stopped them from firing after 11:00 o'clock. Then the next general came in -1 think it was Gen. Hendrix; he had been here as a Deputy Commander, and him and his wife came back - and he was commander, and he said that messed the mission up. They needed to do more night firing. Well, that's when most of us need to sleep. And if you were ever sitting in my house at 11:30 at night when they started firing, you would understand where we're coming from.

It's caused us lots of problems. I've bought cows that were pregnant, that had never been to my farm – hauled them from Kentucky, Texas, or whatever – bring them here, and they calf early. They start firing and scare the hell out of them.

They start running all over the pastures. It caused us lots of problems. The cows that are born there – no problem. They're used to the ground shaking and everything going on, so it doesn't bother them. But being a seed stock producer like we are, and dealing with purebred animals, you're always going out and buying the best you can buy someplace else and bringing them in.

We're not even talking right now about the helicopters that fly over and scare the hell out of everything. We've got a Red Cross helicopter that comes across – we'll it's got a red cross emblem on it – a medivac helicopter is what it is. And I swear that guy gets down as low as he can. He's below treetop level. I watched him one time almost go into the power lines. And he gets right above those cows – likes to chase them across the field. And then he's gone, back into the woods. I wonder sometimes if he's even a soldier because it's been happening too long. That soldier should have left here and went someplace else. But I was a soldier and I know how soldiers act, and how those things happen.

Basically those are my concerns. Without getting any feedback from you, that's what I have.

-2-

Ms. Frances Veal

56 George Cannon Rd Box Springs, GA 31801 Currently receives DMPRC Project mailings.

Some of my concerns are: the noise level, the repercussions from the actual firing, you know how the sound goes through the trees and shakes. The noise doesn't bother you; that is the part that gets to you. You know, that's the part that makes everything rattle and shake. You know, sometimes that can be damaging to some people's property – is that repercussion. So how is that going to be affected by this change? The other thing is, which direction are these bullets going to be going? Is it going to be firing toward my home, and from what I understand, it will be.

The Bradley tanks, [according to?] the gentleman over there, and the Abrams tanks do not fire that far. But the soldier out there with the machine guns and whatever; those bullets can get to my property. I have grandkids who like to ride four-wheelers on my property. And my property is just adjoining. Fort Benning is my neighbor – my closest neighbor. So there's that possibility – that's a concern.

The other concern is the environmental impact study. Does this mean that if they deem it, that they are going to have to put this ranger closer to my house rather than farther away from my house, which, I like the idea of them moving farther away from my house, except that they are going to be firing at me now, instead of away from me, because we're right next to Hastings Range now. I mean, we go off of our property and we're on Hastings Range. So they'll be firing toward us instead of away from us – that could be a concern.

Now these animals that are on the endangered species? They have to move that thing closer to my house? Which direction will they be shooting it at? And then the noise level and the environmental to our homes and everything? Is it going to come up and so, ok, it's too dangerous for you to live here anymore, so we're going to buy you out and let you move someplace else.

The government says they have to give you fair market value, right? What is fair market value going to be if nobody is going to buy the house because they can't move there anyway? So what is fair market value? That's a question.

Now if one of the reasons why they cannot move the range there because of the endangered species, like the bird, the woodpecker, would it be possible to transfer those birds to private property? And if so, what all is involved with that? How much government would be involved, having people walking on our properties making sure the bird is in a safe place? How much privacy do I have

from there? What regulations are going to be involved with that if they decided to do that? What are the advantages and disadvantages of that?

One of the reasons we like living in the area that we are is privacy. We don't have a lot of next door neighbors. I mean you walk out of our back door into your back door. You've got to go places. You know, you've got to go down the road, or you've got to get in your car and go to your neighbor's house. We like that. We'd like to keep it that way. But the noise level, and those birds, and those tortoises, and we've got plenty in our yard already, but how is that going to affect all that? Those are some of my questions that I'd like to have addressed.

In 1977 the government, Congress was looking at it, because the general, or whoever was in charge at Fort Benning, wanted to take over a certain amount of property from the reservation over to Highway 41 down to Buena Vista and up to Juniper. And the power line was in the way so they moved the power line, which passes my property, and a whole lot of other people. Well since that time we've had a whole lot of people move into the area. A lot of people did not get this notification because they don't take the local paper. They work in Columbus all the time. May not get the Columbus paper because they don't have time to read the paper, and not on the internet because we don't have that good of internet access. So the notifications are in, already my address is 30 years old that I'm getting mail from, so a lot of my neighbors are not getting notified that this is happening.

In the 70s Congress said that they would not acquisition our properties at that time because they were going to do an environmental impact study on the environment, what kind of wildlife was in the area, what kind of plants and things like that was, I forgot fish, that sort of thing, was in the area. How was it going to impact all of that? We've got to do an environmental impact study to see how it's going to affect that. So now they're saying, 20 years later, or so many years later, we're doing an impact analysis study. We want your input because we want to move the range over here, but what is behind all this, other than we want to digitize this and make it more technologically usable. So where are all these things coming from, other than it's just new technology and we need to update it?

They said in ten years they were going to review this, but Congress didn't review it because of the economy the way it was at that time, and there were no wars going on. Now we have President Bush ready for war. He's got to train his people. All right, it's going to take two years to build it, they say. And does that mean two years if they work around the clock doing it? If they work around the clock, does that shorten it to one year? In two years? How much time is it going to be before they get this thing ready so that they'll be ready for war, that they're fighting now?

The other thing was the airplanes from all the other air bases that come over and bomb in that area. They will continue to bomb. And how is that noise going to

increase? Because when they fix this range up to be more modern, we're going to have a lot more people training on it than what we do now. We're going to have a lot more activity. How much activity is that going to increase? So what is the long term view of this? How are they going to do that? And if they don't move that range in the center of Fort Benning, but move it closer to where the people live, what's the safety in that? What's our property values going to be? What is our kids that's on the four-wheelers riding around the property – how much danger are they in of getting shot?

So those are some of my questions. I think that's enough for right now. I'll be at the Thursday night meeting.

- 3 -

Ms. Cherry Kersey

424 Cheyenne Rd Columbus, GA 31904 706-322-8919 cherryupnow@knology.net Would like to be on DMPRC Project mailing list.

I was raised in Buena Vista and enjoy the peace and quiet except for the occasional firing that we heard growing up. And I hope to retire here one day and I am concerned about any additional noise factors or fallout, and I'd just urge whoever's in charge to look at things with that in mind. Buena Vista is a beautiful place that ought to be preserved.
- 4 -

Mr. Robert L. Swint III

1141 Georgia Hwy 41 North Buena Vista, GA 31803 229-649-7590 swintb@sowega.net Would like to be on DMPRC Project mailing list.

My name is Robert Swint and I've been a resident of Marion County, Buena Vista, Georgia for 50 plus years. I'd like to go on record as being in opposition to this proposed project on the basis of concerns for public safety and irreparable harm in environmental impact. There's an array of laws governing our country to protect our environment, including – this is not an all-inclusive list, but a lot of the concerns I would be for sera 313, 311, and 312 chemicals, irreparable harm, impact on the national air quality standards. There are a lot of residents that live adjacent to the proposed sites. Personally, I own property in the county within a distance that would be a concern to me and my family. Thank you.

- 5 -

Ms. Deborah Robinson

6739 Georgia Hwy 355 Box Springs, GA 31801 229-649-6520 Would like to be on DMPRC Project mailing list.

I'm very disappointed that I didn't receive a letter, being that I live on the boundary line. There's only one land owner that lives between me and the reservation line. So I heard about this through the news.

The noise level where I live is greater than the 75db. The asphalt in my driveway is cracked. There's a lot of vibration. The dishes shake. The whole house vibrates. And there are certain times that when they bomb it sounds like somebody is trying to knock the door down, in the middle of the night.

I think that they should have a timeframe where they don't shoot after 10:00pm. We do have children that try to sleep and go to school the next morning. I think that this should be more centrally located since the military reservation has so much land – that it should be more in the middle where there are no people.

I'm not really informed enough, and they should have had the meeting inside. It's cold out there tonight.

-6-

Ms. Marion Matthews

922 Pineknot Farms Rd Box Springs, GA 31801 229-649-2464 Would like to be on the DMPRC Project mailing list.

I went over there to ask the environmental guy, because I've heard of different... I work in a store so I see a lot more people, you know, it's like connecting the dots, we talk about different things. Well, it seems to me, I'm wondering, when they fire all these guns – the gun powder, the lead, that stays in the ground and stuff, you know?

We have the clouds that come over. Well that's dropping stuff. And then you've got the water out there. So where's all this stuff going? Is it sitting in there? Are these people, their kids having higher lead levels because of the stuff that's sitting in the ground and seeping down into our drinking water? You know? Is there somebody that can do a study on that?

He said out there that they study the running water. Well that's running water – that's moving on. It's constantly being produced, with the rain and all that kind of stuff, but what about our drinking water up underneath the ground?

Where we are in that north Marion County area, we don't have county water, which I wouldn't get anyway. I don't want some human having an accident, then I drink whatever they mess up on, you know? But I wonder about my ground water. With all their stuff sitting over all that land, whatever is in all the rain – smoke and powder and all that kind of stuff. So I have concern about that. I'd like them to tell me if they can do a study on that. Like I say, I hear different people talking about how their children's lead levels are up. And I want to know.

And that's my comments. I want them to check it, you know?

-7-

Ms. Jacque Costine

265 Fawn Drive Box Springs, GA 31801 229-649-4924 davidcostine@hotmail.com Wants to be on the DMPRC Project mailing list.

Where we live we've always experienced a lot of dust. Usually when the ranges are firing we experience a lot more dust out where I live, because I live a half a mile from the Fort Benning border of Hastings Range.

And the other problem we've got is the times when, I don't know if it's CS gas or what it is, but there's something in the air that comes in with the wind, and it will burn our eyes and our nasal passages. And I was in the army, so I have an idea that it's probably some loose CS gas from training or whatever is going on.

My biggest question is, when I moved out there I knew there was sand. You know, I knew there was dust. I didn't realize the extent Fort Benning was at the time that I moved in. But what I want to know is, is it going to increase? Is it going to be worse? Because we all seem to have respiratory problems in our general area because of the amount of dust.

I have a four year old grandson that lives with me, and when he comes in crying because the wind hurt his eyes, you know, I'd like to know what I can do other than move? You know, if that's the only option I've got, then that's what I'll have to do, but I'm wanting to know if this new plan is going to make it better, make it worse?

The sound, I've kind of figured out if they go to the new plans, it will be muffled more because my area won't be used as much to the extent that it was. But basically that's what I would like to know. You know, what they're expecting in the environmental study on the dust and lead, and stuff like that in the air. I don't see how you can fire that many rounds and something not be in the air.

And I'd just like to know what the situation is going to show. Thank you.

-

FOR COMMENTS ON

THE DIGITAL MULTI-PURPOSE RANGE COMPLEX

		A	rea of concern		
	Wetlands		Cultural Resources		Land Use
	Protected Species	×	Noise		Erosion
	Other:	10.55			
Caller Caller Caller	e's Name: <u>MiCkey</u> e's Address: <u>574</u> e's Email address (optio	<u>Avire</u> 4 <u>35</u> . nal):	tt_ Date of Call 5 Hwy B	: <u>Э</u> 9 КГ ы Браг	10103 95 CA 21501
Here of	Sent in product of the price of	Or Con Sice inte Decially r reach sàl - Als c (LV liSH - A When com Ms. Meliss Environment Meloy Ha Fort Bent	<u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comments</u> <u>Comme</u>	Can ger Can ger Can ger Can ger Chalk Also he build to other Onviro P	Wanted Circlisc <u>Howes</u> <u>How when</u> Mat he was Mat he was} Mat he was Mat he was Mat

FOR COMMENTS ON

THE DIGITAL MULTI-PURPOSE RANGE COMPLEX

Area of concern Wetlands Cultural Resources Land Use Protected Species Erosion Noise Other: me a3 Date of Call: Caller's Name: Caller's Address: Caller's Email address (optional): omments Em Ct. in Con hem When completed, return form to: Ms. Melissa B. Kendrick, R.E.M. Environmental Management Division Meloy Hall (Bldg 6), Room 310 Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122

From: Kendrick, Melissa B-Contractor Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2003 1:04 PM To: 'beardsley_howard@bah.com' Subject: Information on Proposed Fort Benning DMPRC Dear Mr. Beardsley,

Thank you for your interest in the Proposed Fort Benning Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC) project. We do not have any photographs of the DMPRC, due to the fact that this is still a proposed action and is in the preliminary design phase only; however, some additional information on both the proposed action and the environmental analysis process it is undergoing may be found in the attached newsletter. In addition, please refer to the following website for this and subsequent newsletters and other related documents: www.benning.army.mil/EMD/Legal&PublicNotices.htm.

If you would like to be added to the mailing list for this proposed action and receive future newsletters and notices of future meetings, please respond back with your full name, address, and email address; if you prefer email to regular mail, please indicate so and we will be sure to send you only email notices and documents.

For further information, please contact Mr. Rich McDowell, Fort Benning Public Affairs Officer, at (706) 545-2211. Please send your written comments regarding the proposed DMPRC to: Ms. Linda M. Veenstra, DMPRC Environmental Project Manager, Meloy Hall (Bldg 6), Room 309, Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122.

Thank you,

Melissa B. Kendrick, R.E.M. Environmental Specialist, Fort Benning, GA

FOR COMMENTS ON

THE DIGITAL MULTI-PURPOSE RANGE COMPLEX

	<u>Area of concern</u>							
	Wetlands		Cultural Resources		Land Use			
\boxtimes	Protected Species		Noise		Erosion			
	Other:							
Caller's Name: Dr. William Birkhead Date of Call: <u>10 March 2004</u>								
Caller's Address: 4225 University Ave., Columbus, GA 31907-5645								
Caller's Email address (optional): Not given								

Comments

Dr. Birkhead called to request a full copy of the DEIS for review; he had previously been sent the summary. (The DEIS hard copy was mailed to him the same day.) Call taken by Melissa Kendrick.

When completed, return form to:

FOR COMMENTS ON

THE DIGITAL MULTI-PURPOSE RANGE COMPLEX

Area of concern

and Use
rosion
ìr

Caller's Name: Dr. William Birkhead Date of Call: 10 March 2004

Caller's Address: 4225 University Ave., Columbus, GA 31907-5645

Caller's Email address (optional): Not given

Comments

Dr. Birkhead called to request a full copy of the DEIS for review; he had previously been sent the summary. (The DEIS hard copy was mailed to him the same day.) Call taken by Melissa Kendrick.

When completed, return form to:

FOR COMMENTS ON

THE DIGITAL MULTI-PURPOSE RANGE COMPLEX

Area of concern

\bowtie	Wetlands		Cultural Resources	Land Use
	Protected Species		Noise	Erosion
	Other:			
Caller	's Name: <u>Catherine Fox</u>	Date	of Call: <u>18 March 2004</u>	
Caller	's Address: <u>Not Given.</u>			
Caller	's Email address (optional): 1	Not Giv	en.	

Comments

Ms. Fox was calling as part of her job with the Environmental Protection Agency and as a reviewer of the DEIS for the DMPRC. Specifically, she requested information on how to see copies of the wetlands reports indicated in the document and wanted to know the current status of these documents and studies. She made no formal comment, but said her comments would be coming via mail. I referred her to the DMPRC Environmental Project Manager, Ms. Linda Veenstra, regarding copies of the reports, if she found she needed them for her review.

When completed, return form to:

FOR COMMENTS ON

THE DIGITAL MULTI-PURPOSE RANGE COMPLEX

		Are	<u>ea of concern</u>				
	Wetlands		Cultural Resources		Land Use		
	Protected Species		Noise		Erosion		
\boxtimes	Other: Wanted copy of DEIS	<u>).</u>					
Caller's Name: Mr. Jim Phillips Date of Call: 22 March 2004							
Caller'	's Address: Chattahoochee Rive	rkeeper,	P.O. Box 1492, Columbus, GA,	31902			
Caller's Email address (optional): Not given							

Comments

Mr. Phillips called to request a full copy of the DEIS for review; he had previously been sent the summary. (A CD of the DEIS was mailed to him the same day.) Call taken by Melissa Kendrick.

When completed, return form to:

SIGN IN SHEET **DMPRC Public Meeting - Buena Vista** FORT BENNING DIGITAL MULTI-PURPOSE RANGE COMPLEX 4 March 2004 Name and Address Prefer Email? Phone Number Add to Mailing E-mail List? (Yor N) (PLEASE PRINT) (Y or N) Doris & Linon Wilson 1-209-649-931 DWilso_Blan @Yahoo. Com Jaque Costine 1-229-649-4924 Y Teanette, W. Scard 1-229-649-7884 william mª Canter Wendy Timms Spring Falle Algust USACE 706-545-2100 229-649-5441 Gra Herry 355 Margie Junner Miner Rosit 229 -649-2004 USACE Rolf Harniss 334-480-5311

	DM	SIGN IN S	HEET ng - Columbus	
FORT BENNING DIGITAL MUI	ORT BENNING DIGITAL MULTI-PURPOSE RANGE			2004
Name and Address (PLEASE PRINT)	Phone Number	Add to Mailing List? (Y or N)	Prefer Email? (Y or N)	E-mail
MICKEY &LAURA AVIRCH 5744 GA HWY 355 Box Spames GA 31801	229 649-258-4	У	У	MLA55QRARHALINK.NET
Hogh Westbury ASTH-OTR FOR BONN	706 545-7682-	N	N	
LIGE WILDTILES LANE GULMMAN GA. 31907	706-561-494	У		
high Laiss Br. L.d.	706-12-1073	Y		

a di petter con	D	SIGN IN S	HEET	
FORT BENNING DIGITAL MUL	TI-PURPOSE RANG	E COMPLEX	2 March	2004
Name and Address (PLEASE PRINT)	Phone Number	Add to Mailing List? (Y or N)	Prefer Email? (Y or N)	E⊦mali
Doug Linden	706.324.5681		Y	Doreg. Linden @ venning. a my mil Electront
F# Ike Augas	706-547-2100		- <u>Y</u>	Fullic. J. Aliguist p sases. ust

		DM	SIGN IN S	HEET Ig - Buene Mal a	Returnbus	
	FORT BENNING DIGITAL MUL	TI-PURPOSE RANG	-4 March	4 March 2004 2 March 2004		
	Name and Address (PLEASE PRINT)	Phone Number	Add to Mailing List? (Y or N)	Prefer Email? (Y or N)	E-mail-	
	NNN Ben Grieger	229-649-5502	Y			
1	June Veenstro	706-522-8742				
1	Tyrone Ragon	229-732-6196	Y	Y	ragantebenning. army. nil	
1	Brianna Vienstra	Kle - 545 - 8072	4	N		

Comments from Public Meeting for DMPRC

March 2, 2004

Comment 1

Louie Willett On mailing list Residing from Columbus, Georgia <u>Maintenance of Boundary Line Road</u>

"Um, my concern is along the boundary line road right about even with your uh impact area there, that road through the years hadn't been maintained very good and a few years back they had graveled it and it brought a lot of water, and sand and silt into a pond of mine and I worked for a couple years before I could get anybody to finally get a retention pond built but my concern now is one there is going to be any construction on that road, how much that road may be utilized to where it will need maintenance and if there has been any maintenance set aside for it, that's my biggest concern right now, just bring that to some people cause a couple of guys here don't seem to think there is going to be any work done but they think the road is still going to be utilized. If I could get an answer on that I would appreciate it very much. Who would you notify if they could tell me that in event you know I do see road cause right now you just talk to machines and people that say they are going to do something and you never hear back but you're never going to get the same person twice. If they could tell me that, too, in the letter maybe. Who would you contact you know as far as maintenance because I know the right people are probably going to ride and see it and the time it happens and gets away from them you just need another set of eyes to come look at it."

SIGN IN SHEET DMPRC Public Meeting – Buena Vista						
FORT BENNING DIGITAL MULT	I-PURPOSE RANG	4 March	4 March 2004			
Name and Address (PLEASE PRINT)	Phone Number	Add to Mailing List? (Y or N)	Prefer Email? (Y or N)	E-mail		
Sandy Tucker	706613-9493 X30	\sim				
2456 Elm Pr. Columber R. 31957 Harry Franklin	706-5-71-85-21	Y				
Myra & Parky	229 649-7624	Y				
Cathering Pupton	2794497917	¥				
4105 GA. Hun 355 BASEON W. PAKEY	229 649.7624	X				
Winder Timm 31001	229-649-4238	У				
Tony Biles	706-544-1165					
Marcus Turner	229-649-6700	Y		Box Springs Ga. 31801		
Eal & Mayin Juman	229-64941004			236 George EANNEN Rd Boyspringe Cn. 31801		

SIGN IN SHEET DMPRC Public Meeting – Buena Vista						
FORT BENNING DIGITAL MUL	TI-PURPOSE RANG	E COMPLEX	4 March	4 March 2004		
Name and Address (PLEASE PRINT)	Phone Number	Add to Mailing List? (Y or N)	Prefer Email? (Y or N)	E-mall		
MILTON POLIX 22	706 574-3500			UNTAKE		
Doyle Simmons	649-5421	2498 Ga Hy 355 Burna U	152 31905			
Carline Sund	487 862·3941	At 2 Bry 298 Butter Ha	31006			

APPENDIX F

NOTICE OF INTENT TO PREPARE AN EIS AND ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTS This determination is published pursuant to sections 705(d) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: January 24, 2003.

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix I - Issues and Decision Memorandum

Methodology and Background Information

Analysis of Programs

I. Use of Facts Available

II. Programs Determined to Confer Subsidies

A. Provision of Fertilizer and Machinery

B. Provision of Water and Irrigation equipment

C. Provision of Credit

D. Technical Support from the GOI E. Duty Refunds on Imported Raw or

Intermediate Materials Used in the

Production of Exported Goods

F. Program to Improve Quality of Exports of Dried Fruit

III. Program Determined to Be Not Countervailable

A. Price Supports and/or Guaranteed Purchase of All Production

IV. Programs Determined to Be Not Used

A. Export Certificate Voucher Program B. Tax Exemptions

V. Total Ad Valorem Rate

VI. Analysis of Comments

Comment 1: Discovery of Additional Farm Does Not Render Nima Ineligible

for a New Shipper Review *Comment 2:* Nima's Sale of Subject Merchandise to the United States Is

Bona Fide *Comment 3:* Application of Adverse Facts Available to Grower-Related Subsidies

Comment 4: Undisclosed Benefits Relating to Maghsoudi Farms' Land Title

Comment 5: Application of Adverse Facts Available to the Price Supports and/or Guaranteed Purchase of Production Program

Comment 6: Application of Adverse Facts Available to the Provision of GOI Credit Program

Comment 7: Application of Adverse Facts Available to the Provision of Fertilizer and Machinery Program *Comment 8:* Application of Adverse Facts Available to the Tax Exemption Program

Comment 9: Application of Adverse Facts Available to the Water and Irrigation Program

Comment 10: Application of Adverse Facts Available to the Technical Assistance Program

Comment 11: Application of Adverse Facts Available to the Program for Imported Raw or Intermediate Materials Used in the Production of Exported Goods *Comment 12:* Application of Adverse Facts Available to the Program to Improve Quality of Exports of Dried Fruit Comment 13: Application of Adverse Facts Available to the Export Certificate Voucher Program Comment 14: Application of a Combination Rate Limited to Production Exported by Nima from the Single Farm Disclosed by Maghsoudi Comment 15: Completeness and Accuracy of Data Reported by Nima Comment 16: Reliability of Sales Information Submitted by Fallah Pistachios

[FR Doc. 03–2330 Filed 1–30–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex at Fort Benning, GA

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD. **ACTION:** Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multipurpose range complex (DMPRC). The DMPRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for soldiers to conduct gunnery courses in a realistic training environment by expanding the installation's training capacity. The current facilities (ranges) on Fort Benning do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full gunnery training and qualifications, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart, a distance of approximately 200 miles, for the required training. The project would include construction of the firing and target area, installation of fiber optics, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. The proposed DMPRC would ensure soldiers are fully combat ready. The DMPRC would provide a suitable training range to fully support future needs of Army Transformation. Incorporating modern technology and range design into the DMPRC will allow Intermediate Brigade Combat Teams at Fort Benning to train more realistically and efficiently.

DATES: To be considered in the Draft EIS, comments and suggestion should be received not later than March 3, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Please direct written comments concerning the scope of the Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex to Mr. Archibald Caldwell, Assistant Range Officer, Directorate of Training, U.S. Army Infantry Center, Attn: ATZB– OTR, Fort Benning, GA, 31905–5122 or e-mail to *Caldwella@benning.army.mil*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Archibald Caldwell by telephone at (706) 545–3446 or by e-mail to *Caldwella@benning.army.mil.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Fort Benning is the "Home of the Infantry" and conducts Program of Instruction training for Mechanized Infantry Students and sustainment training for elements of Mechanized Infantry Division units. Today's Army includes Mechanized Infantry units with both M2 Bradley Fighting Vehicles (BFVs) and M1A1 and M1A2 Abrams tanks. Although the Army is undergoing a transformation, Abrams tanks and BFVs will play vital roles in Army operations for a significant period of time (20-30 years). In addition to Infantry School training, Fort Benning is the home of several Forces Command deployable units and approximately 44 tank crews and 84 BFV crews. These assigned units are stationed at Fort Benning and must maintain their proficiency through required gunnery training. Consequently, Fort Benning needs a range that will accommodate all weapon systems that are relevant to ground warfare.

BFV crews and Abrams tank crews train for combat readiness by practicing and qualifying at different skill levels, known as gunnery Tables I through XII. Existing facilities on Fort Benning do not meet full training standards for BFV or Abrams tank training due to inadequate firing distance to the targets and width between the firing lanes. Currently Hastings Range (the existing facility) can only support a modified version of Table XII gunnery qualification training for the BFV and Abrams tank in a non-digitized environment. The digital component of the proposed DMPRC will enhance training by providing real time monitoring to increase safety and by providing feedback for after action reviews.

The proposed DMPRC would support Army Transformation by providing a quality range that would meet the training requirements of the current operational assets (Legacy Forces) as well as support the additional training requirements of the Intermediate Armored Vehicles to be used by the Intermediate Brigade Combat Teams.

Alternatives to be considered include:

1. No Action—Continue to conduct some modified gunnery training at Fort Benning and conduct remainder of gunnery training at existing ranges at Fort Stewart.

2. Transport to Fort Stewart (transport troops from Fort Benning to existing ranges at Fort Stewart to conduct all Table XII gunnery and related training).

3. Proposed Action—Conduct and operate DMPRC in Fort Benning Training Compartment D–13.

4. Construct DMPRC in Training Compartment K–21 on Fort Benning.

Scoping: A mailing list has been prepared for public scoping and review throughout the process of preparation of a draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). This list includes local, state, and Federal officials having jurisdictional expertise or other interests in the project; concerned citizens; conservation groups; and local news media. Comments received as a result of this notice will be used to assist the Army in identifying additional significant resources to be evaluated, as well as potential impacts to the quality of the human and natural environments. Individuals or organizations may participate in the scoping process by submitting written comments or attending a public scoping meeting. The time and location of the scoping meeting will be announced in the Columbus Ledger Enquirer, on the Fort Benning Web site (*http:// www.benning.army.mil/EMD/ index.htm*), and by public notice sent to parties on the mailing list. Comments concerning the scope of the EIS may also be submitted to the address listed above.

Robert L. Hope,

Chief of Staff, Installation Management Agency, Southeast Region. [FR Doc. 03–2317 Filed 1–30–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Availability for Non-Exclusive, Exclusive, or Partially Exclusive Licensing of U.S. Patent Application Concerning Chemosensitizing Agents Against Chloroquine Resistant P. Falciparum and Methods of Making and Using Thereof

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with 37 CFR 404.6 and 404.7, announcement is made of the availability for licensing of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/849,400 entitled "Chemosensitizing Agents Against Chloroquine Resistant P. Falciparum and Methods of Making and Using Thereof," filed May 7, 2001. Foreign rights are also available (PCT/ US01/14574). The United States Government, as represented by the Secretary of the Army, has rights in this invention.

ADDRESSES: Commander, U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, ATTN: Command Judge Advocate, MCMR–JA, 504 Scott Street, Fort Detrick, Frederick, MD 21702– 5012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For patent issues, Ms. Elizabeth Arwine, Patent Attorney, (301) 619–7808. For licensing issues, Dr. Paul Mele, Office of Research & Technology Assessment, (301) 619–6664, both at telefax (301) 619–5034.

BILLING CODE 2316-08-M

COLUMBUS

Ledger-Enquirer

AFFIDAVIT

State of Georgia County of Muscogee

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that the legal advertisement attached hereto has been published in The Columbus Ledger-Enquirer, legal organ for Muscogee and Chattahoochee Counties, on the following dates:

February 2, 5, 8, 2003



Notary Public Muscogee County, Georgia (My Commission Expires June 21, 2004)

P.O. BOX 711 COLUMBUS, GEORGIA 31902-0711

Definition of the large barriers of the large Statement to the large Statement to the Definition of the large Complex at The Complex at the Large Complex at The Complex at the Large ACTION: Motion of Intent. Statement to the Large barriers of the Army, DOL ACTION: Motion of Intent. Statement to the Large barriers of the Army, DOL ACTION: Motion of Intent. Statement to the Large barriers of the Army, DOL ACTION: Motion of Intent. Statement to the Large barriers of the Army, DOL ACTION: Motion of Intent. Statement at distance with provide a state of the art targe barriers to conduct gammery controls in a relation training embourness by separating the Justizization's training capacity. The convert halling in integral and the Army separating the Justizization's training capacity. The convert halling in integral at the Army separating the Justizization's training capacity. The convert halling in integral at the Army separating the Justizization's training the Army separating the Justizization's training capacity. The convert halling in the Army capacity and by providing feedback for after action reviews. The proceed likefort would support at the month of generation of the army to the intermediation business providing the analysis of the Army training and the support to Ard State Conduct same modified quarter taking for bestate at the support to Ard State Army taking at each to a support to Ard Statewart I change at the support to Bestate Interime at a state at the support to Ard Statewart I change at the support to Ard Statewart I change at the support to Ard Statewart I change at the state at the intermediation at the state at the state at the intermediation of the state at the support to Ard State Army taking at each at a support to Ard State Arming Comparison at the Army taking at a data at the state at the formation of the state at the state at the formation of the state at the state at the formation of the state at the

AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION SAVANNAH MORNING NEWS

STATE OF GEORGIA COUNTY OF CHATHAM

Personally appeared before me, ELIZABETH MC LAUGHLIN, to me known, who being sworn, deposes and says:

That she is the CLASSIFIED INSIDE SALES MANAGER of Southeastern Newspaper Corporation, a Georgia corporation, doing business in Chatham County, Ga., under the trade name of Savannah Morning News, a daily newspaper published in said county;

That she/he is authorized to make affidavits of publication on behalf of said published corporation;

That said newspaper is of general circulation in said county and in the area adjacent thereto;

That she/he has reviewed the regular editions of the Savannah Morning News, published on:

February 2, 2003 February 5, 2003,

and finds that the following advertisement, to-wit:

April (Deponent)

Notary Public, Chatham County, Ga.

EUGENE J. CRONK Notary Public, Chatham County, GA My Commission Expires February 5, 2006

Appeared in each of said editions. Sworn to and subscribed before me

This 7th day of March 2003

LEGAL NOTICE

Department of Defense Department of the Army

Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex at Fort Benning, GA

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DOD.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multipurpose range complex (DMPRC). The DMPRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for soldiers to conduct gunnery courses in a realistic training environment by expanding the installation's training clapacity. The current facilities (ranges) on Fort Benning do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full gunnery training and qualifications, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart a distance of approximately 200 miles for the required training. The project would include construction of the firing and target area, installation of fiber optics, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. The proposed DMPRC would ensure soldiers are fully combat ready. The DMPRC would provide a suitable training range to fully support future needs of Army Transformation. Incorporating modern technology and range design into the DMPRC will allow Intermediate Brigade Combat. Teams at Fort Benning to train more realistically and efficiently.

DATES: To be considered in the Draft EIS, comments and suggestions should be received not later than March 7, 2003. ADDRESSES: Please direct written comments concerning the scope of the Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex to Mr. Archibaid Caldwell, Assistant Range Officer, Directorate of Training, U.S. Army Inlantry Center, ATTN: ATZB-OTR, Fort Benning, GA, 31905-5122 or email to Caldwella@benning.army.ml.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CON-TACT: Mr. Archibaid Caldwell by telephone at (706) 545-3446 or by email to Caldwella@benning.army.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Fort Benning is the "Home of the Infantry" and conducts Program of Instruction training for Mechanized Infantry Students and sustainment training for elements of Mechanized Infantry Division units.

Today's Army includes Mechanized Infantry units with both M2 Bradley Fighting Vehicles (BFVs) and M1A1 and M1A2 Abrams tanks. Although the Army is undergoing a transformation, Abrams tanks and BFVs will play vital roles in Army operations for a significant period of time (20-30 years). In addition to Infantry School training, Fort Benning is the home of several Forces Command deployable units and approximately 44 tank crews and 84 BFV crews. These assigned units are stationed at Fort Benning and must maintain their proficiency through required gunnery training. Consequently, Fort Benning needs a range that will accommodate all weapon systems that are relevant to ground wartare.

BFV crews and Abrams tank crews train for combat readiness by practicing and qualifying at different skill levels. known as gunnery Tables I through XII. Existing facilities on Fort Benning do not meet full training standards for BFV or Abrams tank training due to inadequate firing distance to the targets and width petween the tripp lanes. Currently Instantion Pance (the disting the rest only support a modified version of Table XII gunnery qualification training for the BFV and Abrams tank in a non-digitized environment. The digital component of the proposed DMPRC will enhance training by providing real time monitoring to increase safety and by providing feedback for after action reviews.

The proposed DMPRC would support Army Transformation by providing a quality range that would meet the training requirements of the current operational assets (Legacy Forces) as well as support the additional training requirements of the Intermediate Armored Vehicles to be used by the Intermediate Brigade Combat Teams.

Alternatives to be considered include:

 No Action - Continue to conduct some modified gunnery training at Fort Benning and conduct remainder of gunnery training at existing ranges at Fort Stewart.

2, Transport to Fort Stewart - (transport troops from Fort Benning to existing ranges at Fort Stewart to conduct all Table XII gunnery and related training).

 Proposed Action - Construct and operate DMPRC in Fort Benning Training Compartment D-13.

4. Construct DMPRC in Training Compartment K-21 on Fort Benning.

Scoping: A mailing list has been p pared for public scoping and revi throughout the process of preparat of a draft Environmental Impact Str ment (EIS). This list includes local, str and Federal officials having jurisdictic expertise or other interests in the proje concerned citizens; conservat groups; and local news media. Cr ments received as a result of this no will be used to assist the Army in ide fying additional significant resource be evaluated, as well as potential pacts to the quality of the human : natural environments. Individuals organizations may participate in scoping process by submitting writ comments or attending a public scot meeting. The time and location of scoping meeting will be announce the Columbus Ledger Enquirer, on Fort Benning website (http://wn benning.army.mil/EMD/index.htm), by public notice sent to parties on mailing list. Comments concerning scope of the EIS may also be submi to the addresses listed above.

ROBERT L. HK Chief of §

Installation Management Age Southeast Re

Fort Benning invites your participation in a public scoping meeting regarithe proposed DMPRC as follows:

February 18, 2003, from 6:00 through 8:00 p.m.: Founders Hall, E beth Bradley Turner Center, Colum State University, Columbus, GA.

February 20, 2003, from 6:00 through 8:00 p.m.: Marion Co Courthouse, Buena Vista, GA.

Information about the propo DMPRC is also posted on the Benning wobsite http://w

herder and generative states and a second seco



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT AGENCY SOUTHEAST REGION 1593 HARDEE AVENUE SW FORT MCPHERSON, GEORGIA 30330-1057



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF:

Director Office of the Federal Register National Archives and Records Service 1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20408

Dear Sir:

The enclosed Notice of Intent for the Fort Benning Range Complex is submitted for publication in the Notice section of the Federal Register.

Please publish this Notice of Intent in the earliest edition of the Federal Register. This notice is required for the Department of the Army to perform its military mission and comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Army Regulation 200-2, and the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations.

Please bill this to charge code 3710-08-M.

Sincerely, ROBERT HOPE Chief of Staff

Enclosure

Cc: TRADOC Commander FORSCOM Commander HQDA DCS G-3 Ft. Benning Directorate of Facilities Engineering & Logistics Ft. Benning ATZB-JAA

BILLING CODE:3710-08-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex at Fort Benning, GA

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DOD.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: Fort Benning proposes to construct and operate a digital multi-purpose range complex (DMPRC). The DMPRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for soldiers to conduct gunnery courses in a realistic training environment by expanding the installation's training capacity. The current facilities (ranges) on Fort Benning do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full gunnery training and qualifications, requiring either training to modified standards or transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart a distance of approximately 200 miles for the required training. The project would include construction of the firing and target area, installation of fiber optics, construction of support facilities, upgrading of associated existing roadways, and construction of utilities to support the site. The proposed DMPRC would ensure soldiers are fully combat ready. The DMPRC would provide a suitable training range to fully support future needs of Army Transformation. Incorporating modern technology and range design into the DMPRC

1

will allow Intermediate Brigade Combat Teams at Fort Benning to train more realistically and efficiently.

DATES: To be considered in the Draft EIS, comments and suggestion should be received not later than [INSERT DATE 30 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].

ADDRESSES: Please direct written comments concerning the scope of the Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex to Mr. Archibald Caldwell, Assistant Range Officer, Directorate of Training, U.S. Army Infantry Center, ATTN: ATZB-OTR, Fort Benning, GA, 31905-5122 or email to Caldwella@benning.army.mil.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Archibald Caldwell by telephone at (706) 545-3446 or by email to Caldwella@benning.army.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Fort Benning is the "Home of the Infantry" and conducts Program of Instruction training for Mechanized Infantry Students and sustainment training for elements of Mechanized Infantry Division units. Today's Army includes Mechanized Infantry units with both M2 Bradley Fighting Vehicles (BFVs) and M1A1 and M1A2 Abrams tanks. Although the Army is undergoing a transformation, Abrams tanks and BFVs will play vital roles in Army operations for a significant period of time (20-30 years). In addition to Infantry School training, Fort Benning is the home of several Forces Command deployable units and approximately 44 tank crews and 84 BFV crews. These assigned units are stationed at Fort Benning and must maintain their proficiency through required gunnery training. Consequently, Fort Benning needs a range that will accommodate all weapon systems that are relevant to ground warfare.

2

BFV crews and Abrams tank crews train for combat readiness by practicing and qualifying at different skill levels, known as gunnery Tables I through XII. Existing facilities on Fort Benning do not meet full training standards for BFV or Abrams tank training due to inadequate firing distance to the targets and width between the firing lanes. Currently Hastings Range (the existing facility) can only support a modified version of Table XII gunnery qualification training for the BFV and Abrams tank in a non-digitized environment. The digital component of the proposed DMPRC will enhance training by providing real time monitoring to increase safety and by providing feedback for after action reviews.

The proposed DMPRC would support Army Transformation by providing a quality range that would meet the training requirements of the current operational assets (Legacy Forces) as well as support the additional training requirements of the Intermediate Armored Vehicles to be used by the Intermediate Brigade Combat Teams.

Alternatives to be considered include:

- No Action Continue to conduct some modified gunnery training at Fort Benning and conduct remainder of gunnery training at existing ranges at Fort Stewart.
- Transport to Fort Stewart (transport troops from Fort Benning to existing ranges at Fort Stewart to conduct all Table XII gunnery and related training).
- Proposed Action Construct and operate DMPRC in Fort Benning Training Compartment D-13.
- 4. Construct DMPRC in Training Compartment K-21 on Fort Benning.

Scoping: A mailing list has been prepared for public scoping and review throughout the process of preparation of a draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). This list includes local, state, and Federal officials having jurisdictional expertise or other interests in the project; concerned citizens; conservation groups; and local news media. Comments received as a result of this notice will be used to assist the Army in identifying additional significant resources to be evaluated, as well as potential impacts to the quality of the human and natural environments. Individuals or organizations may participate in the scoping process by submitting written comments or attending a public scoping meeting. The time and location of the scoping meeting will be announced in the Columbus Ledger Enquirer, on the Fort Benning website (<u>http://www-</u>

benning.army.mil/EMD/index.htm), and by public notice sent to parties on the mailing list. Comments concerning the scope of the EIS may also be submitted to the addresses listed above.

4

ROBERT L. HOPE Chief of Staff Installation Management Agency Southeast Region

APPENDIX G

DMPRC REGULATORY COORDINATION



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY SAVAMAAH BISTAICT, COBPS OF ENGINEERS 1004 North Westawer SLVD, Unit S ALEANY, GENEGIA 31707

April 25, 2003

Regulatory Branch 200305800

Dial Cordy & Associates Attention: Kendall Cochran 490 Osceola Avenue Jacksonville Beach, Florida 32250

Dear Mr. Cochran:

I refer to your request of April, 2003, concerning a Verification of the wetland jurisdictional determination for the Digital Multi-purpose Range Complex (DMPRC), on Fort Benning, Chattahoochee County, Georgia. This project has been assigned number 200305800 and it is important that you refer to this number in all communication concerning this matter.

As stipulated in the January 9, 2001, United States Supreme Court decision on Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County v. United States Army Corps of Engineers, the US Army Corps of Engineers cannot assert Clean Water Act jurisdiction over isolated, non-navigable, intrastate waters based solely on their use as habitat for migratory birds. In light of this decision, you provided the opinion that several wetlands located on the subject tract are non-jurisdictional.

We have reviewed the information under criteria contained in the 1987 "Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual." The survey entitled "DMPRC Wetland Delineation", dated April 2003, is an accurate depiction of the wetland boundary. We have determined that Wetland Areas C, D, and F, are isolated. These isolated wetlands are non-jurisdictional, and Department of the Army authorization, pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1344), is not required for dredge and/or fill activities in these areas.

All non-isolated wetland and other waters of the United States shown on the above referenced survey are subject to our jurisdiction pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) (33 U.S.C. 1344). The placement of dredged or fill material into any waterways and/or their adjacent wetlands or mechanized land clearing of those wetlands would require prior Department of the Army authorization pursuant to section 404. This communication does not convey any property rights, either in real estate or material, or any exclusive privileges. It does not authorize any injury to property, invasion of rights, or any infringement of federal, state or local laws, or regulations. It does not obviate your requirement to obtain state or local assent required by law for the development of this property. If the information you have submitted, and on which the US Army Corps of Engineers has based its determination is later found to be in error, this decision may be revoked.

We have enclosed a form, which explains your client's right to appeal this decision in accordance with Title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 331, published in the March 28, 2000, Eederal Register, Vol. 65, No. 60, Pages 16486-16503. We have also enclosed a document titled, "Basis For Jurisdictional Determination."

Should you have any questions concerning this matter, you may call me at (229) 430-8566.

÷.,

Sincerely,

Thomas C. Fischer Albany Field Office

Enclosure

BASIS FOR JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION

. . .

. .

We reviewed the information provided by the applicant's consultant and all other information available regarding the site and determined that the wetlands were delineated in accordance with 1987 "Corps of Engineers Delineation Manual." Wetland Areas A, B, and E, would be subject to our jurisdiction pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act since they are adjacent to and/or have a surface connection to a tributary to The Chattahoochee River. Impacts to the wetlands on the site would have the potential to affect interstate or foreign commerce since these waters eventually flow into a navigable water of the US.

Based on this review, as well as a review of aerial photographs, soils maps, etc, we determined that the wetland area identified as Wetland Areas C, D, and F, on the plat map are isolated and have no surface connection to any other water of the United States. We then reviewed the isolated areas in accordance with 33 CFR 328.3 to determine if the site is subject to our jurisdiction under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Based on this review, we determined that the isolated wetlands are non-jurisdictional since impacts to the site would not affect interstate or foreign commerce.

. .

all a	NOTIFICATION OF ADAMNS IN ATOM APPEAR OPTIONS AND PR	OVERSS AND				
孝梁	REQUEST FOR APPEAD					
Fort	Benning File Number: 200305800	Date: 4/25/03				
Attac	hed is:	See Section below				
	INITIAL PROFFERED PERMIT (Standard Permit or Letter of permission)	A				
	PROFFERED PERMIT (Standard Permit or Letter of permission)	В				
	PERMIT DENIAL	C				
х	APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION	D				
	PRELIMINARY JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION	E				
SEC decis Corp	FION I - The following identifies your rights and options regarding an administrati ion. Additional information may be found at http://usace.army.mit/inet/functions/o s regulations at 33 CFR Part 331.	ve appeal of the above cw/cecwo/reg or				
 A an si to O th Y to m th 	CCEPT: If you received a Standard Permit, you may sign the permit document and return it to the athorization. If you received a Letter of Permission (LOP), you may accept the LOP and your work gnature on the Standard Permit or acceptance of the LOP means that you accept the permit in its en appeal the permit, including its terms and conditions, and approved jurisdictional determinations a BJECT: If you object to the permit (Standard or LOP) because of certain terms and conditions there e permit be modified accordingly. You must complete Section II of this form and return the form to our objections must be received by the district engineer within 60 days of the date of this notice, or appeal the permit in the future. Upon receipt of your letter, the district engineer will evaluate your oddify the permit to address all of your concerns, (b) modify the permit to address some of your object is permit having determined that the permit should be issued as previously written. After evaluating its prime and your a performed neuroit for your receiption and return the form B.	district engineer for final a is authorized. Your atirety, and waive all rights associated with the permit. rein, you may request that to the district engineer. you will forfeit your right r objections and may: (a) ections, or (c) not modify g your objections, the below				
B: P	ROFFERED PERMIT: You may accept or appeal the permit	below.				
• A an si to	CCEPT: If you received a Standard Permit, you may sign the permit document and return it to the athorization. If you received a Letter of Permission (LOP), you may accept the LOP and your work gnature on the Standard Permit or acceptance of the LOP means that you accept the permit in its en appeal the permit, including its terms and conditions, and approved jurisdictional determinations a	district engineer for final t is authorized. Your stirety, and waive all rights associated with the permit.				
• A m fc di	 APPEAL: If you choose to decline the proffered permit (Standard or LOP) because of certain terms and conditions therein, you may appeal the declined permit under the Corps of Engineers Administrative Appeal Process by completing Section II of this form and sending the form to the division engineer. This form must be received by the division engincer within 60 days of the date of this notice. 					
C: P by cor engine	ERMIT DENIAL: You may appeal the denial of a permit under the Corps of Engineers Admi npleting Section II of this form and sending the form to the division engineer. This form must be re- er within 60 days of the date of this notice.	inistrative Appeal Process eccived by the division				
D: A provi	PPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION: You may accept or appeal de new information.	the approved JD or				
• A d	 ACCEPT: You do not need to notify the Corps to accept an approved JD. Failure to notify the Corps within 60 days of the date of this notice, means that you accept the approved JD in its entirety, and waive all rights to appeal the approved JD. 					
• A A b;	PPEAL: If you disagree with the approved JD, you may appeal the approved JD under the Corps of ppeal Process by completing Section II of this form and sending the form to the division engineer, y the division engineer within 60 days of the date of this notice.	of Engineers Administrative This form must be received				
E: P regar appro provi	RELIMINARY JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION: You do not need to resp ding the preliminary JD. The Preliminary JD is not appealable. If you wish, you n oved JD (which may be appealed), by contacting the Corps district for further instru- de new information for further consideration by the Corps to reevaluate the JD.	pond to the Corps nay request an uction. Also you may				

SECTION II - REQUESTFOR APPEAL or OBJECTIONS TO AN INITIAL PROFFERED PERMIT

REASONS FOR APPEAL OR OBJECTIONS: (Describe your reasons for appealing the decision or your objections to an initial proffered permit in clear concise statements. You may attach additional information to this form to clarify where your reasons or objections are addressed in the administrative record.)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: The appeal is limited to a review of the administrative record, the Corps memorandum for the record of the appeal conference or meeting, and any supplemental information that the review officer has determined is needed to clarify the administrative record. Neither the appellant nor the Corps may add new information or analyses to the record. However, you may provide additional information to clarify the location of information that is already in the administrative record.

POINT OF CONTAGE FOR OUESTIONS OR INFO	RMATION	語に、生また、語言ない		
If you have questions regarding this decision and/or the appeal process you may contact: Thomas C. Fischer U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Albany Field Office 1104 N. Westover Blvd, Unit 9 Albany Georgie 21/207	ppeal If you only have questions regarding the appeal process you may also contact: Mr. Arthur Middleton, Administrative Appeal Review Officer CESAD-ET-CO-R U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, South Atlantic Division 60 Forsyth Street, Room 9M15 Atlantic Georgia 30303-8801			
RIGHT OF ENTRY: Your signature below grants the right of en consultants, to conduct investigations of the project site during th notice of any site investigation, and will have the opportunity to p	Try to Corps of Engineers persona e course of the appeal process. You participate in all site investigations.	el, and any government ou will be provided a 15 day		
Signature of appellant or agent.	Date:	Telephone number:		

DIVISION ENGINEER: Commander U.S. Army Engineer Division, South Atlantic 60 Forsyth Street, Room 9M15 Atlanta, Georgia 30303-3490

Georgia Department of Natural Resources

Lonice C. Barrett, Commissioner

Historic Preservation Division

W. Ray Luce, Division Director and Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer 156 Trinity Avenue, S.W., Suite 101, Atlanta, Georgla 30303-3600 Telephone (404) 656-2840 Fax (404) 657-1040 http://www.gashpo.org

May 19, 2003

John J. Brent Chief, Environmental Management Division (Attention: Chris Hamilton) Department of the Army Headquarters United States Army Infantry Center Fort Benning, Georgia 31905-5000

RE: Fort Benning: DMPRC Phase II Investigations (March 2003) (Contract # DABT10-00-D-0017) Muscogee County, Georgia FP030402-001

Dear Mr. Brent:

The Historic Preservation Division (HPD) has reviewed the information submitted concerning the abovereferenced undertaking within the Fort Benning Military Reservation, Muscogee County, Georgia. Our comments are offered to assist the Department of the Army in complying with the provisions of Sections 110 and 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Based on the information provided, HPD concurs with the determination that sites 9CE433 and 9CE1521 should be considered eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). We also concur that site 9CE1735 should be considered eligible for the NRHP and that protective measures should be taken at these sites to prevent further disturbances. If such measures cannot be taken, we recommend Phase III mitigation for these sites. We further agree that the other seventcen sites (005-1a, 9CE228, 9CE273, 9CE287, 9CE616, 9CE1520, 9CE1522, 9CE1698, 9CE1896, 9CE1897, 9CE1899, 9CE1900, 9CE1901, 9CE1902/3/4, 9CE1911, 9CE1912, and 9CE1915) should be considered not eligible for listing in the NRHP.

Furthermore, please submit one additional copy of the report to our office for our files. Please refer to project number FP030402-001 in any future correspondence regarding this undertaking. If we may be of further assistance, please contact Joseph Charles, Review Archaeologist, at (404) 651-6433 or Serena G. Bellew, Environmental Review Coordinator, at (404) 651-6624.

Sincere

W. Ray Luce Division Director, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

WRL:sfc

cc: Kristen Reed, Panamerican Consultants, Inc.
Georgia Department of Natural Resources

2 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, S.E., Suite 1152 East Tower, Atlanta, Georgia 30334-9000 Lonice C. Barrett, Commissioner Harold F. Reheis, Director Environmental Protection Division 404/656-4713

July 15, 2003

Mr. James I. Palmer, Jr. Regional Administrator U.S. EPA, Region I61 Forsyth Street, SW Atlanta, Georgia 30303-3104

Dear Mr. Palmer:

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has promulgated a new 8-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard. Section 107(d)(1) of the Clean Air Act requires each State to submit to the EPA its recommended designation of each area of the State as attainment/unclassifiable or nonattainment under the standard. The Georgia Environmental Protection Division has developed recommended designations in accordance with EPA's memorandum dated March 28, 2000, "Boundary Guidance on Air Quality Designations for the 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard," as well as other, more recent guidance.

The attached table provides the Georgia EPD's recommendations for the designation status of each county in Georgia. It is recommended that 20 counties in metropolitan Atlanta and three counties outside metropolitan Atlanta be designated as nonattainment.

Modeling conducted by the EPA and Georgia Tech indicates that the Augusta and Macon areas should attain the 8-hour ozone standard after implementation of the regional nitrogen oxide emission reductions and new federal vehicle and fuel standards, without the need for additional local control measures. In light of this modeling we are recommending that only the counties in those areas having ozone monitors showing violations of the standard (Richmond and Bibb Counties) be designated nonattainment. In addition, a monitor located within a federal Class I area in Murray County has shown violation of the standard. In accordance with recent EPA proposed guidance regarding rural transport of ozone, we are recommending only that portion of Murray County comprising the Class I area be designated nonattainment.

Please contact Ron Methier at (404) 363-7016 should you have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

Harold F. Reheis Director

HFR:dks

Attachment

cc: Ron Methier, Chief Air Protection Branch

A. S. SANDAR MARKED AND A MARKED

Appling	Attainment	
Atkinson	Attainment	aronan yang nang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang
Bacon	Attainment	
Baker	Attainment	-
Baldwin	Attainment	
Banks	Attainment	
Barrow		Nonattainment
Bartow		Nonattainment
Ben Hill	Attainment	······································
Berrien	Attainment	
Bibb		Nonattainment
Bleckley	Attainment	
Brantley	Attainment	
Brooks	Attainment	
Bryan	Attainment	
Bulloch	Attainment	
Burke	Attainment	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Butts	Attainment	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Calhoun	Attainment	
Camden	Attainment	
Candler	Attainment	
Carroll		Nonattainment
Catoosa	Attainment	
Charlton	Attainment	
Chatham	Attainment	
Chattahoochee	Attainment	
Chattooga	Attainment	
Cherokee	A	Nonattainment
Clarke	Attainment	
Clay	Attainment	
Clayton		Nonattainment
Clinch	Attainment	
Cobb		Nonattainment
Coffee	Attainment	
Colquitt	Attainment	
Columbia	Attainment	
Cook	Attainment	
Coweta		Nonattainment
Crawford	Attainment	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Crisp	Attainment	
Dade	Attainment	
Dawson	Attainment	

County Name Designation

Decatur	Attainment	
DeKalb		Nonattainment
Dodge	Attainment	
Dooly	Attainment	
Doughtery	Attainment	
Douglas	•	Nonattainment
Early	Attainment	
Echols	Attainment	
Effingham	Attainment	
Elbert	Attainment	
Emanuel	Attainment	
Evans	Attainment	
Fannin	Attainment	
Fayette		Nonattainment
Floyd	Attainment	
Forsyth		Nonattainment
Franklin	Attainment	
Fulton		Nonattainment
Gilmer	Attainment	
Glascock	Attainment	
Glynn	Attainment	
Gordon	Attainment	
Grady	Attainment	
Greene	Attainment	
Gwinnett		Nonattainment
Habersham	Attainment	
Hall		Nonattainment
Hancock	Attainment	
Haralson	Attainment	
Harris	Attainment	
Hart	Attainment	
Heard	Attainment	
Henry		Nonattainment
Houston	Attainment	
Irwin	Attainment	
Jackson	Attainment	
Jasper	Attainment	
Jeff Davis	Attainment	
Jefferson	Attainment	
Jenkins	Attainment	
Johnson	Attainment	
Jones	Attainment	

人名英格兰英格兰英格兰英格兰英格兰英格兰英格兰英格兰英格兰英格兰英格兰英格兰英格兰英	Entrangenergy and the one prior to call a graduate to consider a second s second second se Second second s Second second seco	
	Introduction of the product of the product of the transmission of transmission of the transmission of trans	
		· "你们的你们,你们们的你们,你们的你?""你们你?""你?""你们?""你们你?""你们你你们你?""你?""你你你?""你你?""
		しんちょう しん ちょうちょう ちょうしょ かんちょう とうえいちょう かんしょうかん しんがん かんがらう ちょうかい かたたち かんしょうかい かかれる かがれぬ
		しょうしょう かいえいがく あん ちょうかいしょうかい かっていた かくだいがく かかびえ かかかた かかかかい さかりかび えんか かかが ひょうかん ひょう
 Structure statements and a structure statement of the structure st structure structure s 	a de l'estado de la compañía de la c	n na ne a sen a e a classica é na classica na contente tere amb tacés és calcar e a classe ne el éndece no na c
<u> </u>		같은 같이 집 사람들에게 있었다. 같은 것 같은

Lamar	Attainment	ny na kaominina mampika dia kaominina dia 4000000 mampika 2000 mampika manjara dari dari dari dari dari dari da
Lanier	Attainment	
Laurens	Attainment	
Lee	Attainment	
Liberty	Attainment	
Lincoln	Attainment	
Long	Attainment	
Lowndes	Attainment	
Lumpkin	Attainment	
McDuffie	Attainment	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
McIntosh	Attainment	
Macon	Attainment	
Madison	Attainment	
Marion	Attainment	
Meriwether	Attainment	
Miller	Attainment	
Mitchell	Attainment	
Monroe	Attainment	
Montgomery	Attainment	
Morgan	Attainment	
Murray		Attainment, except for that portion in the Class I area
Muscogee	Attainment	
Newton		Nonattainment
Oconee	Attainment	
Oglethorpe	Attainment	
Paulding		Nonattainment
Peach	Attainment	
Pickens	Attainment	
Pierce	Attainment	
Diko		
FIKE	Attainment	
Polk	Attainment Attainment	
Pike Polk Pulaski	Attainment Attainment Attainment	
Pike Polk Pulaski Putnam	Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment	
Pike Polk Pulaski Putnam Quitman	Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment	
Pulaski Pulaski Putnam Quitman Rabun	Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment	
Pike Polk Pulaski Putnam Quitman Rabun Rabun Randolph	Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment	
Pike Polk Pulaski Putnam Quitman Rabun Randolph Richmond	Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment	Nonattainment
Pike Polk Pulaski Putnam Quitman Rabun Rabun Randolph Richmond Rockdale	Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment	Nonattainment Nonattainment
Pike Polk Pulaski Putnam Quitman Rabun Randolph Richmond Rockdale Schley	Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment	Nonattainment Nonattainment
Pike Polk Pulaski Putnam Quitman Rabun Randolph Richmond Rockdale Schley Screven	Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment	Nonattainment Nonattainment
Pike Polk Pulaski Putnam Quitman Rabun Randolph Richmond Rockdale Schley Screven Seminole	Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment Attainment	Nonattainment Nonattainment

			 the state of the s																	
				(a) (b) (b) (b) (b)	and the second						and the second second second									
		2 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·								and the second second	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				The second second second second	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1				• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
								A set of a local set of a set of a												
	the second se							I = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1												
	A set of the set of	The second s					The second second second						(1)	AND AND A DOMESTIC						
										1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -			101 D.C. 101 D.C. 100							
100 C 100 C																		 the second s		
100 C 100 C 100																				
					and the second				 A set of the set of											
									2.4 million (1997) 11.1 (1997)											
									the second se											
		A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL PROPERTY.																		
					International statements and statements															
						Construction of the second														
										and the second second									 	

Stephens	Attainment
Stewart	Attainment
Sumter	Attainment
Talbot	Attainment
Taliaferro	Attainment
Tattnall	Attainment
Taylor	Attainment
Telfair	Attainment
Terrell	Attainment
Thomas	Attainment
Tift	Attainment
Toombs	Attainment
Towns	Attainment
Treutlen	Attainment
Troup	Attainment
Turner	Attainment
Twiggs	Attainment
Union	Attainment
Upson	Attainment
Walker	Attainment
Walton	Nonattainment
Ware	Attainment
Warren	Attainment
Washington	Attainment
Wayne	Attainment
Webster	Attainment
Wheeler	Attainment
White	Attainment
Whitfield	Attainment
Wilcox	Attainment
Wilkes	Attainment
Wilkinson	Attainment
Worth	Attainment

Georgia Department of Natural Resources

Environmental Protection Division, Air Protection Branch 4244 International Parkway, Suite 120, Atlanta, Georgia 30354 Phone: 404/363-7000; Fax: 404/363-7100 Lonice C. Barrett, Commissioner David M. Word, Assistant Director

July 17, 2003

Ms. Kay Prince Chief, Air Planning Branch Air, Pesticides & Toxics Management Division U.S. EPA, Region IV 61 Forsyth Street, SW Atlanta, GA 30303-8909

Re: Recommendations for Nonattainment Designations Under the 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS

Dear Ms. Prince:

Our July 15, 2003, submittal contains Georgia EPD's recommendations for the designation status of each county in Georgia under the 8-hour ozone standard. As indicated in that letter, we have recommended the following 8-hour ozone nonattainment areas:

- Atlanta area to include Barrow, Bartow, Carroll, Cherokee, Clayton, Cobb, Coweta, DeKalb, Douglas, Fayette, Forsyth, Fulton, Gwinnett, Hall, Henry, Newton, Paulding, Rockdale, Spalding and Walton Counties;
- Macon area to include Bibb County;
- > Augusta area to include Richmond County; and
- Fort Mountain area to include that portion of Murray County, which contains the federal Class 1 Cohutta Wilderness Area.

With this letter we are supplying additional information regarding the selection methodology used to arrive at the aforementioned recommendations. These recommendations were developed in accordance with the boundary guidance provided by the U.S. EPA. The attached memo, dated July 15, 2003, provides the background information on the nonattainment designation process, including the Georgia counties that were evaluated for nonattainment designation, the selection criteria used to evaluate those counties, and the application of those criteria in making the final nonattainment designations. The memo explains how each of the selection criteria used address one or more of the recommended eleven selection criteria contained in EPA's nonattainment designation guidance. It is our hope that this information will aid EPA in reviewing and approving EPD's recommendations for the designations.

If you have any questions or need more information, please contact me at (404) 363-7016.

Sincerely,

Ron Methier Chief, Air Protection Branch

Attachment

Georgia Department of Natural Resources

Environmental Protection Division, Air Protection Branch 4244 International Parkway, Suite 120, Atlanta, Georgia 30354 Phone: 404/363-7000; Fax: 404/363-7100 Lonice C. Barrett, Commissioner Harold F. Reheis, Director

July 15, 2003

MEMORANDUM

TO: Harold Reheis

Ron Methiel

FROM:

SUBJECT: Nonattainment Area Designations under the 8-hour Ozone Standard

Background

As required under section 107(d)(1)(A) of the Clean Air Act (CAA), the Governor must submit to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) by July 15, 2003, a list initially designating each area of the State as nonattainment, attainment or unclassifiable with respect to the new 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standard for ozone. By no later than April 15, 2004, the EPA Administrator will promulgate the designation of each area of the State by Final Rule and notice in the Federal Register. As provided under section 107(d)(1)(B) of the CAA, the Administrator may modify, as he deems necessary, the initial area designations and/or area boundaries submitted by the Governor.

The Air Protection Branch has reviewed guidance provided by the EPA as well as pertinent, available data to develop criteria for assigning area designations and boundaries. The EPA's March 28, 2000, memorandum "Boundary Guidance on Air Quality Designations for the 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS)" enunciates the EPA's position that any monitored violation of the standard within a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) should, as an initial presumption, cause that entire MSA to be considered for designation as nonattainment:

"The EPA believes that any county with an ozone monitor showing a violation of the NAAQS and any nearby contributing area needs to be designated as nonattainment. In reducing ozone concentrations above the NAAQS, EPA believes it is best to consider controls on sources over a larger area due to the pervasive nature of ground level ozone and transport of ozone and its precursors. Thus, EPA recommends that the Metropolitan Statistical Area or the Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (C/MSA) serve as the presumptive boundary for 8-hour NAAQS nonattainment areas. We believe this approach will best ensure public health protection from the adverse effects of ozone pollution caused by population density, traffic and commuting patterns, commercial development, and area growth."

As a result, the starting point for evaluation of nonattainment area boundaries should be the entire C/MSA if any monitor located within a C/MSA shows a violation of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS. In Georgia, monitors showing violations of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS are located in 10 counties within the Atlanta C/MSA (Cobb, Coweta, DeKalb, Douglas, Fayette, Fulton, Gwinnett, Henry, Paulding and Rockdale), in Richmond County within the Augusta-Aiken C/MSA and in Bibb County within the Macon C/MSA. Accordingly, the entire Atlanta, Augusta-Aiken and Macon C/MSAs comprise three potential nonattainment area boundaries. The counties included in these three C/MSAs are shown on the map "Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Areas for Atlanta, Augusta and Macon" (Attachment A). In the case of Atlanta, controls have been placed in the existing 13-county 1-hour ozone nonattainment area as well as the surrounding 32-counties to attain the old 1-hour ozone standard. Hence, the starting point for Atlanta includes

Nonattainment Area Designations under the 8-Hour Ozone Standard July 15, 2003 Page 2

these 45-counties, shown on the map "Atlanta's Area of Influence under the 1-hour Ozone Standard" (Attachment B).

The March 28 memorandum lists the following factors that should be addressed if a State seeks to propose nonattainment area boundaries larger or smaller than the Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Areas (C/MSAs):

- a. Emissions and air quality in adjacent areas
- b. Population density and degree of urbanization
- c. Monitoring data representing ozone concentrations in local areas and larger areas
- d. Location of emission sources
- e. Traffic and commuting patterns
- f. Expected growth
- g. Meteorology
- h. Geography/topography
- i. Jurisdictional boundaries
- j. Level of control of emission sources
- k. Regional emission reductions

In order to address these factors we have obtained and reviewed the following data:

- Quality assured ozone monitoring data from each of the sites operated by our Ambient Monitoring Program.
- County by county NO_x and VOC emissions during CY 1999, compiled using the best available data from Georgia's 1999 Emissions Inventory, Georgia Tech's 1999 modeling inventories for Atlanta, Augusta and Macon, and EPA's 1999 National Emissions Inventory.
- Projected county-by-county NO_x and VOC emissions for CY 2007 based on application of EPA's EGAS projection model to the 1999 county-by-county NO_x and VOC emissions compiled as described above.
- 1990 & 2000 census data, and Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area boundaries from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- Projected CY 2005 and CY 2010 population data from the Georgia Department of Labor as published in Georgia State University's "The Georgia County Guide."
- CY 2001 summer daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) data (without interstates) from the Georgia Department of Transportation.

Development of Criteria

The above data were reviewed in light of the EPA's guidance factors and input received from other State agencies. This process resulted in development of a set of criteria for use in screening counties in and around the Atlanta, Augusta and Macon C/MSAs for inclusion within the proposed nonattainment area boundaries. Attachment C, "Determination of 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Areas" contains data on various criteria for the counties under consideration. In addition to the screening criteria, there are two factors that mandate inclusion of a county in the nonattainment area:

1) If the data from a monitor in a county show a violation of the standard, that is an absolute indicator of nonattainment and the county must be designated nonattainment. The spreadsheet "Determination of 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Areas in Georgia" indicates

those counties in which ozone monitors are located, and whether a monitor has documented a violation of the standard.

2) If a county is currently designated nonattainment under the 1-hour standard, it will be included in the 8-hour nonattainment area. As a result, all 13 counties in the existing Atlanta 1-hour ozone nonattainment area will be included in the new Atlanta 8-hour ozone nonattainment area.

The two factors listed above incorporate the air quality considerations of the EPA's guidance factors "a" and "c" related to air quality and monitoring data, as well as local and regional emission controls already in place (for the 1-hour standard) which relate to guidance factors "j" and "k".

The screening criteria and rationale for their application are presented below.

Criterion 1: Projected 2007 population density exceeding the minimum value that corresponds to a monitored violation within a C/MSA. This criterion addresses guidance factors "b" and "f". To the extent that ozone precursor emissions are a function of human activity, population density of a county may serve as a reasonable indicator that activities within the county contribute to overall nonattainment within the C/MSA. The threshold value for this criterion has been selected as the population density below which no monitored violation of the 8-hour standard has occurred (an exception is Murray County, which is discussed below). The 2007 projected population of each county was interpolated using values for four years: U.S. Census Bureau data for years 1990 and 2000, and projected 2005 and 2010 data from the Georgia Department of Labor as published in Georgia State University's "The Georgia County Guide." As indicated in the spreadsheet "Determination of 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Areas in Georgia," the county with the lowest measured population density, which has a violating monitor, is Coweta County, with a (2000 census) population density of 204 persons per square mile. Accordingly, a county with a projected 2007 population density equal to or greater than 204 persons per square mile would satisfy this criterion for inclusion in its C/MSAs nonattainment area.

Criterion 2: Projected 2007 NO_x <u>or</u> VOC emissions density exceeding the minimum value that corresponds to a known monitored violation within a C/MSA. As NO_x and VOC are precursors to ozone formation, the more NO_x or VOC emitted in a county the greater the contribution to the nonattainment problem. This criterion reflects the normalized (by land area) level of precursor emissions (per guidance factors "a", "d", "f," "h" and "i") as well as those emission controls and emission reductions already in place (per guidance factors j and k). Correlation of county-by-county 1999 emissions data to monitored violations of the 8-hour standard reveals that Paulding County has had the lowest NO_x emissions density (8 tons per year per square mile) of any counties having a violating monitor (excluding Murray County, which is discussed below). Any county having <u>either</u> a NO_x emissions density equal to or greater than 8 tons per year per square mile <u>or</u> a VOC emissions density equal to or greater than 10 tons per year per square mile would meet this criterion for nonattainment designation.

Criterion 3: Daily commuting trips (year 2000 basis) from a county into the nonattainment area exceeding the minimum number of daily in-commutes for an existing nonattainment county. This criterion addresses the commuting pattern aspect of guidance factor "e." For the Atlanta C/MSA, an "in-commute" represents a trip into one of the five nonattainment "core

Nonattainment Area Designations under the 8-Hour Ozone Standard July 15, 2003 Page 4

counties" (Clayton, Cobb, DeKalb, Fulton and Gwinnett). For the Macon C/MSA, an in-commute is a trip into Bibb County. For the Augusta C/MSA, an in-commute is a trip into either Richmond County (Georgia) or Aiken County (South Carolina). Based on year 2000 data from the U.S. Census Bureau, the minimum number of daily in-commutes from a county currently designated nonattainment is 14,388 (from Rockdale County into the five Atlanta core counties). Any county with year 2000 daily in-commutes of 14,388 or greater would meet this criterion for nonattainment.

Criterion 4: Summer daily non-interstate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding the minimum summer daily non-interstate VMT for an existing nonattainment county (year **2001 basis**). This criterion addresses the overall magnitude of a county's traffic per guidance factor "e." In order to minimize the effects of non-resident traffic, only non-interstate VMT are considered. Based on data from the Georgia Department of Transportation for the year 2001, Rockdale County had the minimum summer daily non-interstate VMT of any existing nonattainment county – 1,736,566 miles per day. Any county with summer daily non-interstate VMT of 1,736,556 miles per day would meet this criterion for nonattainment.

Application of Criteria

Any county within a nonattainment C/MSA (or, for Atlanta, within the 45 county "area of influence") would be included in the nonattainment area if it meets any two of the four screening criteria, unless there were compelling factors to override that determination. As indicated previously, the 13 Atlanta area counties (Cherokee, Clayton, Cobb, Coweta, DeKalb, Douglas, Fayette, Forsyth, Fulton, Gwinnett, Henry, Paulding and Rockdale) currently designated nonattainment under the 1-hour standard will be designated nonattainment for the 8-hour standard. In addition to the existing Atlanta area nonattainment counties, Bibb, Richmond and Murray Counties have monitors, which violate the 8-hour standard and must be designated nonattainment. As indicated on the attached spreadsheet "Determination of 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Areas in Georgia," the following additional counties meet two or more screening criteria:

In the Atlanta C/MSA or 45-county area of influence – Barrow, Bartow, Carroll, Newton, Spalding, Walton, Hall, Clarke and Floyd.

In the Macon C/MSA - Houston.

In the Augusta-Aiken (SC) C/MSA -- Columbia.

In the Chattanooga (TN) C/MSA - Catoosa and Whitfield.

(For the Columbus C/MSA, Muscogee County meets two criteria but there have been no monitored violations of the 8-hour standard in the C/MSA and therefore the area is in attainment.)

Additional Considerations

The U.S. EPA and Georgia Tech have performed ozone air quality modeling under the Fall-line Air Quality Study (FAQS) which indicates that Macon and Augusta should attain (and Columbus will continue to attain) the 8-hour ozone standard by 2007, after implementation of the NOx SIP Call and federal fuel and vehicle standards, with no additional local control measures required.

The EPA and Systems Application International (SAI) have also performed such modeling under the Arkansas–Tennessee–Mississippi Ozone study (ATMOS) for the Chattanooga, Tennessee area, with similar results. In addition, local governments in both the Chattanooga and Augusta areas have entered into Early Action Compacts with the EPA, committing to achieve attainment by no later than December 31, 2007. Because modeling indicates that the Chattanooga, Augusta and Macon areas will achieve attainment of the 8-hour ozone standard without the need for any new control measures, the Air Protection Branch concludes that designation of Catoosa, Whitfield, Houston and Columbia Counties as nonattainment is not warranted.

The monitor in Murray County is located at Fort Mountain in the federal Class I Cohutta Wilderness Area at a high elevation. Nonattainment found at this monitor undoubtedly results from regional ozone transport, as the county has no significant emission sources and meets none of the screening criteria. EPA's proposed rulemaking for implementation of the 8-hour standard acknowledges that rural nonattainment areas such as Cohutta are completely dependent upon control measures implemented at upwind emission sources for future attainment. As a result, the Air Protection Branch concludes that only the federal Class I Cohutta Wilderness Area within Murray County should be designated as nonattainment.

As indicated previously, Clarke County meets at least two of the screening criteria for nonattainment and is within Atlanta's 45-county area of influence. However, Clarke County has an ozone monitor which has not collected the required three years' data to indicate either attainment or nonattainment. Because Clarke County is the hub of a separate C/MSA and nonattainment has not been documented, the Air Protection Branch concludes that Clarke County should not be designated nonattainment at this time.

Floyd County meets two of the screening criteria and is within Atlanta's 45-county area of influence. As is the case with Clarke County, Floyd County is the hub of a separate C/MSA and nonattainment has not been documented. The Air Protection Branch concludes that Floyd County should not be designated nonattainment at this time.

Recommendation

The Air Protection Branch recommends the following areas be designated nonattainment for the 8-hour ozone standard:

Atlanta Nonattainment Area: Barrow, Bartow, Carroll, Cherokee, Clayton, Cobb, Coweta, DeKalb, Douglas, Fayette, Forsyth, Fulton, Gwinnett, Hall, Henry, Newton, Paulding, Rockdale, Spalding and Walton Counties.

Augusta Nonattainment Area: Richmond County

Macon Nonattainment Area: Bibb County

Fort Mountain Nonattainment Area: That portion of Murray County within the Cohutta Wilderness Class 1 Area

RCM:dks

Attachments

ATTACHMENT A

Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Areas (C/MSAs) for Atlanta, Augusta and Macon

Source: U.S. Census Bureau's 2000 data on metropolitan, micropolitan, and combined statistical areas (CSAs) in Georgia.



ATTACHMENT B

Atlanta's Area of Influence under the 1-hour Ozone Standard (13-County Nonattainment area + 32 Surrounding Counties)



ATTACHMENT C

Determination of 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Areas in Georgia

		Criterion 1	Criterion 2		Crit	erion 3	Criterion 4	
	Monitor violates the 8-	Population Density	Emission	ne Density	2000 In-Commut	es (worker flows) to	2001 Summer Daily Vehicle Miles	No. of Criteria
County Name	hour standard?	i opulation behalty	Emission	is Delisity	Core counties	Monitored counties	Traveled (VMT)	Met
		2007	2007 NOx	2007 VOC			w/o interstates	-
	(yes/no)	(persons/sq mile)	(tpy/sq mile)	(tpy/sq mile)	(persons)	(persons)	(miles/day)	
ATLANTA								
Cherokee		440	11	11	41,597	41,766	3,277,346.40	4
Clayton		1,979	84	49	99,057	66,152	4,239,523.26	4
Cobb	Yes	2,150	68	49	301,751	305,446	11,641,231.72	4
Coweta	Yes	266	34	7	14,499	38,078	2,335,876.15	4
DeKalb	Yes	2,726	64	68	325,679	325,606	11,109,850.91	4
Douglas	Yes	549	19	16	25,857	42,689	2,419,880.63	4
Fayette	Yes	574	14	13	23,962	37,328	2,460,373.91	4
Forsyth		668	16	20	25,844	25,967	3,376,456.27	4
Fulton	Yes	1,738	71	52	363,026	358,732	18,437,558.09	4
Gwinnett	Yes	1,785	43	39	288,779	289,889	13,181,926.59	4
Henry	Yes	539	21	14	36,191	43,728	2,817,964.83	4
Paulding	Yes	374	7	8	24,665	37,382	1,851,557.55	3
Rockdale	Yes	616	19	19	14,338	28,629	1,736,565.83	4
Barrow		368	16	18	10,565	10,707	1,561,901.72	2
Bartow		205	30	8	10,062	10,317	2,656,851.02	3
Butts		128	9	7	1,740	2,718	527,038.15	1
Carroll		206	11	11	7,042	12,259	2,625,927.60	3
Dawson	No	104	4	6	2,143	2,148	581,438.14	0
Haralson		102	6	10	1,733	2,651	828,711.34	1
Heard		43	15	4	454	1,488	386,263.09	1
Jasper		38	2	3	717	1,442	470,308.97	0
Lamar		98	5	5	851	1,237	548,854.73	0
Meriwether		45	4	5	859	2,753	782,719.78	0
Newton		298	13	12	8,177	14,696	1,603,222.49	2
Pickens		134	6	8	2,183	2,225	891,478.77	0
Pike		77	3	4	1,067	1,286	491,746.29	0
Spalding		307	15	15	5,071	7,321	1,511,748.59	2
Walton		247	8	10	12,218	13,659	1,934,266.90	3
								Т
Hall		444	17	18	11,604	11,590	4,014,380.43	3
Polk		134	7	8	1,406	1,940	1,256,843.37	0
Iroup		148	11	15	855	1,740	1,680,467.48	1
Upson		88	5	5	310	340	790,243.48	0
Deple		70	4	4	270	201	400 001 44	0
Ballks		/6	4	4	376	391	492,231.44	0
Challooga	N -	89	0	4	89	99	820,245.25	0
Clarke	NO	908	31	30	2,190	2,303	2,872,700.73	3
Floyd		189	22	11	1,520	1,050	3,030,301.95	2
Cordon		13	3	3	840	859	970,323.00	1
laskaan		145	11	9	689	709	1,417,958.18	1
		152	11	1	3,230	3,213	1,545,272.14	1
Lumpkin		92	4	4	1,073	1,083	018,513.01	0
Morgon		102	4	4	200	288	690,025.57	0
Oceano		51	6	1	480	6/9	1 262 255 00	1
Dutnam		176	11	11	/40	/08	1,302,355.00	1
Talbot		17	09	4 2	420	479	411 567 01	

ATTACHMENT C

Determination of 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Areas in Georgia

		Criterion 1	Criter	rion 2	Crit	erion 3	Criterion 4	
	Monitor violates the 8-	Bonulation Density	Emission	o Donoity	2000 In-Commut	es (worker flows) to	2001 Summer Daily Vehicle Miles	No. of Critoria
County Name	hour standard?	Population Density	EIIIISSIOII	Emissions Density		Manitarad counties	Traveled (VMT)	No. of Chiefia
		2007	2007 NOx	2007 VOC	Core counties	Monitored counties	w/o interstates	Wet
	(yes/no)	(persons/sq mile)	(tpy/sq mile)	(tpy/sq mile)	(persons)	(persons)	(miles/day)	
AUGUSTA								-
Burke		29	2	2	2,147	2,147	1,009,887.89	0
Columbia		363	12	14	26,207	22,363	1,641,509.10	2
McDuffie		84	6	6	892	1,332	737,166.53	0
Richmond	Yes	608	25	25	72,696	67,645	4,363,836.99	4
								-
Emanuel		33	2	2	33	33	942,466.58	0
Jefferson		32	2	3	544	544	863,869.69	0
Jenkins		25	2	2	93	93	414,792.46	0
Lincoln		42	3	6	522	522	278,616.08	0
Screven		25	2	2	151	151	651,121.97	0
Warren		23	4	2	232	232	304,374.02	0
Wilkes		23	1	2	69	69	542,270.41	0
MACON								
Bibb	Yes	620	40	36	57,828	54,125	3,372,884.80	4
Crawford		45	2	2	3,002	2,360	394,743.30	0
Jones		66	5	4	6,345	5,988	921,533.85	0
Monroe		63	90	6	3,398	3,262	683,756.19	1
Twiggs		31	4	2	2,179	1,929	439,435.88	0
								•
Houston		336	21	14	48,524	8,570	2,510,757.84	3
Peach		172	13	12	4,308	2,361	699,517.16	1
								•
Baldwin		184	6	9	985	900	1,268,651.45	0
Bleckley		58	3	3	1,028	432	428,672.99	0
Dooly		32	6	4	295	75	468,144.54	0
Laurens		59	4	4	595	501	1.748.505.20	1
Macon		37	7	3	590	270	507.988.87	0
Pulaski		42	2	2	695	161	349.733.29	0
Taylor		25	3	2	298	184	470,280,42	0
Wilkinson		23	3	2	599	538	567,109.69	0
- This is a set of the			Ŭ	-	000		001,100.00	ů,
CHATTANOOGA								
Catoosa		384	16	18	14 257	12 320	1,219 090 43	2
Dade		98	9	6	3 838	3 091	446 251 54	1
Walker		143	3	7	20 342	9,091	1 705 784 84	0
Walter		143	5	1	20,342	9,098	1,703,704.04	U U
Murray	Yes	120	7	5	410	240	1 402 542 48	0
Whitfield	100	320	23	21	910	807	2 603 084 11	3



ATTENTION OF

August 26, 2003

Mr. Steve Parris Supervisory Fish and Wildlife Biologist U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service Georgia Ecological Service West Georgia Sub Office P.O. Box 52560 Ft. Benning, GA 31995

Dear Mr. Parris:

Fort Benning is in the process of preparing a BA (Biological Assessment) for the development of a DMPRC (Digital Multi Purpose Range Complex) on the Northeastern portion of the installation. There are presently five federally listed species known to occur on the installation, of these five, only two are expected to be impacted or possibly impacted by the DMPRC. The RCW (red-cockaded woodpecker, *Picoides borealis*) will be impacted and some clusters may be taken and significant amounts of foraging habitat will be lost. In addition to RCWs, relict trillium (*Trillium reliquum*) populations may be present within the action area of the DMPRC. Surveys will be performed in the spring of 2004 to look for unknown populations of relict trilliums. The other 3 known federally listed species on Fort Benning are the wood stork, (*Mycteria americana*) a summer resident, Bald eagle, (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) which arrives early winter to nest until spring, and the American alligator, (*Alligator mississippiensis*) a year round resident. None of these species are known to occur in the DMPRC action area due to a lack of suitable habitat.

To help in our efforts to complete the BA we request a list of the federally listed species that occur in Muscogee and Chattahoochee Counties. If you have any questions please contact Mark Thornton at 706-544-7079. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter and I look forward to working with you on this and other projects in the future.

Sincerely,

Peter K. Swiderek Chief, Conservation Branch



United States Department of the Interior

Fish and Wildlife Service 247 South Milledge Avenue Athens, Georgia 30605

West Georgia Sub Office P.O. Box 52560 Ft. Benning, Georgia 31995-2560

2003SEP 2

Coastal Sub Office 4270 Norwich Street Brunswick, Georgia 31520

Mr. Pete Swiderek Chief, Conservation Branch Dept. of the Army Headquarters U. S. Army Infantry Center Fort Benning, GA 31905

Re: FWS Log No. 03-0584 (DMPRC) Protected species list request for Chattahoochee and Muscogee Counties

Dear Mr. Swiderek:

As per your request, we have enclosed the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (Service) Listed Species for Chattahoochee and Muscogee Counties, Georgia and the Georgia Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program Locations of Special Concern Animals, Plants and Natural Communities for the same counties.

Your interest in ensuring the protection of endangered species and our natural resources is appreciated. We appreciate the opportunity to work with you during the planning stages of the proposed Digital Multi Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC). If you have further questions or require additional information, please contact Nancy Jordan, staff biologist, at the Fort Benning address listed above or at (706) 544-6428.

Sincerely,

Stephen D. Parrie

Sandra S. Tucker
 Field Supervisor

Cc: file, FWS West GA, Athens



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 4 ATLANTA FEDERAL CENTER 61 FORSYTH STREET ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-8960 DEC - 3 Z003

4APT-APB

Carol A. Couch, Ph.D., Director, Georgia Environmental Protection Division 2 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, S.E. Suite 1152 East Tower Atlanta, GA 30334-9000

Dear Ms. Couch:

Thank you for your State's recommendations on 8-hour ozone air quality designations. This recommendation is an important step in providing citizens of Georgia with information on air pollution levels where they live and work. Levels of ground-level ozone have improved significantly since the Clean Air Act (CAA) was amended in 1990, at which time 135 areas were designated as not attaining the 1-hour ozone standard. Since that time nearly half those areas (67) have cleaned up their air to meet the 1-hour ozone standard and have been redesignated as attaining that standard. However, many areas have still not met the less stringent 1-hour ozone standard and in 1997, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) promulgated a more stringent 8-hour ozone national ambient air quality standard. Thus, much work remains to be done. Under the CAA, EPA is required to promulgate designations for new or revised standards, such as the 8-hour ozone standard. Earlier this year, after several public interest groups filed a lawsuit claiming EPA had not met the statutory deadline for designating areas for the 8-hour ozone standard, we entered into a consent decree that requires us to promulgate designations by April 15, 2004.

The CAA defines a nonattainment area as any area that does not meet (or that contributes to ambient air quality in a nearby area that does not meet) the national primary or secondary ambient air quality standard for the pollutant. EPA guidance indicates that Georgia should use the larger of the Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA), Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA), or the 1-hour ozone nonattainment area as the presumptive boundary for 8-hour ozone nonattainment areas. The guidance provides 11 factors that Georgia should consider in determining whether to modify the presumptive boundaries. We have reviewed the letter from Mr. Harold Reheis, dated July 15, 2003, submitting Georgia's recommendations on air quality designations for the 8-hour ozone standard. We have also reviewed the extensive justification information you have submitted to support your recommendations for areas that differed from the presumptive nonattainment area. We appreciate the effort the State has made to develop this supporting information.

Consistent with section 107(d)(1) of the CAA, this letter is to inform you that, based upon the information contained in your submittal, EPA intends to make modifications to Georgia's recommended designations and boundaries. Additionally, the EPA Headquarters' Office of Air and Radiation believes that all MSA counties that are part of an Early Action Compact (EAC) area that contains a violating ozone monitor should be included as part of one area that would be designated as nonattainment. EPA is issuing a proposed rule to defer the effective date for these areas for so long as they continues to meet the milestones required for EAC areas. In Georgia, we intend to modify the State's recommendation to include: Walker County in the Chattanooga area. EPA will work with the State over the next few months to determine whether any information the State submits by February 6, 2004, justify drawing different boundaries for the nonattainment area.

EPA has been tracking preliminary 2003 ozone monitoring data and its impact on areas' 2001-2003 design values. We received a letter from Mr. David Word, dated November 14, 2003, informing us that the ozone monitoring data for 2003 has completed the full quality assurance and quality control process and has been fully uploaded into the Air Quality System (AQS). According to this data, the Augusta-Aiken area is now meeting the 8-hour ozone standard, and, because of this, Mr. Word revised your official recommendation for Richmond County, Georgia, to attainment. In addition to the data you have submitted into AQS, please submit the 8-hour and 1-hour ozone design values and the average expected 1-hour exceedance rate to Beverly Banister, Director, Air Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, by December 17, 2003, so that air quality designations and classifications for the 8-hour standard will accurately reflect the State's air quality.

The enclosures to this letter provides tables in which EPA identifies the counties that should be included in each nonattainment area. Enclosure 1 contains a description of areas where EPA intends to modify Georgia's recommendation, and the basis for such modification. Enclosure 2 provides information on those areas/counties which do not require modification, but which differ from EPA's presumptive nonattainment area.

We look forward to a continued dialogue with Georgia as we work to finalize the designations for the 8-hour ozone standard. We appreciate your efforts and will review any future supporting information that Georgia wishes to submit on these recommendations. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Beverly Banister, Director, Air Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, at (404)562-9326 or Kay Prince, Chief, Air Planning Branch, at (404)-562-9026.

Sincerely Palmer, Jr. Regional Administrator

Enclosure

cc: Ron Methier, Chief, Air Protection Branch, Georgia EPD

Lewis Shaw, Deputy Commissioner, SCDHEC James A. Joy, III, P.E., Chief, Bureau of Air Quality Control, SC DHEC

Betsy L. Child, Commissioner, TDEC

Barry R. Stephens, P.E., Director, Division of Air Pollution Control, TDEC

Enclosure 1

The following table identifies the individual areas and counties comprising those areas within Georgia that EPA intends to designate as nonattainment. Following the table is a description of areas where EPA intends to modify Georgia's recommendation, and the basis for such modification. Where EPA intends to include only part of a county in a nonattainment area, we have indicated the boundaries of the portion of the county that will be included. EPA intends to designate as attainment/unclassifiable all counties (or parts thereof) not identified in the table below.

Nonattainment Areas							
Area	Georgia Recommended Nonattainment Counties	EPA Recommended Nonattainment Counties					
Atlanta	Barrow, Bartow, Carroll, Cherokee, Clayton, Cobb, Coweta, DeKalb, Douglas, Fayette, Forsyth, Fulton, Gwinnett, Hall, Henry, Newton, Paulding, Rockdale, Spalding and Walton	Barrow, Bartow, Carroll, Cherokee, Clayton, Cobb, Coweta, DeKalb, Douglas, Fayette, Forsyth, Fulton, Gwinnett, Hall, Henry, Newton, Paulding, Rockdale, Spalding and Walton					
Chattanooga TN-GA*	None	Catoosa and Walker					
Macon	Bibb	Bibb, Houston and Monroe					
Murray County	Murray County - all mountain peaks within the Chattahoochee National Forest area of Murray County that have an elevation greater than or equal to 2400 feet and that are enclosed by contour lines that close on themselves.	Murray County - all mountain peaks within the Chattahoochee National Forest area of Murray County that have an elevation greater than or equal to 2400 feet and that are enclosed by contour lines that close on themselves					

*This is an interstate area. A letter addressing the Tennessee portion of this area was sent to the Environmental Commissioner of Tennessee.

Background

Georgia's submittal included a description of the specific methodology the State used to exclude, or include, counties in the presumptive nonattainment area, i.e., the CMSA. Georgia's methodology used to arrive at their recommendations was based on a set of criteria based on EPA's 11 factors and input received from other State agencies. This methodology set specific cut points for the factors described below. The process is explained in Georgia's July 15, 2003, recommendation. The screening criteria were: (1) projected 2007 population density exceeding the minimum value that corresponds to a monitored violation within a CMSA; (2) Projected 2007 nitrogen oxides (NOx) or volatile organic compounds (VOC) emissions density exceeding the minimum value that corresponds to a know monitored violation within a CMSA; (3) Daily commuting trips (year 2000) basis from a county into the nonattainment area exceeding the minimum number of daily in-commutes for an existing nonattainment county; and (4) Summer daily non-interstate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding the minimum summer daily non-interstate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding the minimum summer daily non-interstate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding the minimum summer daily non-interstate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding the minimum summer daily non-interstate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding the minimum summer daily non-interstate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding the minimum summer daily non-interstate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding the minimum summer daily non-interstate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding the minimum summer daily non-interstate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding the minimum summer daily non-interstate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding the minimum summer daily non-interstate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding the minimum summer daily non-interstate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding the minimum summer daily non-interstate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding the minimum summer daily non-i

Modifications to Georgia's Recommendations

Macon, Georgia

Houston County:

The State recommended Bibb County, which is one of the five CMSA counties in the Macon area. EPA intends to modify the State's recommendation to include Houston County in the Macon nonattainment area. EPA is recommending the inclusion of Houston County in the Macon nonattainment area because of its similarities to Bibb County, which is the county with the violating monitor. Houston County is a CMSA county with a population of 110,765 in the year 2000, and a projected population growth rate of 17 percent (18,300 people) from 2000 to 2010. Additionally, in the analysis conducted by the State of Georgia based on the 11 factors, Houston County exceeded three of the criteria for inclusion in a nonattainment area as set forth by the State. Houston County exceeded the State's criteria of population density (336 people per square mile) in 2007, density of nitrogen oxides (NOx) (21 ton per year/square mile) in 2007, volatile organic compound (VOC) density (14 tons per year/square mile) in 2007, and 2001 Summer Daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) (2,510,758 miles per day). These values indicated a high probability that Houston County is contributing to the violations measured in Bibb County. The State did not provide a compelling argument based on the 11 factors to exclude Houston County from the nonattainment area.

Monroe County:

EPA also intends to modify the State's recommendation to include Monroe County to the Macon nonattainment area. While this county is outside of the presumptive boundary, EPA is recommending the inclusion of Monroe County in the Macon nonattainment area because it is adjacent to the core CMSA county of Bibb and has a large source of NOx emissions (46,479 tons

per year), Georgia Power Company's Plant Scherer, which does not have state of the art NOx controls and adversely impacts the air quality in Bibb County. The State did not provide a compelling argument based on the 11 factors to exclude Monroe County from the nonattainment area.

Chattanooga, GA-TN

Catoosa County:

Georgia recommended all of the three Georgia counties within the Chattanooga CMSA as attainment. EPA is modifying the State's recommendations to include Catoosa County in the Chattanooga nonattainment area because Catoosa County is a CMSA county with a relatively high population (53,282) in the year 2000 and is experiencing a high population growth rate (13,408 people or 25 percent) from 2000 to 2010. Catoosa County also has a high percentage (80 percent) of commuters traveling into the core CMSA counties. Additionally, in the analysis conducted by the State of Georgia, Catoosa County exceeded two of the criteria for inclusion in a nonattainment area as set forth by the State. Catoosa County exceeded the State's criteria of population density (384 people per square mile) in 2007, NOx density (16 tons per year/square mile) in 2007, and VOC density (18 tons per year/square mile) in 2007. The State did not provide a compelling argument based on the 11 factors to exclude Catoosa County from the nonattainment area.

Walker County:

EPA is modifying the State's recommendation to include Walker County in the Chattanooga TN-GA nonattainment area because it is within the Chattanooga MSA, which has a violating monitor and this county is a participant in the Chattanooga Early Action Compact (EAC). Walker County, as well as other Chattanooga MSA counties in the EAC, will be designated nonattainment with a deferred effective date so long as the Chattanooga EAC meets all of the required milestones.

Enclosure 2

This table identifies counties which would otherwise be included in a nonattainment area's presumptive boundary, in accordance with EPA's March 28, 2000, Boundary Guidance Memorandum, but which have been omitted from the State's recommendations for nonattainment areas, and for which EPA is not modifying. Following this table is a discussion of the justification for omitting each county from the nonattainment area.

Justification for Less than Presumptive Boundaries					
Area	"Presumptive" Counties Excluded from Nonattainment Area				
Atlanta	Pickens				
Chattanooga TN-GA	Dade				
Macon	Twiggs Peach Jones				

Background

Georgia's methodology used to arrive at their recommendations was based on a set of criteria developed from EPA's guidance factors and input received from other State agencies. The process is explained in Georgia's July 15, 2003, recommendation. The screening criteria were: (1) projected 2007 population density exceeding the minimum value that corresponds to a known monitored violation within a CMSA; (2) Projected 2007 NOx or VOC emissions density exceeding the minimum value that corresponds to a known monitored violation within a CMSA; (3) Daily commuting trips (year 2000) basis from a county into the nonattainment area exceeding the minimum number of daily in-commutes for an existing nonattainment county; and (4) Summer daily non-interstate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding the minimum summer daily non-interstate VMT for an existing nonattainment county (year 2001 basis).

Atlanta

Pickens County:

EPA concurs with the State of Georgia's decision to recommend Pickens County as attainment. Pickens County is within the CMSA, but has very low population (22,983) as compared to one of the larger CMSA county such as Fulton County (816,006) and is much less that one percent of the over 4 million people in the Atlanta CMSA. It has low NOx emissions (1,060 tons per year - less than one percent of the CMSA emissions), and low VOC emissions (1,774 tons per year - approximately one percent of the CMSA emissions). Additionally, Pickens

County did not exceed any of the State's criteria for inclusion into a nonattainment area.

Chattanooga, TN-GA

Dade County:

EPA concurs with the State of Georgia's decision to recommend Dade County as attainment. Dade County is an CMSA county, but has very low population (15,154) as compared to the core CMSA county of Hamilton County, TN (307,896); or the entire CMSA population of over 450,000. The population growth is 17 percent, but the increase in the number of people, at 2,553, is a very small increase in actual people, compared to the population of the entire CMSA. The County has low NOx emissions (2,419 tons per year) compared to the Hamilton County (20,062 tons per year), or the overall CMSA (30,891 tons per year), and low VOC emissions (1,572 tons per year) compared to Hamilton County (27,103 tons per year), or the overall CMSA (36,324 tons per year). Dade County did not exceed any of the State's criteria for inclusion into a nonattainment area.

Macon

Twiggs County:

EPA concurs with the State of Georgia's decision to recommend Twiggs County as attainment. Twiggs County is an CMSA county, but has very low population (10,590) as compared to Bibb County's population (153,887), or the overall CMSA population (322,549), no expected population growth (0 percent), low NOx (2,257 tons/year), and VOC emissions (1,187 tons/year). Twiggs County did not exceed any of the State's criteria for inclusion into a nonattainment area, as discussed above.

Peach County:

EPA concurs with the State of Georgia's decision to recommend Peach County as attainment. Peach County is an CMSA county, has a population growth (16 percent) but has very low population (23,668) as compared to Bibb County's population (153,887), or the overall CMSA population (322,549), and low NOx emissions (2,029 tons per year - 9 percent of the CMSA emissions), and VOC emissions (2,220 tons per year - 11 percent of the CMSA emissions). Peach County did not exceed any of the State's criteria for inclusion into a nonattainment area, as discussed above.

Jones County:

EPA concurs with the State of Georgia's decision to recommend Jones County as attainment. Jones County is a CMSA county, has a population growth of 17 percent, but a very low population (23,639) as compared to Bibb County's (153,887), or the overall CMSA population (322,549), low NOx emissions (1,471 tons per year - 6 percent of the CMSA

emissions), and low VOC emissions (1,510 tons per year - 7 percent of the CMSA emissions). Jones County did not exceed any of the State's criteria for inclusion into a nonattainment area, as discussed above.



Directorate of Facilities Engineering & Logistics

Ms. Debbie Thomas Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas Attn: Walter Celestine Route 3, Box 645 Livingston, Texas 77351

Dear Ms. Thomas,

Fort Benning proposes to evaluate 10 cultural sites near the planned Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex. The site evaluations will assist Fort Benning in providing appropriate levels of protection to those sites found to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Attached is the site evaluation Scope of Work for your comment. Should you have any comment on the proposed work, please feel free to contact me at (706) 545-2292 or Dr. Christopher E, Hamilton, Cultural Resource Manager for Fort Benning at (706) 545-2377 at your convenience.

Respectfully,

Acting Director of Facilities Engineering & Logistics



Sec 1 5 200

Directorate of Facilities Engineering & Logistics

Ms. Augustine Asbury Cultural Resource Specialist Alabama/Quassarte Tribal Town P.O. Box 187 117 North Main Street Wetumka, Oklahoma 74880

Dear Ms. Asbury,

Fort Benning proposes to evaluate 10 cultural sites near the planned Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex. The site evaluations will assist Fort Benning in providing appropriate levels of protection to those sites found to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Attached is the site evaluation Scope of Work for your comment. Should you have any comment on the proposed work, please feel free to contact me at (706) 545-2292 or Dr. Christopher E. Hamilton, Cultural Resource Manager for Fort Benning at (706) 545-2377 at your convenience.

Respectfully,

Acting Director of Facilities Engineering & Logistics



JIC: 1 0 2004

Directorate of Facilities Engineering & Logistics

Ms. Rena Duncan Director of Cultural Resources Chickasaw Nation 124 South Broadway American Building, 3rd Floor Ada, Oklahoma 74821

Dear Ms. Duncan,

Fort Benning proposes to evaluate 10 cultural sites near the planned Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex. The site evaluations will assist Fort Benning in providing appropriate levels of protection to those sites found to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Attached is the site evaluation Scope of Work for your comment. Should you have any comment on the proposed work, please feel free to contact me at (706) 545-2292 or Dr. Christopher E. Hamilton, Cultural Resource Manager for Fort Benning at (706) 545-2377 at your convenience.

Respectfully,

Acting Director of Facilities Engineering & Logistics



Directorate of Facilities Engineering & Logistics

Ms. Phyllis Nichols Tribal Administrator Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana P.O. Box 818, 1940 Bell Road Attn: Hugh Cunningham Elton, Louisana 70532

Dear Ms. Nichols,

Fort Benning proposes to evaluate 10 cultural sites near the planned Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex. The site evaluations will assist Fort Benning in providing appropriate levels of protection to those sites found to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Attached is the site evaluation Scope of Work for your comment. Should you have any comment on the proposed work, please feel free to contact me at (706) 545-2292 or Dr. Christopher E. Hamilton, Cultural Resource Manager for Fort Benning at (706) 545-2377 at your convenience.

Respectfully,

Acting Director of Facilities Engineering & Logistics



345. 24

Directorate of Facilities Engineering & Logistics

Mr. Archie Mouse Assistant Chief United Keetoowah Band of the Chreokee Indians in Oklahoma R. 1, Box 83 Colcord, Oklahoma 74338

Dear Mr. Mouse,

Fort Benning proposes to evaluate 10 cultural sites near the planned Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex. The site evaluations will assist Fort Benning in providing appropriate levels of protection to those sites found to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Attached is the site evaluation Scope of Work for your comment. Should you have any comment on the proposed work, please feel free to contact me at (706) 545-2292 or Dr. Christopher E. Hamilton, Cultural Resource Manager for Fort Benning at (706) 545-2377 at your convenience.

Respectfully,

trumpler

Acting Director of Facilities Engineering & Logistics



Sec. 18 2007

Directorate of Facilities Engineering & Logistics

Ms. Melissa Harjo Director, Heritage & Culture Kialegee Tribal Town P. O. Box 332 108 N. Main Street Wetumka, Oklahoma 74883

Dear Ms. Harjo,

Fort Benning proposes to evaluate 10 cultural sites near the planned Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex. The site evaluations will assist Fort Benning in providing appropriate levels of protection to those sites found to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Attached is the site evaluation Scope of Work for your comment. Should you have any comment on the proposed work, please feel free to contact me at (706) 545-2292 or Dr. Christopher E. Hamilton, Cultural Resource Manager for Fort Benning at (706) 545-2377 at your convenience.

Respectfully,

Acting Director of Facilities Engineering & Logistics



JAN 2004

Directorate of Facilities Engineering & Logistics

Mr. Steven Terry NAGPRA Representative Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida P. O. Box 440021 Tamiami Station Miami, Florida 33144

Dear Mr. Terry,

Fort Benning proposes to evaluate 10 cultural sites near the planned Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex. The site evaluations will assist Fort Benning in providing appropriate levels of protection to those sites found to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Attached is the site evaluation Scope of Work for your comment. Should you have any comment on the proposed work, please feel free to contact me at (706) 545-2292 or Dr. Christopher E. Hamilton, Cultural Resource Manager for Fort Benning at (706) 545-2377 at your convenience.

Respectfully,

nard R pler

Acting Director of Facilities Engineering & Logistics



ARY : 5 220

Directorate of Facilities Engineering & Logistics

Ms. Joyce Bear Preservation Officer Muscogec (Creek) Nation of Oklahoma Cultural Preservation Office P. O. Box 580 Okmulgee, Oklahoma 74447

Dear Ms. Bear,

Fort Benning proposes to evaluate 10 cultural sites near the planned Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex. The site evaluations will assist Fort Benning in providing appropriate levels of protection to those sites found to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Attached is the site evaluation Scope of Work for your comment. Should you have any comment on the proposed work, please feel free to contact me at (706) 545-2292 or Dr. Christopher E. Hamilton, Cultural Resource Manager for Fort Benning at (706) 545-2377 at your convenience.

Respectfully,

Acting Director of Facilities Engineering & Logistics



Directorate of Facilities Engineering & Logistics

Mr. Robert Thrower Representative Poarch Band of Creek Indians 3061 York Street Century, Florida 32535

Dear Mr. Thrower,

Fort Benning proposes to evaluate 10 cultural sites near the planned Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex. The site evaluations will assist Fort Benning in providing appropriate levels of protection to those sites found to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Attached is the site evaluation Scope of Work for your comment. Should you have any comment on the proposed work, please feel free to contact me at (706) 545-2292 or Dr. Christopher E. Hamilton, Cultural Resource Manager for Fort Benning at (706) 545-2377 at your convenience.

Respectfully,

Kennard R. Strumple

Acting Director of Facilities Engineering & Logistics



348 1 1 132

Directorate of Facilities Engineering & Logistics

Mr. Billy Cypress Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Seminole Tribe of Florida AH-THA-THI-KI Museum HC 61, Box 21A Clewiston, Florida 33440

Dear Mr. Cypress,

Fort Benning proposes to evaluate 10 cultural sites near the planned Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex. The site evaluations will assist Fort Benning in providing appropriate levels of protection to those sites found to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Attached is the site evaluation Scope of Work for your comment. Should you have any comment on the proposed work, please feel free to contact me at (706) 545-2292 or Dr. Christopher E. Hamilton, Cultural Resource Manager for Fort Benning at (706) 545-2377 at your convenience.

Respectfully,

Acting Director of Facilities Engineering & Logistics


1 1 204

Directorate of Facilities Engineering & Logistics

Mr. Emman Spain Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Seminole Nation of Oklahoma P. O. Box 1498 Wewoka, Oklahoma 74884

Dear Mr. Spain,

Fort Benning proposes to evaluate 10 cultural sites near the planned Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex. The site evaluations will assist Fort Benning in providing appropriate levels of protection to those sites found to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Attached is the site evaluation Scope of Work for your comment. Should you have any comment on the proposed work, please feel free to contact me at (706) 545-2292 or Dr. Christopher E. Hamilton, Cultural Resource Manager for Fort Benning at (706) 545-2377 at your convenience.

Respectfully,

Acting Director of Facilities Engineering & Logistics



ACC - 23

144 f. le

Directorate of Facilities Engineering & Logistics

Dr. W. Ray Luce Deputy Director & Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer Department of Natural Resources Historic Preservation Division Attn: Serena Bellew Colcord Suite 101 Atlanta, GA 30303-3600

Dear Dr. Luce:

Fort Benning proposes to evaluate 10 cultural sites near the planned Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex. The site evaluations will assist Fort Benning in providing appropriate levels of protection to those sites found to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Attached is the site evaluation Scope of Work for your comment. Should you have any comment on the proposed work, please feel free to contact me at (706) 545-2292 or Dr. Christopher E. Hamilton, Cultural Resource Manager for Fort Benning at (706) 545-2377 at your convenience.

Respectfully,

St

Acting Director for Facilities Engineering & Logistics



Directorate of Facilities Engineering & Logistics

Mr. Charles Coleman Representative Thlopthlocco Tribal Town P.O. Box 188 Ext. 227, I-40, 7mi. East Okemah, Oklahoma 74859

Dear Mr. Coleman,

Fort Benning proposes to evaluate 10 cultural sites near the planned Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex. The site evaluations will assist Fort Benning in providing appropriate levels of protection to those sites found to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Attached is the site evaluation Scope of Work for your comment. Should you have any comment on the proposed work, please feel free to contact me at (706) 545-2292 or Dr. Christopher E. Hamilton, Cultural Resource Manager for Fort Benning at (706) 545-2377 at your convenience.

Respectfully,

inard R. Strume

Acting Director of Facilities Engineering & Logistics

GEORGIA STATE CLEARINGHOUSE MEMORANDUM EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 REVIEW PROCESS

TO: Chief, Environmental Mgt. Div. ATZB-ELN-E (Attn: John Brown) Bldg. 6, Meloy Hall, Rm. 310 Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122

FROM: Georgia State Clearinghouse

DATE: 2/10/2004

SUBJECT: Executive Order 12372 Review

APPLICANT: Department of the Army

PROJECT: DEIS: Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (Fort Benning, GA)

CFDA #:

STATE ID: GA040210001

FEDERAL ID:

Correspondence related to the above project was received by the Georgia State Clearinghouse on 2/10/2004. The review has been initiated and every effort is being made to ensure prompt action. The proposal will be reviewed for its consistency with goals, policies, plans, objectives, programs, environmental impact, criteria for Developments of Regional Impact (DRI) or inconsistencies with federal executive orders, acts and/or rules and regulations, and if applicable, with budgetary restraints.

The initial review process should be completed by 3/10/2004 (*approximately*). If the Clearinghouse has not contacted you by that date, please call (404) 656-3855, and we will check into the delay. We appreciate your cooperation on this matter.

In future correspondence regarding this project, please include the State Application Identifier number shown above. If you have any questions regarding this project, please contact us at the above number.

> Form SC-1 April 2003



Office of Planning and Budget

Sonny Perdue Governor

Timothy A. Connell Director

GEORGIA STATE CLEARINGHOUSE MEMORANDUM EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 REVIEW PROCESS

- TO: Chief, Environmental Mgt. Div. ATZB-ELN-E (Attn: John Brown) Bldg. 6, Meloy Hall, Rm. 310 Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122
- FROM: Barbara Jackson Georgia State Clearinghouse

DATE: 3/3/2004

SUBJECT: Executive Order 12372 Review

APPLICANT: Department of the Army

PROJECT: DEIS: Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (Fort Benning, GA)

STATE ID: GA040210001

The State level review of the above referenced document has been completed. As a result of the environmental review process, the activity this document was prepared for has been found to be consistent with state social, economic, physical goals, policies, plans, and programs with which the State is concerned.

Additional Comments:

None.

/bj Enc.: Lower Chattahoochee RDC, Mar. 2, 2004

> Form SC-4-EIS-4 January 1995

270 Washington Street, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30334 An Equal Opportunity Employer

GEORGIA STATE CLEARINGHOUSE MEMORANDUM EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 REVIEW PROCESS

- TO: Barbara Jackson Georgia State Clearinghouse 270 Washington Street, SW, Eighth Floor Atlanta, Georgia 30334
- FROM: MS. PATTI CULLEN LOWER CHATTAHOOCHEE RDC

SUBJECT: Executive Order 12372 Review

PROJECT: DEIS: Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (Fort Benning, GA)

STATE ID: GA040210001

DATE:

囟

This notice is considered to be consistent with those state or regional goals, policies, plans, fiscal resources, criteria for developments of regional impact, environmental impacts, federal executive orders, acts and/or rules and regulations with which this organization is concerned.

This notice is not consistent with:

The goals, plans, policies, or fiscal resources with which this organization is concerned. (Line through inappropriate word or words and prepare a statement that explains the rationale for the inconsistency. Additional pages may be used for outlining the inconsistencies).

The criteria for developments of regional impact, federal executive orders, acts and/or rules and regulations administered by your agency. Negative environmental impacts or provision for protection of the environment should be pointed out. (Additional pages may be used for outlining the inconsistencies).

This notice does not impact upon the activities of the organization.

Form SC-3 January 1995

RECEIVED

MAR 0 2 2004

GEORGIA STATE CLEARINGHOUSE



Conservation Branch

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

MAR 1 1 2004

Sandy Tucker Field Supervisor U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 247 S. Milledge Avenue Athens, Georgia 30605

Dear Ms. Tucker:

This correspondence serves as a request for formal consultation regarding the proposed construction, operation and maintenance of a Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC) on Fort Benning, Georgia. A Biological Assessment (BA) has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA), section 7, a, (2). The BA includes all of the information required by 50 CFR 402.14 (c) - (d).

The Determination of Effect concludes this project may affect - is likely to adversely affect the Red-cockaded woodpecker. The adverse effects will be limited to 2-3 active groups and four planned recruitment clusters. The project has no effect on the wood stork, American alligator, relict trillium, and bald eagle. We therefore request initiation of formal consultation.

We look forward to working cooperatively with you and your staff during the consultation process. If additional information is needed, please contact Ms. Linda Veenstra, DMPRC Environmental Project Manager at (706) 545-8072. Your continued cooperation and assistance are appreciated.

Sinceret Colone Garrison-Commander

Encl: DMPRC BA

CE: SERO RCW Régional Recovery Coordinator







United States Department of the Interior

Fish and Wildlife Service 247 South Milledge Avenue Athens, Georgia 30605

West Georgia Sub Office P.O. Box 52560 Ft. Benning, Georgia 31995-2560

MAR 23 2004

Coastal Sub Office 4270 Norwich Street Brunswick, Georgia 31520

Colonel Ricardo R. Riera Garrison Commander Department of the Army Headquarters Unites States Army Infantry Center Fort Benning, Georgia 31905-5000

Re: FWS No. 03-0584

Dear Colonel Riera:

This letter is the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (Service) response to your letter of March 11, 2003, requesting formal consultation in accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. The biological assessment that was forwarded with your letter concluded that Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC) construction and operation may affect, and is likely to adversely affect, the federally listed red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW) (*Picoides borealis*), and will have no effect on the federally listed wood stork (*Mycteria mericana*), bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), American alligator (*Alligator mississipensis*), and relict trillium (*Trillium reliquum*). This letter constitutes the comments of the Service in accordance with the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended, (16 U. S. C. 1531 et seq.).

We concur with your determination of no effect for the wood stork, bald eagle, and American alligator. Habitat at the DMPRC site is unsuitable or marginal and there are no records of these species on the site. We do not concur with your determination of no effect for relict trillium. Suitable habitat exists on site and relict trillium is found at several locations on Fort Benning; a determination of no effect is premature until potentially suitable habitat on the DMPRC is surveyed for the presence of relict trillium. It is our understanding such a survey will be conducted on approximately 400 acres during late March. When results of that survey are available potential effects of the DMPRC on relict trillium will more appropriately be addressed.

We agree with your determination of may affect, likely to adversely affect, for the RCW. Our staff at the West Georgia Sub-Office at Fort Benning worked closely with Fort Benning personnel in efforts to identify all data and reports necessary to initiate formal consultation. We received adequate information on March 12; therefore, formal consultation began on that date. Section 7 allows the Service up to 90 calendar days to conclude formal consultation and an additional 45 calendar days to prepare our biological opinion (unless we mutually agree to an extension). We have assigned a log number,

FWS No. 03-0584, to this consultation. Please refer to that number in future correspondence on this consultation.

We have identified additional information we will need early in the formal consultation process and are concerned that delay in providing the information could prolong consultation or require us to issue a biological opinion based on reasonable worst case impacts to the RCW. Reasonable worst case scenarios can be expected to require additional effort to minimize impacts and greater commitment of funds and manpower by Fort Benning. Critical information includes:

- final design of the DMPRC, including correct elevations;

 an estimate of the number of days annually and seasonally that Conservation Branch personnel will need access to the area affected by the DMPRC to conduct RCW management and monitoring;

- a description of the range scheduling process and scheduling priorities; and

 aerial photography of the northeastern portion of the installation at intervals of approximately 10 years.

An important issue that will be evaluated during consultation is the number of RCW cavity trees and the amount of foraging habitat that will be destroyed over time by munitions fired on the DMPRC. Since a final design is not currently available we will proceed with consultation based on the 95% design. Without a final design and corrected elevations, it will be necessary for us to apply the reasonable worst case standard regarding the issue of down range munitions impacts to RCW cavity trees or foraging habitat. When the final design is completed we can reevaluate down range impacts. However, if late in the consultation process, we can be expected to recommend that Fort Benning reinitiate formal consultation, providing us with additional days to incorporate the final design.

The DMPRPC project poses both immediate direct and long-term indirect impacts to RCW habitat. You should expect the biological opinion to require a monitoring program to quantify impacts to the RCW. The monitoring program will include a long-term commitment by Fort Benning to provide adequate access to the DMPRC action area for biologists monitoring the RCW and its habitat. Service personnel will work with Fort Benning Environmental Management Division and Range Division personnel to design a monitoring plan. Given the continuing national emergency, we are concerned that adequate access and manpower may be difficult to allocate and we would like to address the issue early during consultation. If you have any questions about this consultation please contact Mr. Stephen Parris, the supervisor at the West Georgia Sub-Office, at (706) 544-6999.

Sincerely,

typhen D. Paris

Sandra S. Tucker Field Supervisor

cc: FWS, WGA

Mr. John Brent, Fort Benning, DPW, EMD Mr. Pete Swiderek, Fort Benning, DPW, EMD, CB Ms. Linda Veenstra, Fort Benning, SJA



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 4 ATLANTA FEDERAL CENTER 61 FORSYTH STREET ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-8960

March 29, 2004

Directorate of Facilities Logistics and Engineering ATTN: John E. Brown, Chief Environmental Management Division ATZZB-ELN-E Building 6, Room 310 Fort Benning, Georgia 31905-5122

Subject: EPA Review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex; Fort Benning, Georgia CEO #: 040060, ERP #: USA-E11052-GA.

Dear Sir:

Thank you for your interagency coordination efforts on November 12, 2003 and March 12, 2004 regarding the proposed project. Pursuant to Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), EPA Region 4 has evaluated the consequences of constructing, operating and maintaining a 1,800-acre digital multi-purpose training facility (DMPRC), which would provide realistic advanced gunnery training. The DMPRC would provide training facilities for the Bradley Fighting Vehicle (BFV), the Abrams MIAI Tank System (TANK), and future systems such as the (Stryker).

The DEIS examines two action alternatives (alternatives II and III) in relationship to maintaining the existing facility (no-action alternative I). Alternative III is identified as Fort Bennings preferred alternative because this alternative would result in less adverse environmental effects than alternative II. However, EPA continues to have concerns with the proposed project regarding the summary of the alternatives, adverse noise impacts, loss of natural habitat, potential water resource impacts and the limitations in the mitigation plan. Therefore, we have concentrated our comments on these impacts areas for Fort Benning's consideration in the development of the Final EIS (FEIS).

Alternatives Analysis (Summary Table S-1) - EPA appreciates the summary of environmental consequences and mitigation for each of the alternatives. However, the summary of impacts only includes symbols which represent the qualitative level of environmental impact (i.e., no effect, minor, moderate, or significant). In addition, the summary table is sub-divided into three separate tables. Consequently, it is more difficult to compare the impacts and mitigation of the alternatives relative to one another.

<u>Recommendation</u>: The FEIS should include a summary table that also incorporates the quantitative information that is provided in the document. For example, the table should include the number of stream crossing, quantity (i.e., linear feet) and quality of stream impacts, quantity and quality of wetland impacts per type, number of potential noise sites that exceeded noise thresholds, or number and type of archeological/cultural resources impacted. This type of information within the summary table enables resource agencies and the public to independently evaluate the severity of the impacts. In addition, this information should be incorporated into one summary matrix verses three.

Habitat Loss - The proposed project will result in expansive changes to the present land use of portions of the Fort Benning. This will entail conversion of up to 1,800 acres of forests to a grass land habitat since the dimensions of current facilities are not extensive enough to provide realistic training nor do they meet. Every effort should be made to avoid and minimize impacts to unique ecological areas, especially if the habitat supports endangered species, such as the Red Cockaded Woodpecker or other biologically important plants or animals.

Recommendation: Every effort should be made to avoid or minimize extensive habitat loss particularly in unique and ecologically sensitive areas. The FEIS should include more detailed information regarding the impacts of habitat loss on endangered species or other biological specimens. EPA recommends that Fort Benning coordinate and consult with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding these avoidance, minimization, and mitigation issues.

Noise - The proposed project will result in significant noise impacts. This is one of the major adverse environmental factors associated with this proposed project that are difficult to mitigate. The off-post noise impacts is directly related to the proposed action as well as the other cumulative actions anticipated in the near future (See Figures 43, 44 and 45). Noise contours for Zone 3 (70 CDNL) extend past the installation boundaries on the northeastern side of the installation. Other areas around the installation will also experience some fluctuations in noise level (i.e., noise levels may decrease temporarily and then increase when improvements to other training areas like Hastings occurs). Consequently, these areas are not expected to produce substantial increases in off-post noise impacts by themselves. Overall, it is unclear what the current and projected number of residents are that will be impacted by noise impacts associated with the proposed project and other cumulative projects on Fort Benning.

<u>Recommendation</u>: Every effort should be made to avoid, minimize and mitigate for off-post noise impacts. EPA recommends that nighttime and weekend firing should be minimized after 10 p.m. With exceptions being adequately announced to nearby communities. We also suggest that ICUZ noise data be provided to local realtors that are servicing the nearby lots available for development so that prospective buyers are well aware of noise levels before potential home purchases. The FEIS should also clearly identify, in text and graphic format, the locations and number of residents located in the areas to be affected by noise, and what practices will be employed to minimize these impacts (e.g., restricting training hours, restricting the types of training at certain times, etc). In addition, was an alternative considered that permitted cumulative Zone III noise to stay on site; i.e., not affect off-site residents?

Wetlands - Fort Benning has delineated approximately 315 acres of jurisdictional wetlands on the preferred alternative site. According to EPA's Wetland Regulatory Section, Fort Benning delivered a presentation on this project at an interagency meeting on November 12, 2003 and estimated the range could impact up 16 acres of these jurisdictional wetlands. Apparently there are also approximately 10 acres of non jurisdictional "isolated" wetlands on the preferred alternative site. The Savannah District Corps of Engineers Regulatory Program has indicated that an individual Clean Water Act Section 404 permit will be required for the proposed project. In the normal course of permit review, the EPA Wetlands Regulatory Section will review and comment on, as appropriate, the project alternatives analysis, avoidance or minimization of impacts to waters of the U.S. for the preferred alternative and compensatory mitigation for unavoidable impacts. EPA is aware that Fort Benning has preliminarily identified some potential wetland and stream mitigation sites. We were unable to have a representative participate in the March 12, 2004, interagency site visit. EPA will continue to work with Fort Benning to develop the least damaging practicable alternative, minimize impacts from that alternative and develop an appropriate compensatory mitigation plan for unavoidable wetland and stream impacts.

<u>Recommendation</u>: EPA recommends that Fort Benning continue to work through the Savannah District COE to coordinate with EPA's Wetland Regulatory Section regarding the Section 404 permit. While it would have been preferred for inclusion in the DEIS, the FEIS should include a detailed wetland and stream mitigation plan.

Water Quality (Section 4.2) - The DEIS does not name or list the stream segments that are impaired due to sedimentation. In addition, the document does not include sufficient discussion regarding proposed best management practices (BMPs) to minimize water quality impacts and prevent stream bank erosion. It is also notable that a draft Mitigation and Monitoring Plan is included in the document, however, the existence of the plan is not discussed in this portion of the document.

<u>Recommendation:</u> Every effort should be made to avoid and minimize further impact to TMDL streams. The FEIS water quality section should name the specific stream segments impaired due to sediments. EPA recommends avoidance first, use of BMPs second, and mitigation third (i.e., establishment of protected stream segments and buffers across the entire base). Management should also include long-term water quality monitoring of both TMDL and other streams. Suggested BMPs include: (a) restricting tank crossings to specific areas in which the stream bank is relatively flat; (b) reinforcing the stream bed with non-eroding materials, if possible; (c) covering the exposed soil along the stream bank with commercial materials designed to prevent stormwater runoff after the military exercise is complete. Other approaches more familiar to base personnel may also be applicable. In summary, the FEIS should provide additional discussion on appropriate BMPs for minimizing water quality impacts and prevention of stream bank erosion throughout the document.

Erosion and Sediment Control (Executive Summary) - The proposed project will substantially affect streambanks and stream water quality. According to previous discussions with state and military staff, erosion and sediment control has been an on-going issue of concern at Fort Benning. As identified in the document, many streams located on Fort Benning have

documented impacts to stream biota due to sediment. Although historical agricultural practices are responsible for some of the observed impacts, more recent land use data suggest that military operations training, (i.e., particularly the effects of tanks crossing streams and lack of stream buffers), may be a primary source of sediments to the streams. In general, the DEIS does not place enough emphasis on monitoring and negating the anticipated impacts of the new construction and training activities on local water resources.

<u>Recommendation</u>: The FEIS should include assurances that there will be more emphasis on monitoring and minimizing the adverse impacts of clearing, new construction and training activities on water resources.

Erosion and Sediment Control (Executive Summary, Statement of Compliance) - Fort Benning, Army Corps of Engineers, and contractors must adhere to current federal and state erosion and sediment control practices. Similar to other federal and non-federal jurisdictions across the state, current BMPs used to control polluted stormwater runoff on Fort Benning may not be effective. This is especially true with respect to maintenance of silt fences and clean-out of sediment detention areas.

<u>Recommendations</u>: The FEIS should identify specific practices that will be used to ensure adequate review of sediment and erosion control plans, post-development stormwater requirements, stream buffers (25 foot is the minimum state width requirement), and others by contractors and federal representatives. The FEIS should also include specific contract language, as well as the names of the contact persons responsible for conducting site inspections, and ensuring that best management practices are maintained.

Based on our review of the DEIS, EPA assigned a rating of EC-1 to the preferred alternative. That is, we have identified a number of environmental concerns that need to be addressed. However, it appears that the particular training elements which produced these concerns can be modified to mitigate the adverse consequences to acceptable limits. A major outstanding issue that requires careful attention relates to noise impacts that are expected to increase beyond the boundaries of the Fort Benning reservation. Fort Benning will have to carefully monitor to ensure that these episodes do not increase in degree and scope.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposed action. Additional comments and public health and safety comments are located in Appendix A. If we can be of further assistance, please feel free to contact Ntale Kajumba at (404) 562-9620 or Bob Lord of the Wetlands Regulatory Section at (404) 562-9408.

Sincerely

Heinz J. Mueller, Chief NEPA Program Office Office of Policy and Management

Additional Comments (Appendix A)

Water Resources-

Table S-1: Potential Direct and Indirect Effects and Mitigation (Executive Summary) EPA anticipates that the potential impacts to water quality due to polluted stormwater runoff and destruction of the stream banks during construction and training operations under both Alternative II and III maybe greater than that indicated on the table. If installation and maintenance of BMPs is not fully adhered to, the potential for polluted stormwater during clearing and construction maybe substantial.

Recommendation: The FEIS should describe proposed mitigation and monitoring measures in more detail.

Location of Latrines (Alternative III. Section 4.3.3) - The document states that there is no choice but to locate the latrines along Upatoi Creek upstream of the drinking water intake.

<u>Recommendation</u>: If that is the case, it is important to institute good housekeeping measures to ensure that the latrines are functioning properly. EPA recommends regular inspections and waste cleanup and disposal, to ensure there are no impacts to the primary source of the Fort Bennings drinking water.

Timber Management Plan (Appendix I) - EPA agrees that trees located in wetlands and streamside management zones should be preserved as much as possible.

<u>Comments</u>: Can additional guidance be provided on how the individual trees will be identified? In an effort to preserve habitat, is it possible that larger, hardwood trees located in areas not affecting the line of sight on the DMPRC be preserved as much as possible? Felled trees and brush may be used to stabilize streambanks and prevent erosion which is a significant concern at Fort Benning. Please include this best management practice in the Timber Management Plan as well as other parts of the document.

Water Quality (Section 3.1.3) - The linkage between the on-going research program and the proposed project should be made more clear in Section 3.1.3.2. Also, Section 3.1.3.3.2 should include more discussion about the impacts from the sewage spills that are believed to occur at least two times each year. It is our understanding that a comprehensive watershed assessment has not been completed for Fort Benning. This information could be used to ensure that impacts to impaired or high quality waterbodies are minimized.

<u>Recommendation</u>: Given the water quality issues associated with stormwater runoff from the urbanized and training areas, the accidental releases from the wastewater treatment plant, the compliance issues of the drinking water plant, and the many total maximum daily load (TMDL) streams on the base, EPA recommends that a comprehensive watershed assessment of the entire base take place should be conducted. Other, non-TMDL streams located in areas that may be impacted by military training exercises and other base operations, including permitted discharges from the aged wastewater treatment system and drinking water plant should be included in this assessment. The results of the assessment should be used to develop a watershed management plan that meets the new requirements of NPDES Phase II.

Wetlands and Stream Banks (Section 4.3) - It is noteworthy that the document states that streambank buffer zones will be marked along specific creeks to protect water quality. However, Section 4.3. does not provide information on the width of the stream buffer and how it will be marked and maintained.

<u>Recomendation</u>: Please provide information on the width of the stream buffer, how it will be marked, and how the buffer will be maintained over time. We also support the wetland restoration and streambank restoration measures but need more information on the proposed plan to make an evaluation of its potential to mitigate the anticipated impacts. Please provide us with a copy of the "Preliminary Draft Wetland Mitigation Siting Analysis for the Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex" along with information obtained from EPA on any prior coordination on this report. We support the research being conducted at the site under the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP). Ideally, the research would evaluate the affects of the military on the health of the streams, identification of appropriate best management practices, and an evaluation of the effectiveness of these BMPs on the health of the impacted streams. In addition, we stress the importance of adequate coordination and concurrence with EPA on the Wetland Mitigation Siting Analysis and this DEIS prior to buffer disturbance or tree removal.

Safety -

Safety of Range Operations (Executive Summary, Unresolved Issues) - The firing range should be oriented away from eastern boundary of the base given the nearness of the currently proposed alternatives.

Public Health and Safety: The document should include the types of public health and safety that have occurred or been documented during the past 10 years as it relates to military training exercises. This information should include noise exceedances, firearm or artillery incidents (particularly as it relates to surrounding area (i.e., off-post and areas outside the safety zone). For example, one of the public comments in the DEIS included an account in which a cow was killed by a bullet on personal property. This individual was eventually compensated by the military.



United States Department of the Interior

Fish and Wildlife Service 247 South Milledge Avenue Athens, Georgia 30605

West Georgia Sub Office P.O. Box 52560 Ft. Benning, Georgia 31995-2560

MAR 29 2004

Coastal Sub Office 4270 Norwich Street Brunswick, Georgia 31520

Chief, Environmental Management Division ATZB-ELN-E (Attn: John E. Brown) Building 6, (Meloy Hall) Room 310 Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122

Dear Mr. Brown:

This letter constitutes the comments of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), "Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex, Fort Benning, GA". We submit the following comments under provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.) and Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et. seq.)

General Comments: The DEIS was prepared based on the 35% range design, operational plans, and data available as of September 30, 2003, and does not incorporate more current information. Realizing that there have been additional data acquired since September 30, we anticipate that the final EIS will reflect the final Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC) design and final appending reports and permit applications, especially since final revisions may change the level of impacts discussed in the DEIS.

Many of the sections addressed under Environmental Consequences are generic discussions about impact reduction, without data or focused plans of action. It is our understanding that the final design for the DMPRC has not yet been provided by the design contractor, which has delayed the completion of a final erosion control plan and delayed applications for the section 404 (wetlands) and NPDES permits. Without appended plans and permit applications we are able to provide only a few detailed comments. Therefore, our comments focus or recommendations for information that should be included in the final EIS and that will assist us in assessing the potential impacts from the proposed project.

Specific comments: Page 36, Section 3.1.9, Migratory Birds: This section seems to indicate that loss of habitat for migratory bird species is not significant since they do not inhabit the area all year. All seasonal habitats of migratory species are necessary for their survival; this includes breeding habitat, over-wintering habitat, and resting and foraging habitat along routes of migration. As stated on page 36, 275 singing male Bachman's sparrows were documented during the USFWS Terrestrial Survey, indicating a breeding population on Fort Benning. We recommend the section be rewritten to provide a more detailed discussion of the impacts of the proposed action on breeding, over-wintering, and migratory habitat to representative species that currently use the site.

Page 42, Section 3.2.2.3, Range Sustainment: The 373-day throughput requirement needs to be better explained in relation to a 365-day year. For all ranges that have a listed throughput requirement, provide an estimate of the number of days annually each range will be active. The Service is concerned that inaccessibility due to training may result in a potential reduction of wildlife habitat management and improvement activities, such as prescribed burning, and the ability of Fort Benning personnel to adequately respond to wildfires.

Page 62, Section 3.2.13.2, Surface Danger Zone (SDZ): Please provide a reference to a training manual, research publication, or other Army document that deals with the statistical probability defining the extent of SDZs. Only the construction footprint of the DMPRC will be cleared while the SDZ is much larger and will remain forested. The Service must assess potential impacts to wildlife habitat outside of the range footprint due to operation of the range. Since "statistically, these items (i.e. projectiles) have a one in a million chance of landing outside the SDZ" (page 62, Section 3.2.13.2), the information contained within the statistical report would assist the Service in identifying and quantifying areas of habitat which may be more vulnerable to adverse impacts than others.

Page 63, Section 4.1.3, Soils and Vegetation, Alternative III: This section contains generalities which, if applied appropriately, should greatly reduce erosion and water quality impacts. We recommend that this section be expanded to incorporate specific details that will be contained in the final erosion control plan and in the NPDES and section 404 (wetlands) permits which have yet to be issued.

In particular, we would like a detailed erosion control plan to evaluate in the final EIS. Soil erosion poses a threat to natural resources on and off site because of the highly erodable soil and slopes on site. Without an appropriate design and adequate long-term maintenance, eroded soil may fill wetlands on-site and further degrade water quality in Upatoi Creek and the Chattahoochee River. The location of silt catchment basins, type and amount of mulch, design of ditches, fertilization and seed specifications, and maintenance schedule are all critical. Components of the NPDES permit, especially relating to acceptable water quality parameters downstream, would be helpful in reviewing the erosion control plan.

The Service is also concerned about the use of exotic plant species for erosion control, especially persistent species such as the perennials love grass and Sericea lespedeza. Fort Benning's 2001-2004 Installation Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) emphasizes the preferential use of native species in soil erosion projects (Section 10.17.3, page 179, INRMP). The Service encourages the use of <u>only</u> native species and we request that the detailed soil erosion plan include information on native vegetation to be planted.

Page 77, Section 4.5.1.3, Alternative III: We agree that research and monitoring on the effects of SDZs on RCW clusters and foraging habitat would be useful to the Army and the Service for assessing potential adverse impacts to RCW foraging habitat from range operations. It has proven difficult to quantify the long-term effects of ammunition embedding in pine trees during training events to the persistence and fitness of clusters and foraging habitat within SDZs.

Page 76, Section 4.6.3, Alternative III: We agree that adjusting the timing of construction activities to minimize impacts on the red-cockaded woodpecker and migratory bird species, especially during the nesting seasons, would be a positive action.

Page 98, Section 5.3, Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions Within the ROI, Fort Benning community: The DEIS for the DMPRC lists 23 potential projects that may occur on Fort Benning in the future. The North/South Maneuver Corridors count as 3 projects and may require 5,000 acres for construction. This Corridor project appears to be contiguous to the DMPRC as the Corridor will run through compartments D2-16 and the Preferred Alternative III for the DMPRC is mainly located in compartments D2 and D14. We would like to see an expanded discussion of the potential cumulative impacts of the maneuver corridors in the final EIS including any information about minimizing impacts to fish and wildlife habitats.

Page B-11, Section 5.2.3.1, Endangered Species: The Preferred Alternative III for the DMPRC is estimated to impact 115 gopher tortoise burrows and remove 1,107 acres of gopher tortoise habitat. We recommend Fort Benning staff contact the appropriate personnel within the Georgia Department of Natural Resources in order to minimize potential impacts to State protected species. The final EIS should include information on coordination with the State, including a detailed gopher tortoise relocation plan that outlines the relocation process, appropriate relocation sites, and success criteria monitoring.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the DEIS. If you have any questions about our comments, please contact Mr. Stephen Parris, supervisor at the West Georgia Sub-Office located at Fort Benning.

Sincerely,

techen D. Paris

Sandra S. Tucker Field Supervisor

Cc: file, FWS West GA, Athens



0

MAR S I 2004

Directorate of Public Works

FILE COPY

Dr. W. Ray Luce Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer Historic Preservation Division 47 Trinity Avenue, SW Suite 414-H Atlanta, GA 30303-9006

Dear Dr. Luce,

Fort Benning has proposed to construct a Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex. The State of Georgia and the public were provided copies of the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for review and comment. Details on the specific cultural sites within the DEIS were not contained within the DEIS to protect their locations and identities from potential vandalism and looting.

Enclosed please find on Compact Disk the specific site information, including site locations, descriptions, and recommendations for their eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places for your further information. In summary, review of the enclosed information and the information provided in the DEIS leads Fort Benning to conclude that no adverse effects will result from the construction and operation of the DMPRC on cultural resources at Fort Benning. The determination of 'no adverse effect' is achieved with the building of protective berms or data recovery within the footprint of construction of the DMPRC and the use of low impact logging methods within the landing path for the helipad servicing the range.

Please review the enclosed information and provide to Fort Benning any comments or questions that you may have regarding the proposed construction of the DMPRC. You may contact me at (706) 545-1500, or Dr. Christopher E. Hamilton at (706) 545-2377 should you require any assistance

Respectfully,

Acting Director of Public Works

Enclosure CD



Preserving our Chattahoochee

Working for the Protection, Preservation and Restoration of the Chattahoochee River

APB O & MES

March 30, 2004

Ms. Linda M. Veenstra Meloy Hall (Building 6), Room 309 Ft. Benning, GA 31905-5122

Dear Ms. Veenstra:

Please consider these comments on your Draft EIS.

The project (DMPRC) undoubtedly poses an extensive list of environmental concerns. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement addresses this list, and provides options to be considered.

Based on what has been addressed, my organization's principal concerns are erosion and water quality. The additional sediment load, coupled with the increase in spent ammunition residues, must be properly dealt with. All NPDES regulations must be satisfied.

Please assure that the final DIS reflects the full and complete cost of dealing with these issues.

Sincerely,

James H. Phillips Executive Director/Riverkeeper



Conservation Branch

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

APR 9 2004

Sandy Tucker Field Supervisor U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 247 S. Milledge Avenue Athens, GA 30605 RE: FWS N0. 03-0584

Dear Ms. Tucker:

This correspondence is in response to your letter of March 23, 2004, requesting additional information for the Fort Benning Biological Assessment (BA) of a Digital Multi Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC). Your letter states that if the additional information is not provided it could result in prolonging the consultation process or require your agency to issue a Biological Opinion based on a "reasonable worst case scenario."

The four "critical information needs" you have requested are a final design of the DMPRC, including correct elevations; an estimate of the number of days annually and seasonally that the Conservation Branch personnel will need access to the area affected by the DMPRC to conduct red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW) management and monitoring; a description of the range scheduling process and scheduling priorities; and aerial photography of the northeastern portion of the Installation at intervals of approximately 10 years.

As stated in our March 15, 2004 email to your West Georgia Sub-Office, our plan was to provide your agency with a Draft Monitoring Plan and a 110% DMPRC (i.e. Final) by the end of April 2004. The March 15 email goes on to request that the format in which the needed information is submitted to your agency is as an addendum to the Biological Assessment. Please find enclosed the addendum, which includes the four critical information needs you requested however, the Access Plan is in draft form.

If you have any questions regarding the critical information needs please contact Ms. Linda Veenstra, the DMPRC Environmental Project Manager at (706) 545-8072

Sincerely. John J. Brent Chief, Environmental Management Division



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF: ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION

APR 1 6 2004

United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4 ATTN: Mr. Heinz J. Meuller, Chief, NEPA Program Office Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, GA 30303-8960

Dear Sir:

Thank you for your comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC) at Fort Benning, GA (your CEQ#: 040060; ERP# USA-E11052-GA). We appreciate the time and efforts of your staff in reviewing and commenting on the DEIS and have prepared the following response. We considered all of your comments in our preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). For consistency, we have ordered our responses to mirror the order of your comments dated 29 March 2004.

Alternatives Analysis (Summary Table S-1) - Fort Benning agrees that a "summary table incorporating the quantitative information" presented in the DEIS would further clarify the differences between the alternatives presented in the document and has created a new Table S-1 accordingly for inclusion in the FEIS. For Alternative II, however, where we do not have a sitespecific design available, we have had to use estimates based on the best information available. We were able to subsequently identify the "number of potential noise sites that exceeded noise thresholds" and have incorporated that into the FEIS, Sections 3.2.9, 4.11, and 5.4.6. We have elected to retain the three summary matrices for each alternative elsewhere in the FEIS.

Habitat Loss - Substantial efforts were made in siting and designing the proposed DMPRC to avoid environmental impacts, including impacts to UEAs and Federally or state listed species and their habitat. Fort Benning has drafted and submitted a Biological Assessment for the DMPRC to the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service that addresses the concerns regarding habitat loss for Federally listed species. The USFWS has been consultED on this project and is currently reviewing the BA. In addition, the USFWS has reviewed the DEIS and made comment on it as well. One particular comment from USFWS was a request to survey the area of the action alternatives for another Federally endangered species, Relict trillium. This survey was completed in March 2004 and the results of this survey have been incorporated in Section 3.1.7.5 of the FEIS. We have also added more detail concerning habitat loss to the FEIS, as well as referencing the BA for the DMPRC. All coordination letters between Fort Benning and the USFWS are included in Appendix G of the FEIS.

Noise - Our analysis of potential noise impacts for Alternative II or III indicates that it will actually improve the noise situation off Post and bring the Zone III (incompatible) contour back within the Installation boundary, thereby reducing the number of residences affected from one to none. Cumulatively, when the future upgrades to Hastings Range occur and are added to the rest of the training queue, both of the action alternatives (II and III) will result in some of the Zone III contour again leaving the Installation boundary, but to a lesser degree (and covering less land) than under the currently existing conditions. Our review of aerial photography for this portion of the Installation shows that only one residence lies within the current Zone III contour extending off Post and therefore potentially impacted; this would remain the same situation cumulatively, with the same one residence remaining in the Zone III contour. We have added text to the FEIS to further clarify the potential noise impacts, including the aerial photograph showing the one residence lying within the current Zone III contour. We have also added text explaining the need for night and weekend firing, to provide a realistic training environment for the soldiers. This issue did come up at our 2 and 4 March 2004 public meetings, but the residents said they would actually prefer it if Fort Benning did most of its firing on the weekends and not at night. At this time, this DMPRC proposal does not have significant effects that need to be mitigated, although we have proposed a Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) as a means of identifying possible minimization efforts for the future.

Wetlands - Fort Benning will continue to coordinate with the Savannah District, US Corps of Engineers, Regulatory Section (COE-R) regarding this project. We have recently submitted the Section 404 Wetlands Permit Application to them, which includes information regarding proposed mitigation at a restoration site in a Conceptual Mitigation Plan and a Wetlands Mitigation Siting Analysis. We are also currently working on a more detailed, site-specific mitigation plan, which will be forwarded to the COE-R when complete. It is our understanding that all of these documents will also be forwarded to you through the COE-R. The FEIS includes some of the details gleaned from these documents and references them, as well.

Water Quality - The table listing the impaired stream segments on Fort Benning is located in Section 3.0 of the FEIS; however, we added the stream names in the relevant sections of the FEIS to improve clarity on this issue. We also included a reference to the DMPRC Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, a draft of which is included in the FEIS appendix because it will include full details regarding mitigation for potential impacts to impaired streams. Fort Benning attempted to avoid streams as much as possible during the design phase and the consideration of other options. Our Range personnel, however, did not sanction the use of culverts or bridge-like crossings on the DMPRC for safety reasons, i.e., the potential for tanks to go off the culvert/bridge and fall into the stream. For this reason, only low water crossings will be utilized for tank trails on the DMPRC. The FEIS clarifies this issue in more detail, as well as including additional information on mitigation for impacts to water quality. Future minimization options may arise as a result of the SEMP research in the area of the DMPRC, as well.

Erosion and Sediment Control (Executive Summary) - Fort Benning has added text to the FEIS and the DMPRC Mitigation and Monitoring Plan to address this issue. Specifically, see Sections 4.1-4.3 and Appendix J of the FEIS.

Erosion and Sediment Control (Executive Summary, Statement of Compliance) - We have added details regarding mitigation and monitoring requirements from the March 2004 Alternative III design to the text of the FEIS, in addition to referencing the NPDES permit, Section 404 Permit Application, and the DMPRC Mitigation and Monitoring Plan in the FEIS. The Fort Benning environmental team has also continued to work with the design team to incorporate environmental specifications into the contract(s) for the construction of the DMPRC.

Additional Comments Water Resources

- Table S-1: Potential Direct and Indirect Effects and Mitigation (Executive Summary) - Details concerning the proposed mitigation and monitoring measures for water quality, including specific BMPs, have been added to the text of the FEIS and the DMPRC Mitigation and Monitoring Plan.
- Location of Latrines Per our environmental and Range personnel, it is standard policy to institute these good

housekeeping measures, which are accomplished through periodic range inspections.

- Timber Management Plan Individual trees located in wetlands and stream buffer zones will only be removed for construction purposes (stream crossings, etc.) and to achieve line of sight. Edits to the FEIS and Timber Harvest Plan include additional details for clarification, including marking procedures and the Best Management Practice. Our Forester will be on site during the timber harvest to monitor the tree cutting; in addition, we plan to have an Environmental Monitor for the duration of the project who will conduct routine inspections, including during the timber harvest. Details regarding this monitoring will be in the DMPRC Mitigation and Monitoring Plan.
- Water Quality (Section 3.1.3) The SEMP research program was actually established prior to the planning for the DMPRC and is independent of this project; however, the DMPRC project may impact some of their research sites, which may or may not be left in place. The connection between this research and the DMPRC, therefore, is not really that strong. We have attempted to clarify this in the text of the FEIS. The sewage spills mentioned in Section 3.1.3 were located far from the two action alternative for the DMPRC and were not an impact to the streams associated with these alternatives. Fort Benning has operating and discharge permits for our sewage systems and we comply with these permits. Additionally, we have no data indicating that we have significantly and adversely impacted any of the streams on Fort Benning as a result of either our sewage plant operations/discharges or the incidental bypasses/spills. Fort Benning is currently in the process of privatizing its water and wastewater distribution systems and has no plans to conduct a watershed assessment at this time.
- Wetlands and Streambanks (Section 4.3) Text regarding the width of the stream buffer has been added to this section of the FEIS. As for the documents you have requested, these will be forwarded to you by the COE-R as part of the Section 404 Permit Application. If you would like an additional copy, please reply accordingly and we will provide that to you as soon as possible. We will pass on your comments regarding the SEMP research. We also understand that we must wait for the Section 404 Permit approval prior to the removal of any trees in the wetlands or stream buffer zones.

4

Safety

- Safety of Range Operations (Executive Summary, Unresolved Issues) - Alternative II is already oriented away from the Eastern boundary of the Installation. As for Alternative III, although it is oriented towards that boundary, its firing points are sufficiently distant from the boundary to negate any safety concerns, as indicated in the FEIS. Army safety requirements require intensive studies of range and firing plans, which ensures safety, regardless of range orientation.
- Public Health and Safety Past incidents were likely due to the proximity of Hastings Range, current site of the advanced gunnery training, to the Installation boundary. The two action alternatives would move this advanced gunnery training to a more interior location and decrease the potential for future occurrences of this type. If an incident does occur, however, there is an established procedure for filing claims. Noise concerns are addressed in a separate section of the FEIS.

We thank you again for your timely review of this document and your comments regarding it and look forward to future coordination. POC for additional information or question is Ms. Linda M. Veenstra, DMPRC Environmental Project Manager, (706) 545-8072.

Sincerely,

Chief, Environmental Management Division



REPLY TO ATTINTION OF: ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION

The Riverkeeper Attn: Mr. Jim Phillips 117 12th Street P.O. Box 1492 Columbus, GA 31902 APR 1 6 2004

Dear Sir:

Thank you for your comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC) at Fort Benning, GA. We appreciate your time and efforts in reviewing and commenting on the DEIS and have prepared the following response.

Fort Benning agrees that soil erosion and water quality are a major concern for this project. Additional details, gleaned from the Section 404 Permit Application and its associated documents and the latest draft of the Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan have been worked into the text of the Final EIS and the DMPRC Mitigation and Monitoring Plan. This should provide sufficient detail regarding the measures Fort Benning plans to minimize the potential for soil erosion and adverse impacts to water quality in this area. The NPDES Permit will also include mitigation measures and monitoring to reduce soil erosion and to protect water quality. Fort Benning intends to have an Environmental Monitor, also, who will inspect, monitor, and report on all aspects of mitigation associated with this project.

We thank you again for your timely review of the DEIS and your comments regarding it and look forward to future coordination. POC for additional information or question is Ms. Linda M. Veenstra, DMPRC Environmental Project Manager, (706) 545-8072.

Sincerely. John J. Brent Chief, Environmental Management Division



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF: ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION

APR 1 6 2004

United States Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service Attn: Ms. Sandra S. Tucker, Field Supervisor 247 South Milledge Avenue Athens, GA 30605

Dear Ma'am:

Thank you for your comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC) at Fort Benning, GA. We appreciate the time and efforts of your staff in reviewing and commenting on the DEIS and have prepared the following response. For consistency, we have ordered our responses to mirror the order of your comments dated 29 March 2004.

General Comments - The DEIS was actually prepared utilizing the 30 September 2003 design, which is approximately a 95% design. Since publication of the DEIS, however, design revisions have occurred and this will be reflected in the FEIS. In addition, many of the other environmental documents, regarding wetlands, soil erosion, and protected species, are also in final status and will be referenced in the FEIS. Details now available through these final documents will also be included in the text of the FEIS. Any changes to the design or environmental documents beyond this point will be coordinated with you at the appropriate level.

Specific Comments

Page 36, Section 3.1.9, Migratory Birds - Fort Benning is including additional details, as appropriate, in the FEIS and DMPRC Mitigation Monitoring Plan regarding Migratory Birds.

Page 42, Section 3.2.2.3, Range Sustainment - Fort Benning has added text to the FEIS to clarify and define the numbers associated with the throughput requirements and any inconsistencies which may have been in this section. Regarding accessibility to sites for monitoring purposes, Fort Benning has drafted an access plan to clearly lay out the agreements between the Environmental Management Division (EMD) and the Directorate of Training (DOT). This access plan addresses all of the issues identified in your comment on this issue and has been referenced in the FEIS. This access plan will be provided to you through the consultation process on the Biological Assessment (BA).

Page 62, Section 3.2.13.2, Surface Danger Zones (SDZs) - There is no training manual or other document that defines the statistical probabilities referenced in this section; rather, this number is based on the experience of our professionals within the Range Division and DOT. We have clarified this in the text of the FEIS.

Page 63, Section 4.1.3, Soils and Vegetation, Alternative III -Additional details have been added to the text of the FEIS and DMPRC Mitigation and Monitoring Plan to address your concerns regarding soil erosion and water quality impacts, such as listing specific BMPs that would be employed. The latest draft of the Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) is under review and will be forwarded to you, along with a copy of the Section 404 Wetlands Application, both of which contain additional details concerning monitoring. The ESPCP also includes a list of acceptable seed mixes, to address the concern regarding invasive non-native species.

Page 77, Section 4.5.1.3, Alternative III - Fort Benning agrees and will consider this aspect of SDZ and foraging habitat research when designing the monitoring for the DMPRC project. Unfortunately, funding and resource limitations may prevent such research.

Page 76, Section 4.6.3, Alternative III - Fort Benning plans to adjust the timing of construction to minimize impacts to RCWs and migratory birds, when possible.

Page 98, Section 5.3, Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions Within the ROI, Fort Benning Community - The North/South Maneuver Corridors are an existing site on Fort Benning and this action would not entail any new construction. We have added text to the FEIS to clarify that this action consists of the rehabilitation of an already-existing maneuver corridor and would have positive environmental impacts. We have added text to the FEIS to more thoroughly delineate potential impacts, as well.

Page B-11, Section 5.2.3.1, Endangered Species - Fort Benning has added text to the FEIS and DMPRC Mitigation and Monitoring Plan to address the concern regarding the gopher tortoise, including more details regarding a relocation process. Updated information indicates that only 30-40 active burrows remain in the Alternative III area due to a cooperative research initiative with Auburn University.

We thank you again for your timely review of this document and your comments regarding it and look forward to future coordination. POC for additional information or question is Ms. Linda M. Veenstra, DMPRC Environmental Project Manager, (706) 545-8072.

\$incerely, John J. Brent Chief, Environmental Management

Division

APPENDIX H

DMPRC MEDIA COVERAGE



CAURA RADCH Associated Pro

Three members of the Fort Benning based 317th Engineer Battalion - from left, 1st Lt. Alexander Yn of Syracuse, NY: Apia Co. commander Capit Esfael Lopez and Int Li, John Yao of Silver Spring, Md. --- take time out from their desert training last week to read letters from home. The combit engineering battalion has been in the Persian Gulf since early January. Lopez is the only one of the three to have family in this area - his wife and three children live on post.

Benning target for firing range

BY S. THORNE HARPER. Staff Writer

Pending an Environmental Impact Statement and funding, the Army said it wants to build a \$30 million computerized firing range complex at Port Benning. The Army also hinted that if those plans fall through that it could result in the shift of Fort Beaning topops to Port Stewart.

The range would be built at the castern end of the 285-square-mile

post, a Fort Benning spokesman said. Fort Benning is home to the 3rd Brigade, 3rd Infantry Division (Mechanized) and conducts training for other infantry units that include 44 tank crews and 84 Bradley Fighting Vehicle cress. In a statement released Tuesday alternoon, the Army said it needed a "state-of-the art"

firing range to accommodate armored training.

"Right now we can't train them at the standards they need to be at to go to war," Fort Benning spokesman Rich McDowell said.

McDowell declined to comment on that effect the range would play in the upcoming round of Base

See RANGE, Page C3

RANGE | Noise, safety are concerns

From C1

ledger-enquirer.com.

Realignment and Closure in 2005.

However, the Army state-ment said Fort Benning must . either "modify standards" there or face the prospect of "transporting units from Fort Benning to Fort Stewart for the required training."

McDowell said he did not know if that meant the temporary transport of troops to Port Stewart or whether Fort Benning would permanently lose troops to the cast Georgia post if Fort Benning failed to construct the so-called 'Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex.

The 3rd Brigade, 3rd Infantry Division is a tenant unit at Fort Benning. The headquar-ters of the 3rd Infantry. Division, along with its other two brigades, is located at Fort Stewart. In recent years some

Army officials have suggested WHAT'S NEXT that the 4,000-soldier 3rd Brigaie be moved there.

The proposed range, with computerized targets, is tentile tively scheduled for construction in summer 2004. It would measure about 15 football fields wide and 45 football fields long.

Some of the concerns involved with the range involve. noise, ammunition-generated dust blowing into residential areas, effects on Native American archeological sites and endangered species - like the red-cooladed woodpecker and the gapher tortoise --- and the impact on wetland areas and soil crusion.

The Army will host two public meetings regarding its proposed ficing range at Fort Berning.

6-8 p.m. Feb. 15 - The Elizabeth Bradley Tamer Center at Columbus State University, East Lindsey Drive.

6-8 p.m. Feb. 20 - The Marion County Court House, 100 N.

Broad St., Buena Vista, Ga. Unable to attend a meeting? Mail comments to Richard McDowell, Public Atlairs Office. U.S. Army Infantry Center and Fort Benning, ATTN: ATZB-PO, Building 4 (Infantry Hall), Fort Benning, GA 31905-5122,

Not really part of but somewhat related

Friday, Feb. 7, 2003

NEWS & FEATURES

THE BAYONET A-3

Fort Benning proposes building new range complex

Public invited to voice concerns Pic. Brian Trapp Environt staff

Fort Benning warts to build a terra Faitge complex.

The range would give midters a state-of-the-art facility to conduct guarty overnes, said Fred Werkley, instalizon more unsegue

Fort Danning is well behind or modernization of mogas, las thing.

The last maps moderaized segarity

was about 12 years ago. As intent to construct a signal, multiperpose range complex, was released Jac. 31 to inform the community about the project. "We want to get the public

is volved sarly, to know what kind of curcerus they want us to study," said Linds Veenstra, erreistonerannal project stamager The preferred conscruction she is at the eastern and of Port. Bearing, but other locations are being considered. Officials will

Reveau. ste potential. environmental impacts of the fange construction sizes.

"We look at possibilit impocts through

surveys and other collected information to see the impacts on wedlauds, endorgenad species and historical or cultural siles," Voonstes said. "We have to look at any negative impacts to sta here to minimize them."

The initial construction cent is estimated at \$30 million, the digitization and instructeutation. is estimated at \$20 million and the range is projected to last 20 to 30 years. Weekley said,

"We can train people to be soldiers and send them to way, but without investing in training, we muy not be able to bring them back," Woekley said "In Desayt Salem, we didn't

lose any tasks to Iraq. If we can

"We can train people to be soldiers and send them to war, but without investing in training, we may not be able to bring them back." Fred Weekley

installation range manager

losing mother task or person, it's worth the rosery."

The mage instrumentation right vision from the system. which will improve safety on the range, Weakley said.

"The video can be used at

go through another war without show the soldiers what they did, not what they through they did." he said.

Construction of the new will have the ability to give range is slated to start in video feedback, kaltaced or summer 2004 with two years of construction time, and building the new range will give the post a chance to trite assignated ranges and update them for new

purposes, Weshiey said. Hartings Rough, the content poundry testing rouge, is well past its expected file spit. Is was originally bais for 12 to 15 yvers of use bot has need in som for 25 years.

There will be two public scoping meetings in connection with the Sevintemental Ampact Sciences

The first will be from 6 to 8 p.m. Feb. 18 at the Elitabeth Bradley Turner Centar at Courades State University on East Lindsey Drive,

The second will be from 6 to-8 p.m. Feb. 20 at the Marion Crossly Court House, 300 North Stead Street, Roote Viets.

WEDNESDAY, FESSUARY 12, 2003

Legal Notices

10

000

NOTICE

Fort Benning will be hosting meetings regarding a proposed Digital Multipurpose Range Complex (DMPRC).

DMPRC PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS Tuesday, February 18, 2003, from 6-8 p.m., at Columbus State University's Elizabeth Bradley Turner Center in Columbus, GA and Thursday, February 20, 2003, from 6-8 p.m., at the Buena Vista Courthouse in Buena Vista, GA

All are welcomed to come and learn of the benefits that a new range will provide soldiers training at Ft. Benning. There will be Army representatives on hand to discuss plans and potential environmental impacts, as well as address your questions and concerns and hear your thoughts on the proposed project. Both meetings are opened to the general public.

Contact: Rich McDowell, Public Affairs Office, Fort Benning, GA • (706) 545-2211
Melissa i Copy FY Reinds Hudey



Tim Chitwood

Gauging a range of noise

To hear nearby residents describe it, it sounds like the lumbering approach of Tyrannosaurus Rex in the movie "Jurassic Park" — a deep reverberation that shakes the ground, rattles windows and ripples ponds.

But it's not some movie-dinosaur stomp that staggers Fort Benning's neighbors, It's gunnery training on the Hastings range.

Hastings rests on one corner of the Fort Benning post. It's the firing range for tanks and Bradley infantry vehicles, and it is inadequate, the Army says. It lacks the width and depth needed for advanced gunnery training, and its targets are not digitized, so they lack a high-tech component that would provide a more precise and immediate measure of marksmanship.

So Fort Benning wants to build a new range for this advanced training. It would prefer to put that range deep in the post's interior, away from the borders civilians live near. The 25-year-old Hastings range still would be used, for beginner and intermediate training, but not as often.

Benning officials swear building this new range on their preferred site would not lead to any change in the type of weapons they use or the frequency. The training is essentially the same. They'll still be using tanks and Bradleys. They won't use bigger, louder guns.

The only changes are the location and the sophistication of the target system, they say. And moving most of that training away from the boundary might even lessen the noise

But then again, it might not. And that's really the question, as far as the neighbors are concerned: If Fort Bething builds its hew range on its preferred file. Will there be more noise, less noise or about that same noise? , No bie knows, yet. So when post officials recently held public hearings about the new range, that about the new range, that issue wasn't settled. They told folks that because of the variables that affect sound travel — huminity, the confour of the land and the direction of firing — they weren't sure what effect the range would have. We've really just started booking at the potential looking at the potential environmental impacts, and one of the things that we're going to do is noise modeling," said Linda Veenstra, an environmental attorney. That analysis will take about a year. Some neighbors wanted to know if the new range would be redundant. An advanced gunnery range has been built at Fort Hood. Another's being built at Fort Knox. Georgia's Fort Stewart, over by Savannah, is going to upgrade its range, too. Would Fort Benning's range just duplicate Fort Stewart's? "Not truly, because Fort Stewart can barely handle its training load now," said Fred Weckley, Fort Benning's range manager. Stewart has two full brigades and must support reserve units, too, "so their schedule is fairly full," he shid.'s If Benning's new range is approved, construction would start in the summer of '04 and take about 18 months to finish, so it would be late 2005 or early 2006 before it released the dinosaur. A. Topleton Contact Tim Chitwood at (706) 571-8508 or chitwood@ledger-enguirer.com 1.23 Business C10 Death notices ... C2-3Legal ads

Ledger Engurer 28Feb 03

3RD INFANTRY DIVISION

future

Ar

50 cents facilities comwww.ledger-enquirer.com/news A3

ARMY Transformation

COLUMBUOCTOBER 15, 2003

From A1

would divide the division's three brigades into five smaller units. The goal is smaller, faster, more mobile combat units.

The spokesman, Lt. Col. Cliff Kent, said it was not yet clear how those plans would affect the division's 3rd Brigade.

"That is also being studied," Kent said.

Fort Benning spokeswoman Elsie Jackson said it is not known whether the number of 3rd Brigade troops on post — about 4,000 of them would be reduced, increased or remain the same as result of the reorganization.

"We just don't know," Jackson said.

The 3rd Brigade, which led the charge into Iraq during the spring offensive, is preparing for a January training deployment to Southern California's Mojave Desert. Third Brigade officials have said that the one-month training mission to the Army's National Training Center at Fort Irwin is readying the brigade for a possible return to Iraq. The Army has not said when or where the 3rd Brigade will go. Before and after and the war, the National Training Center has been a training ground for units headed for

Coldination of Alexandrian

Iraq.

Kent, who said he "has not seen a timeline" associated with Schoomaker's plan, said he did not know whether those plans would be implemented before the 3rd Brigade arrives at Fort Irwin.

"It is highly likely that units that go to NTC probably would like to have been reorganized before they went to NTC," he said. "But that may not be true for the 3rd Brigade."

The reorganization effort is part of a bigger plan to transform the Army into a lighter, more lethal force, ultimately capable of deploying anywhere in the world in 96 hours. However, other than breaking the division down into five smaller brigades, the Army has not yet indicated how Schoomaker's directive will affect the heavy mechanized division.

Schoomaker has not indicated whether the division would have to rid itself of its heavy M1A1 Abrams tanks, Bradley Fighting Vehicles and Paladin howitzers — the core of its armament — to meet the directive's requirements. The Army recently activated its first "Stryker Brigade," designed around the new Stryker wehicle, a wheeled, armored troop transport that the Army has touted as a symbol of transformation.

leaner Schoomaker says 3rd is

lighter,

first; unclear how plans will affect Fort Benning

> By S. THORNE HARPER Staff Writer

The 3rd Infantry Division will be the Army's first to undergo major reorganization, one seeking to nearly double its firepower while keeping troop levels the same.

Army Chief of Staff Gen. Peter Schoomaker announced the initiative during a speech in Washington, D.C., last week.

"We are going to move from the current force to the future force ... now," Schoomaker said in the speech.



A spokesman for the 3rd Infantry Division said division staff is studying how to follow Schoomaker's directive, which



maker







APPENDIX I

TIMBER HARVEST PLAN FOR THE DMPRC

DMPRC Timber Harvest Plan 21 April 2004

I. Harvest of marketable timber.

Boundaries of the timber harvest area will be located and marked by Land 1. Management Branch (LMB) personnel. Forestry Best Management Practices (BMPs) for water quality, streamside management zones (SMZ's), and timber harvesting will be implemented. Timber harvest boundaries will be marked with red paint and/or stakes. In clearcut areas all trees 5-inches diameter at breast height (dbh) and 30 feet tall or larger will be removed within the red painted boundary. Any trees that are to be left within a clearcut area will be marked with orange paint. LMB will identify timber harvest boundaries and timber will be marked with blue paint for singletree harvest of the taller trees affecting the line of sight (LOS) on the DMPRC. Only trees directly affecting the LOS will be selectively removed from wetlands and SMZs, which cover approximately the same area as stream buffers. Elevations and individual tree height measurements will be used to determine if a tree will interfere with LOS. All trees in the wetlands and SMZs not directly interfering with the line of sight will remain. LMB personnel and Corps of Engineers (COE) timber personnel will ensure that the timber is properly marked for timber harvest. Stream crossings, firing positions and target positions that lie in wetlands will be clearcut. All trees harvested will be cut as low as possible and not higher than an 8-inch stump except when the measurements are impractical in the judgment of the COE timber personnel.

2. Timber will have to be cruised by LMB personnel for volume estimations after receipt of the final design and related viewshed (leave tree map), in order to make it available for sale.

3. The Conservation Branch (CB) personnel will conduct a Red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW) survey and foraging habitat analysis prior to any timber harvesting in areas that may impact RCW clusters or their habitat. CB will provide that information to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and coordinate with them as needed. All requirements and provisions of the consultation between Fort Benning and the USFWS as documented in the biological assessment (BA) and biological opinion (BO) must be followed.

4. The CB will also conduct an appropriate resurvey prior to timber removal for other Federal and state protected species that may be impacted by the range to include timber removal and/or slash removal. Timber harvesting within RCW clusters D14-04 and D13-02 will occur outside of the breeding season (April through July) and will be coordinated with the CB. The CB will coordinate the capture, testing for upper respiratory tract disease and relocation of any gopher tortoises found in timber removal/construction areas. A written report of all gopher tortoise capture, relocation and impact mitigation measures will be prepared by the contractor doing the work and submitted to the Chief of EMD or designee. The CB has conducted a survey for relict trillium in March of 2004; none were found. Any other Federal or state listed species locations will be documented and plans to mitigate impacts of timber and/or slash removal and future range construction will be coordinated by the CB.

5. Soil disturbance must be minimized in wetlands (except in construction areas) and eligible and potentially eligible historic property areas. Cut-to-length (CTL) will be the only authorized process used for timber harvest from eligible or potentially eligible historic property sites, wetlands, SMZs, and Federally listed species habitat.

6. The COE representative will monitor the timber harvest and prepare a written report each week to document compliance with all applicable mitigation requirements and/or restrictions, including compliance with Forestry BMPs, any deviations from the same, and any corrective action that was taken. The report will be provided to the Chief of EMD or designee. Any deviations from the requirements and/or other violations will be immediately reported to the contracting officer or their representative and EMD Chief.

II. Removal of logging slash and vegetation

1. The DMPRC construction contractor will address the remaining non-marketable timber and other vegetation in clearcut areas indicated by the design. The contractor will submit a written plan for the disposal of the logging slash and vegetation. All remaining slash and vegetation in the LOS will be lopped to within two feet of the ground, a herbicide will be applied for woody vegetation, the area will be over seeded with annuals, and erosion control netting will be used in eroded areas. Before any herbicide storage or application on Post, the construction contractor must coordinate and get approval from the Installation Pest Management Coordinator of the EMD. To provide the most flexibility to the construction contractor, several options are listed for use to dispose of the resultant slash and remaining vegetation greater than two feet above ground level. The contractor will indicate in the written plan which method(s) will be used in which general areas of the DMPRC. The slash/vegetation removal plan will be submitted to the contracting officer and EMD at least 30 days prior to any construction or slash removal.

2. The slash/vegetation removal areas will be clearly marked with red paint by the LMB or agent.

3. Grubbing or removal of stumps in the construction/grading areas must be done with care to minimize impacts to the environment. There are no direct restrictions for grubbing or stump removal except for eligible or potentially eligible historical properties and wetlands and SMZs, which are protected and to minimize soil disturbance around highly erodible areas. No vehicular traffic or soil disturbance can occur in eligible or potentially eligible historic properties and wetlands and SMZs.

a. Slash used for on-site barriers: Slash would be piled to construct brush barriers for the range. The brush barriers will be highly susceptible to fire and will most likely burn by a wildfire. Therefore slash should only be used in accordance with the soil erosion control plan and only in areas where permanent barriers are not required. Tree tops and slash from felled trees may be used to stabilize streambanks and prevent soil erosion.

b. Chipping of debris and moving off range for use as fuel. This would require cooperation with local paper mills to determine whether or not they are taking chips as fuelwood. If mills are accepting fuelwood, the slash can be chipped and hauled to the mill. The chips would be removed immediately from the DMPRC site and not stored on the site. The estimated time for chipping the slash would be 2 - 3 months depending upon the area to be cleared. The contractor will be responsible to coordinate will local mills about taking the chips.

c. Chipping debris into mulch: The chips from the slash can also be used as mulch for landscaping. Chips can be scattered on the DMPRC site, excluding construction areas. If chips are dispersed on-site they cannot exceed a depth of three inches. Again, this would be the construction contractor's responsibility to coordinate dispersal or disposal of the chips by acceptable means.

d. Haul to a non-Fort Benning site or landfill. The contractor would be responsible for proper disposal on non-Fort Benning land, attaining proper permits, and paying fees.

e. Grind Debris in Place: The construction contractor would probably engage subcontractor(s) that provide this service. Generally this process results in grinding of approximately 1 to 2 acres per day per machine. The machine is a modified dozer with a drum chipping head attached. It will grind all debris and stumps in place leaving mulch scattered across the ground. Stumps would be ground to the surface of the ground (not removed). This option may not be feasible as the only method in construction areas due to the stumps remaining at or below ground level. This process will most likely not create large amounts of mulch. Mulching of debris generally causes no problems to wetlands or streams if properly spread away from those areas. This is a very lengthy process dependent upon the amount of chipping machines that can be used on the site. There are a limited number of contractors that provide this service.

f. Pile debris in trenches and burn: This would require digging trenches and placing all of the slash into the trenches and setting it on fire. This will be a very high temperature burn using a blowtorch or other acceptable equipment. Most of the slash would be incinerated and the remaining slash and residue would be buried once the trenches were filled in. This process would require monitoring by the EMD Air Program Manager, and would need to meet any construction air permit, Title V permit, or other applicable Federal, state, and local air permits or requirements. The contractor would be responsible for record keeping that would involve but not be limited to weather conditions, amount of slash burned, locations of trenches, etc. Additional detail on this method is in the DMPRC Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, Air Quality Section.

Prepared by: James Parker

Forester, Land Management Branch Environmental Management Division Directorate of Public Works and Bob Larimore

Chief, Land Management Branch Environmental Management Division Directorate of Public Works

Revised by: Linda Veenstra, J.D.

Environmental Law Specialist & DMPRC Environmental Project Manager Administrative and Civil Law Division Office of the Staff Judge Advocate

APPENDIX J

DRAFT DMPRC MITIGATION AND MONITORING PLAN

DMPRC Mitigation and Monitoring Plan

1. Introduction a. Definitions of Mitigation

The President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) describes mitigation as:

<u>Avoidance</u>: Avoid the impact by changing the plan. Do not take certain actions that would cause the environmental effect.

<u>Minimization</u>: Minimize impacts by changing the intensity, timing, or duration of the action and its implementation.

<u>Rectifying:</u> Fix, repair, or restore damage that may be caused by implementing the proposed action.

<u>Reducing:</u> Reduce or eliminate the impact over time.

<u>Compensation</u>: Compensate for the impact by replacing the damage by improving the environment elsewhere or by providing other substitute resources such as funds to pay for the environmental impact.

b. Mitigation Planning Process

Fort Benning proposes to use a variety of measures that will mitigate potential environmental impacts resulting from construction, operation, and maintenance of the DMPRC. Implementation of proposed mitigation measures is dependent upon regulatory requirements, public and agency comments on the EIS, and funding availability.

As discussed in Section 2.3 of the EIS, mitigation by avoidance has already occurred during the initial DMPRC site-screening phase. An interdisciplinary team of environmental, engineering, regulatory, military operations, and planning professionals used GIS data and existing information to validate and to eliminate potential DMPRC sites. The process helped mitigate potential environmental impacts through avoiding further consideration of sites with potentially more significant environmental impacts, focusing design on sites that would support the mission and cost requirements while reducing environmental impacts. There are reasonable mitigation measures that were considered but rejected; these are discussed in Chapter 4 of the EIS. Additional mitigation by avoidance was accomplished during the design process for the preferred alternative, Alternative III.

Many mitigation measures are mandatory in order for Alternative III (the preferred alternative) to proceed, and all mitigation measures presented in this document are mandatory unless otherwise indicated as optional. Timing of mitigation measures can be significant and has been described as necessary to ensure proper execution of the

mitigation plan. Some avoidance and minimization of impacts will occur prior to the initiation of any phase of construction. This will include measures to protect several types of resources before work on the construction phase commences. Pending environmental planning processes will result in identification of mitigation that will be incorporated into this plan as new information becomes available. An example of this would be the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service requiring reasonable and prudent measures, terms and conditions as part of their Biological Opinion. Also, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) may require conditions to any Section 404 Clean Water Act wetlands permit.

The mitigation proposed in the EIS is subject to further public review, in addition to coordination and consultation with stakeholders. After the Army considers public and stakeholder comments received on the final EIS, then a decision will be made on which DMPRC alternative to select and what mitigation actions to implement. While this document contains tentative plans for funding the mitigation and monitoring, that funding is dependent upon public and stakeholder review of the final EIS and decision-making in the Record of Decision. For proposed mitigation measures identified in this EIS, Fort Benning generally is requesting funds from the United States Army Installation Management Agency, Southeastern Regional Office (SERO) and the Army military construction program. The final DMPRC Mitigation and Monitoring Plan will be included in the FEIS and/or the ROD, which will be available to the public. Additionally, the DMPRC Mitigation & Monitoring Plan will serve as a working document for compliance monitoring and may be modified to reflect adaptations during the implementation process.

If Alternative III (preferred) is selected, then mitigation would be implemented during the planning, construction, operation, and maintenance phases of the proposed DMPRC as described in the following sections. This plan will focus on all of the Alternative III mitigation; however, because Alternative II mitigation is similar, the mitigation discussed in this plan may be applicable to Alternative II. If Alternative II is selected, then a detailed plan for that alternative will be developed. The FEIS concluded that no additional mitigation is required beyond current actions for socioeconomics, environmental justice, migratory birds, and human health and safety; therefore, those topics are not addressed in this DMPRC Mitigation and Monitoring Plan.

2. Mitigation Phases

a. DMPRC Planning Phase:

During design, considerable effort was made to avoid siting the range targets and the equipment in areas with environmental concerns, such as wetlands, red-cockaded woodpecker clusters, and cultural resource sites. Therefore, placement of each range component (including road and utility access and support facilities) is a critical aspect of the preferred alternative. The design modifications also reduced the standard number of water crossings by using four tank trails, rather than six, for a portion of the range. One lane was also shortened to avoid additional crossings of Pine Knot Creek. Tree clearing under this alternative would consist of approximately 1,500 acres, with approximately 300 acres of trees remaining within the DMPRC. Further details and other avoidance mitigation impacts are discussed below and by media in Section 4 of this Mitigation and Monitoring Plan.

In addition to range siting and range equipment placement, numerous soil erosion control measures were inserted to address concerns about soil erosion and potential effects on wetlands, water quality, protected species habitat, Unique Ecological Areas, and other media that is further addressed in the FEIS. Also there was consideration of utilizing materials that would minimize any risk of contamination and/or require hazardous waste disposal; however operational, safety and economic factors prohibited implementation of all of the recommendations. For instance, recommendations to recycle the inoperable Tank tracks (that can no longer be used to propel the Tanks) by using them for low water crossings or tank turn around pad areas was not acceptable to the engineer reviewers. Another proposal was utilizing concrete segments rather than pressure treated wood for portions of the targetry support equipment and defilade positions, because maintenance activities may result in replacement of these materials and the concrete may be recycled but the pressure treated wood may have to be disposed as hazardous waste; however this was not economically acceptable to the range designers.

b. Construction Phase Mitigation:

Some of the potential impacts that would have occurred during the construction phase were mitigated through the planning and design process. After the interdisciplinary DMPRC team received community input during public scoping meetings held in 2003, the DMPRC design was initiated. This construction phase includes the timber harvest and slash removal that precedes the other construction activities. Fort Benning will utilize its normal process to harvest the marketable timber where required on the range footprint via the Corps of Engineers (COEs), then the construction contractor will remove the remaining vegetation and slash. More details on the mitigation for the timber harvest and other vegetation removal are provided below.

The DMPRC March 2004 design includes detailed construction contract specifications that indicate materials, procedures and requirements that the construction contractor will follow during the construction of the DMPRC. Many requirements that mitigate potential environmental impacts have been incorporated into the design drawings and construction specifications.

The March 2004 construction specifications (Polyengineering, 2004) require the construction contractor to:

- Designate an Environmental Engineer with at least three years experience to provide construction contractor quality control
- Comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local environmental protection laws and regulations
- Comply with all DOD, Army and Fort Benning regulations that are specified, which includes numerous environmental requirements
- Submit a pre-construction Environmental Protection Plan (EPP) to the Contracting Officer and Environmental Management Division for review and approval. The EPP would include:

- Soil and sediment control plan including monitoring and reporting requirements
- Recycling and waste minimization/disposal plan
- Air pollution control plan
- Contaminant prevention plan
- Waste water management plan
- o Cultural and natural resources plan
- o Pesticide treatment plan
- Employee Environmental Training
- Spill Prevention Control & Countermeasure Plan (SPCC)
- Spill Contingency Plan (SCP)

The March 2004 design identifies proposed locations for a primary and secondary contractor staging area. These areas can only be identified generally at this time, and they are proposed in areas that are already cleared of most vegetation; however potential impacts to some environmental media should be avoided, such as eligible or potentially eligible cultural resources and protected species. Therefore, the construction contractor will be required to submit to EMD a more detailed plan for the staging area(s) prior to authorization for use. Then EMD will identify any location restrictions or other mitigation of potential environmental effects, and establish any additional monitoring of that mitigation.

After the construction contract, Simulation, Training, & Instrumentation Command (STRICOM) will coordinate the installation of targetry and the associated power and communication systems, probably via another contract. This is also part of the construction phase to make the DMPRC ready for operation. The target and support system installation will also follow the appropriate mitigation identified herein and will be monitored as specified.

Any additional requirements identified through continuing coordination and consultation with stakeholders will be incorporated into the construction phase through compliance with regulations and construction specifications. The Clean Water Act will require mitigation for wetland impacts. NPDES will require preparation of an Erosion Sedimentation Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP), which will include incorporation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) into the construction process. A Soil Erosion Control (SEC) Plan will detail BMPs to be implemented and the timing of implementation. The Endangered Species Act requires preparation of a Biological Opinion by the US Fish and Wildlife Service which will include mitigation requirements for impacts or potential impacts to endangered species. This DMPRC Mitigation & Monitoring Plan uses the best information available to identify the mitigation and monitoring planned to date, and revisions to this DMPRC Mitigation and Monitoring Plan to reflect the changes in the mitigation or monitoring proposed herein, will be made as necessary.

Fort Benning will designate an Environmental Monitor to act as a liaison between the timber harvest personnel, construction contractor, STRICOM personnel, contracting officers, the Directorate of operations and Training Range Division, and Environmental Management Division (EMD) personnel to ensure compliance with this Mitigation and Monitoring Plan. This position will require thorough knowledge of Fort Benning environmental policies and familiarity with appropriate contacts for specific resource issues. Any modification to this plan in accordance with field conditions will be coordinated by the Environmental Monitor with the appropriate EMD Program Manager and Range Division. The duties of the Environmental Monitor are further addressed with each media issue. If an Environmental Monitor position cannot be filled or is vacant, the Chief, EMD or designee will take over the duties of the Environmental Monitor that are specified in this DMPRC Mitigation and Monitoring Plan.

The public and stakeholder comments received during draft EIS and final EIS public review periods will facilitate selection of the DMPRC alternative that will help sustain military training missions and the environment. Comments received will help Army planners consider any changes to timber harvest, construction specifications and construction contractor's Environmental Protection Plan. Additional mitigation measures for the construction phase are discussed in more detail in the following sections for each media.

c. Operation and Maintenance Phase Mitigation:

The operation and maintenance phase would begin after construction is complete and as soldiers begin training on the new facility. EMD and Range Division would continue to work closely to ensure all mitigation requirements are implemented and maintained as planned. Additional mitigation measures and the monitoring requirements for the operation and maintenance phase are discussed in more detail in the following sections for each media.

3. Mitigation Monitoring Strategy

An important key to success in mitigation of potential project impacts is the continuous monitoring of mitigation implementation and effectiveness, and informing the public and decision makers of monitoring results. An adaptable policy will incorporate flexibility into the environmental management of the project. This Mitigation and Monitoring Plan includes a description of how Fort Benning proposes to monitor mitigation and adjust plans and operations as needed to help ensure actual environmental impacts are not significantly different than predicted in this EIS. Fort Benning will respond to individual inquiries about monitoring programs, and it will place updates on the Fort Benning DMPRC website. EMD and Range Division will conduct an annual review of the status of mitigation to determine if monitoring updates are needed in the future.

Fort Benning plans to monitor implementation and effectiveness of any mitigation selected to implement the proposed DMPRC. Each media has its own method listed in this plan for monitoring, however because several mitigation and monitoring actions overlap, the appropriate sections this plan of will be referenced. Another purpose of this plan is enforcement monitoring, which will help the proponent and lead agency (Army and Fort Benning) who is ultimately responsible for performing any mitigation activities, establish responsibilities and procedures with those who will actually perform the mitigation, such as contractors, educational facilities, etc. For the DMPRC, the enforcement monitoring has been incorporated into each aspect of this Mitigation Monitoring Plan to indicate the responsible entity, the communication and coordination mechanisms within Fort Benning and with those entities, incorporation of mitigation and monitoring requirements into contracts, procedures to enforce those contract provisions, appropriate funding mechanisms for all identified mitigation and monitoring, and other means. The Office of the Staff Judge Advocate, Environmental Law Specialist (ELS), will be informed regarding any potential legal violations relating to mitigation or monitoring, the specifically the and the Contracting Law Specialist may be of assistance, when warranted.

The Installation would use a combination of more staff (e.g. an Environmental Monitor and at least two RCW Biologists), and using existing systems such as the Environmental Performance Assessment System (EPAS) to track mitigation compliance. Although compensatory mitigation implementation and some monitoring will be contracted, the Environmental Monitor will again act as a liaison for Fort Benning environmental and range personnel, notifying them of any significant deviation from plans and coordinating any digression with EMD, or others as requested by EMD, as well as updating the publicly accessible website indicating DMPRC mitigation and monitoring The Army has directed each Installation to develop and implement an status. Environmental Management System (EMS), such as ISO 14001, to improve environmental performance, compliance, and stewardship. Fort Benning's EMS is currently under development and mitigation and monitoring specified in this Plan may be worked into that EMS as appropriate. For information on EMS and ISO 14001 EMS, see the Appendix the following website: or https://www.denix.osd.mil/denix/Public/Library/EMS/ems.html.

4. Proposed Mitigation and Monitoring Measures

This section identifies proposed mitigation measures, by media, for the DMPRC. It is applicable for both the construction and operation and maintenance phases of the proposed action.

a. Soils and Vegetation

Impacts to soils and vegetation are anticipated from construction of the DMPRC. Construction of the DMPRC and its associated support facilities will disturb an area greater than one acre, and the state will require the construction contractor to prepare and to obtain a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, which will mandate the preparation of a Erosion Sediment Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP).

Mitigation

Avoidance of impacts to soils and vegetation has occurred during the reduction of the size of the proposed construction area. The optimal standard DMPRC design consists of the construction of a 2500-by-8000 meter (approximately 4,942 acres) range and target firing area; however, this optimal standard design was reduced in size to account for site limitations, environmental concerns, and other factors at the site, resulting in the Alternative III range and target firing area of about 1800 acres. During evaluation of the Alternative III design, efforts were made to avoid potential environmental impacts due to

tree/vegetation removal; however, vegetation removal cannot be avoided on the portions of the range complex needed for construction of support facilities, roads, trails, targets, and berms. Tree clearing for construction purposes, such as target emplacement and trail/access road development, will require stump removal and grubbing. For Line of Sight (LOS), removed trees would be cut to four-to-eight inch stump height, with no grubbing, disking, or stump/root removal occurring (See FEIS Appendix I, Timber Harvest Plan).

The specifications of the NPDES permit will be discussed in more detail under water quality, but it is relevant to minimization mitigation for soils in that it includes submission of a Soil Erosion Control Plan (SEC Plan) to the Georgia EPD, with a copy furnished to Chief of EMD or designee. The March 2004 SEC Plan includes a project description, soil information, changes to existing contours, existing drainage patterns, general location of structural best management practices (BMPs), BMP specifications, quantity, and cost estimates, BMP inspection and maintenance requirements, detailed construction drawings, and a construction schedule (Polyengineering, 2004). The BMPs include erosion control matting, channel stabilization, silt fencing, brush barriers, storm drain outlet protection, stone check dams, rock filter dams, temporary and permanent seeding and the application of mulch. Erosion control matting would be used on slopes greater than 2.5:1. Silt fencing, stone check dams, and rock filter dams will be used to trap sediment on the site. A majority of the disturbed areas will be seeded with temporary and permanent grasses to stabilize the area. Disturbed areas will be planted with native and non-native seed. Alamo Switchgrass is included in the warm season grasses to be planted. Some wetland areas may already contain a cache of viable seed and may not need to be planted. Brush barriers will be constructed on the perimeter of the wetlands to trap sediment. Stone check dams will be constructed at turnouts to reduce sedimentation from tank trails. The construction contractor will submit a NPDES permit as required and will make any modifications to the ESPCP at that time to meet all requirements at the Alternative III site.

Other BMPs to be used during the construction phase to mitigate soil and sedimentation issues would include: buffer zones, dust control on disturbed areas, streambank stabilization, construction exit, construction road stabilization, stream diversion channel, temporary stream crossing, and storm drain outlet protection. Construction exits would be built in areas where traffic will be leaving the construction site to a major roadway (to include paved roads such as Buena Vista Road) to reduce or eliminate the transport of mud from the construction area. Gravel roads that provide access to the DMPRC facility may not require a construction exit.

Selective cutting in the wetland and stream buffer areas within the LOS is required. The areas to be cleared or selectively cut using low-impact methods will the clearly marked. Georgia Forestry Best Management Practices (BMPs) for water quality, streamside management zones (SMZ's), and timber harvesting will be implemented. Forestry BMP's for water quality would include SMZ's to prevent movement of soil or other potential pollutants and maintain streambank integrity. Forestry BMP's for timber harvesting will include strategic placement for log decks and skid trails to minimize rutting and soil movement. Further, some vegetation will benefit from mitigation requirements for other media; notably, some vegetation outside the boundaries of the range firing and target area which comprises RCW habitat will be protected by the construction of the protective berms discussed under endangered species mitigation. Further range modeling of the LOS and the associated tree cutting area may result in keeping all rounds within the range and target area and the impact area, so that a berm for protection of RCW habitat would not be required.

Optional mitigation proposed in the FEIS includes selective tree removal in LOS areas. The DMPRC Timber Harvest Plan details the procedures that will be used to comply with the mitigation measures set forth in this document. Trees and shrubs that fall below the line-of-sight would not be disturbed. Some "topping" of trees may occur, but roughly 300 acres of trees and vegetation would remain in the LOS area. Other optional mitigation measures that are under consideration for construction include leaving more trees in the support area. Site disturbance, including earthwork and vegetation clearing, would be to 40 feet beyond the perimeter of support buildings; five feet beyond roadways, walkways, and main utility branch trenches; and 25 feet beyond parking areas that require a staging area (FEIS Appendix L).

Monitoring

An ACOE representative will monitor the timber harvest contractor and prepare a written report each week to document compliance with all applicable mitigation requirements and/or restrictions, any deviations from the same and any corrective action that was taken or is proposed. The report will be provided to the Environmental Monitor and the Chief of EMD or designee. Any deviations from the requirements and/or regulatory violations will be immediately reported to the Contracting Officer or their representative and EMD Chief.

The contracting officer for the construction contract should monitor mitigation measures described in the ESPCP to further ensure the success of mitigation. The ESPCP includes detailed vegetation establishment specifications, which ensure the timely installation and establishment of vegetation (PolyEngineering, 2004). Vegetation is significant because it controls soil erosion rather than captures eroded sediment. It is also the most effective BMP with success percentages in the ninety percent range as opposed to half that for some non-structural BMPs such as silt fence (Fifield 2001). It will be the responsibility of the Environmental Monitor to monitor compliance with relevant contract specifications and applicable requirements, and report any deviations to the Chief of EMD or designee.

The construction contractor must adhere to the ESPCP and NPDES permit. The content and frequency of the reports the construction contractor must prepare are detailed in the March 2004 plans (design) and construction specifications. The construction contractor is currently required to inspect disturbed areas of the construction site, areas used for storage of materials that are exposed to precipitation that have not been fully stabilized, stabilization practices, structural practices, other controls, and the area where vehicles exit the site at least once every seven days and within 24 hours of the end of any rainfall event that produces .5 inches or more precipitation at the site. The report shall be submitted to the Contracting Officer within 24 hours of inspection and then forwarded to EMD. These requirements are stated in the project specifications but need to be updated to reflect recent changes in Georgia law. A new GA NPDES permit which changes the inspection requirements of the construction contractor became effective August 13, 2003. The new Monitoring requirements are:

- <u>Daily</u> Inspect all areas where petroleum products are stored, used, or handled for spills and leaks. Inspect all locations where vehicles exit or enter the site for evidence of off-site tracking. Measure rainfall once each twenty-four hour period at the site.
- Once every 7 calendar days and within 24 hours of a storm that is 0.5 inches or greater Inspect disturbed areas and storage areas that are exposed to precipitation that have not undergone final stabilization. Inspect structural control measures.
- <u>Once per month during term of permit</u> Inspect areas that have undergone final stabilization for evidence of or potential for, pollutants entering the drainage system and receiving waters.

Based on the results of each inspection, the site description and pollution prevention and control measures identified in the ESPCP shall be revised by the construction contractor no later than 7 calendar days following each inspection. The contractor has an additional obligation to sample all receiving waters or outfalls at two times during the construction process.

1. After the first rain event that reaches 0.5 inch and allows monitoring during normal business hours when construction activity is being conducted that occurs after all clearing and grubbing operations have been completed in the drainage area.

2. The first rain event that reaches or exceeds 0.5 inch and allows for sampling during normal business hours that occurs either 90 days after the first sampling event or after all mass grading operations have been completed. Additional monitoring and sampling may be required if corrective action is mandated by the sampling results.

The new ESPCP should detail the procedures to be followed for monitoring and sampling efforts which can be derived from General Permit No. GAR100001.

Additionally, Fort Benning's Environmental Monitor will prepare weekly detailed mitigation and monitoring reports during the construction phase, and the beginning phases of operation, as appropriate. These reports will address compliance and maintenance of soil erosion and timber BMPs, and will be forwarded to the Chief, EMD or designee, and the Chief of Range Division. Specific practices that will be considered include:

- The condition of all markings (flags, stakes, paint, etc.) that delineate sensitive areas (for example: wetlands, eligible historic properties, etc.)
- The condition of BMPs (e.g., Are all BMPs installed according to requirements outlined in the SEC, Are sediment loads below allowable quantities)

Discrepancies in actual versus planned impacts to soils and vegetation will be addressed by the Chief, EMD or designee through the contracting officer. During the construction phase, there should be no adverse impacts to vegetation outside of the footprint and support areas for the DMPRC.

After the construction phase, Range Division personnel would monitor the DMPRC monthly to determine any needs for erosion control and/or revegetation to maintain realistic training areas and sustain the range. Monitoring reports will be submitted to the Chief, Range Division and the Chief, EMD, and appropriate action will be taken. Range Division would ensure any problem areas are revegetated as soon as possible, and the area is monitored closely until it is stabilized. EMD staff will also make

note of any needs for erosion control and/or vegetation anytime they are in the DMPRC area, and will document and forward the results of any such monitoring to the Chief, EMD.

b. Water Quality

Adherence to applicable Federal and state laws and regulations and Army regulations, as required, would minimize impacts. All tree clearing and construction activities greater than one acre in size and/or as part of a common development area, such as this proposed action, require a NPDES Permit for Storm Water Discharges under the ESCA. The general permit establishes requirements such as:

- Notice of Intent (NOI) and Notice of Termination
- Payment of Fees
- Development and implementation of a ESPCP
- Site inspections for facilities with discharges authorized by the permit
- Amendments to plans as necessary to keep them current
- Retention of records for at least three years from the date of final stabilization.

Unless notified to the contrary, the permit authorizes discharge of storm water from construction sites under the terms and conditions of the permit fourteen days after the date the NOI is postmarked. The ESPCP must be prepared by a design professional licensed by the state of Georgia or a Certified Professional in Erosion and Sediment Control with a current certification by Certified Professional in Erosion and Sediment Control Inc. The ESPSP must be designed in accordance with the design requirements and specifications contained in the "Manual for Erosion and Sediment Control in Georgia." The design professional who prepared the ESPCP is required to conduct a site visit to certify that the ESPCP provides an appropriate and comprehensive system of BMPs, provides for the sampling of receiving waters or the sampling of the storm water outfalls, and that the designed system is expected to meet the requirements contained in the General NPDES Permit No. GAR 100001.

Mitigation

During the design process, minimization mitigation was incorporated when Fort Benning decided to use low water crossings rather than standard road crossings to minimize impacts to water flow and quality. To construct low-water crossings, the construction contractor may need to divert streams temporarily; the stream diversion channel BMP would be utilized to minimize erosion and other water quality impacts. Elevated stream crossings were considered to further reduce impacts; however, concerns about the safety of tanks crossings (e.g., preventing a tank from falling into a stream) dismissed the use of an elevated crossing.

Additional minimization of impacts is provided in the construction contract specifications which includes stormwater management measures that reduce the average annual total suspended solids load in the development site's post-construction runoff by 80%. This would be accomplished through conveyance of stormwater through BMPs, as discussed under Soils and Vegetation Mitigation, which in turn would lessen the deposition of sediments into adjacent surface waters at the site of disturbance, primarily

Pine Knot Creek, Sally Branch and its tributaries, and Bonham Creek. The designer has supplied pre-construction drawings illustrating what, when, and where sediment control structures are installed, inspected, and maintained. This will ensure that after construction is complete, there are measures in place to mitigate the new circumstances created during construction such as concentrated flows in specific areas.

The preparation and implementation of a SPCC Plan and/or its requirements during construction activities will prevent and/or minimize spill/release from hazardous materials into waterways. The SPCC is just one aspect of the larger ESPCP that will be required for construction to commence. The ESPCP should specifically address the implementation of discharge from control areas for equipment maintenance or repair, waste locations, wash-down locations, and sanitary facility areas. If above ground storage of POL products exceed 1,320 gallons, counting containers 55 gallons or larger; an SPCC Plan at the state level will also be required. In addition, SPCC requirements would be implemented during training exercises to avoid/minimize impacts to desirable habitat. Operation and maintenance requirements on the newly constructed DMPRC at this alternative would also be similar to those described in the EIS (4.1.1), as would the proposed mitigation measures described under Wetlands and Streambanks.

Monitoring

During the construction phase, which includes the timber harvest and gopher tortoise relocation, the construction contract specifications require all water areas affected by construction activities to be monitored. The monitoring and sampling requirements are explained above in Soils and Vegetation Mitigation. The construction contractor would submit required monitoring results to the Contracting Officer and the Environmental Monitor, in addition to the GA required submittals. The Environmental Monitor will review the mitigation and monitoring reports and also take any additional samples or conduct additional monitoring to evaluate adherence to environmental requirements in the construction specifications and this Mitigation and Monitoring Plan. This is to ensure that the erosion and sediment controls are working as envisioned through adherence to regulatory requirements and the implementation of erosion control BMPs, stream habitats and water quality would improve over time relative to conditions during construction.

After construction is complete and operations begin, the Range Division should visually monitor surface water quality at least quarterly to identify any water quality concerns such as spills, oil sheen, sediment build-up or other pollution. -Monitoring reports will be submitted to the Chief, Range Division and the Chief, EMD, and appropriate action will be taken.

Fort Benning is concluding the first phase of ecosystems research under the Defense Department's Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP). This SERDP Ecosystem Management Project (SEMP) had more than 20 researchers from 12 universities and four government laboratories conducting ecological research at over 800 sites on Fort Benning. The SEMP Ecosystem Characterization and Monitoring Initiative (ECMI) is developing a long-term ecological monitoring plan that will be incorporated into the Installation's ecological monitoring plan. Fort Benning and SEMP researchers would evaluate how SEMP monitoring would be useful for pre-

construction and post-construction monitoring, and Fort Benning would seek adjustments to the ECMI monitoring plan to help ensure some monitoring occurs on, and downstream from, the DMPRC site. SEMP researchers would submit any monitoring results related to DMPRC to the Chief of EMD or designee.

c. Wetlands and Streambanks

Impacts to jurisdictional wetlands and streams associated with the proposed DMPRC total approximately 9 acres for wetlands and 1,300 linear feet (lf) (7 acres) for streams. Wetlands and streambank impacts were determined to be limited to those locations, as shown on the September 2003 design drawings, where low water crossings, targets, and maintenance roads are proposed. Wetland impacts include approximately 8 acres of wetlands for tank trails, 1 acre for target orientation, and 0.2 acres of wetlands for low-water crossings. Stream impacts consist of approximately 1,200 lf for low-water crossings, and 100 lf for a tank trail. Compensatory mitigation required for the DMPRC will include approximately 64 wetland credits, and 4,065 stream credits. More detailed information is provided in the Wetland and Stream Impact Analysis Report (Dial-Cordy, 2004a) and the Conceptual Mitigation Plan (Dial-Cordy, 2004c). Changes in the March 2004 design and further restoration site surveys and modeling may result in modifications to these specific figures. Fort Benning will provide the updated calculations with the site-specific Clear Creek Mitigation Plan to the ACOE Regulatory office.

Mitigation

Mitigation for impacts to wetlands and streambanks by avoidance was incorporated into the design process by eliminating potential sites with greater detrimental effects than the alternatives considered in this EIS. Impacts were minimized by moving tank trails, targets, and roads out of wetlands where practicable, utilizing low-water crossings rather than placement of unconsolidated fill, and use of selective vegetation removal in wetlands/ streams, where feasible; and other measures. The design modifications also reduced the standard number of water crossings by using four tank trails, rather than six, for a portion of the range; therefore, tanks and Bradley Fighting Vehicles (BFVs) will use four low-water crossings (approximately 100-350 feet long by 29 feet wide) along Bonham Creek and four low-water crossings (same dimensions) across Sally Branch, for a total of eight crossings. One lane was also shortened to avoid additional crossings of Pine Knot Creek. Since preparation of the 15 percent design (July 2002) to the September 2003 design impacts have been reduced by over 50 percent. Unavoidable wetland and stream impacts account for only 16 acres on the 1,800-acre project area (Dial-Cordy, 2004a).

Wetland mitigation and stream bank mitigation measures would be implemented as a part of the mitigation for the proposed DMPRC and would be in accordance with the Section 404 permit for the project. Prior to the initiation of clearing activities, streambank buffer zones and wetlands would be marked by EMD or their wetlands consultant. To reduce potential sources of sedimentation, logging decks and defined skid trails would be located outside the stream buffer zones. Brush barriers would be utilized along the edge of the wetlands which will be marked with stakes. Stream buffer zones will be at least 25 feet on each side of the stream. In many areas the buffer zone will be greater than 25 feet, due to variations in the width of the floodplain. The buffer zones will be marked with red paint and/or stakes. The construction contractor will also utilize additional erosion control measures as needed. Impacted areas within the stream buffer zone would be cleared for construction of low water crossings; however, the following BMPs should be used: stream diversion channels, silt fence, vegetation establishment, and others as needed to minimize sedimentation in the streams.

For Line of Sight (LOS), only selective tree removal would occur in wetland areas and stream buffers, consisting of the trees directly impeding LOS. In addition, these removed trees would be cut to four-to-eight inch stump height, with no grubbing, disking, or stump/root removal occurring. Trees not directly affecting LOS and stumps in wetlands and stream buffers would not be removed where feasible, allowing as much vegetative cover as possible to remain.

The Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan and erosion control BMPs would also be implemented to avoid impacts to desirable habitat during construction (see Water Quality and Soils and Vegetation above for more details). In addition, SPCC requirements would be implemented during training exercises to avoid/minimize impacts to desirable habitat. Operation and maintenance requirements on the newly constructed DMPRC at this alternative would also be similar to those described in the EIS (4.1.3), as would the proposed mitigation measures. Military units are required to utilize secondary containment for the storage of hazardous materials/wastes and during refueling operations. Also, routine maintenance of the vehicles helps to identify and repair any conditions that might cause leaks. A spill response protocol has been established Post-wide and personnel on the range should have adequate spill response supplies on hand. Continued adherence to Federal and state laws and regulations and established Installation policies and guidelines, such as erosion control best management practices (BMPs) and spill control measures, should repair or minimize any adverse impacts to wetlands as a result of this alternative.

Restoration of wetlands and streambanks at another location on Post is proposed to further mitigate construction impacts (see FEIS 4.3.3). Mitigation site development normally involves restoring the wetland hydrology by excavating sediment from a degraded wetland area and planting native trees and shrubs. Fort Benning prefers to use on-post restoration sites. After thorough analysis of potential mitigation sites, several sites were selected for final mitigation consideration. A final Mitigation Siting Analysis was prepared which described six sites that satisfied selection criteria and developed preliminary conceptual mitigation plans for each site. Recommendation of a single, preferred restoration site was based on which site could provide the mitigation credits necessary to satisfy the estimated credit requirements, which did not interfere with Fort Benning's training, and which site could meet mitigation goals in the most cost effective manner possible. Based on those criteria, Clear Creek was selected as the proposed mitigation site, but this selection is contingent upon regulatory approval by the COE Regulatory (Dial Cordy, 2004b).

In order to offset the wetland and stream impacts of the preferred site, approximately 49 acres of the Clear Creek stream channel and forested wetlands located on Ft. Benning will be restored. Mitigation will be completed concurrent with construction of the DMPRC. Clear Creek is the only single site assessed that would satisfy the projected wetland credits (63) and stream credits (4,065) required. Any

balance of credits remaining will be reserved as advanced mitigation for future projects if surplus credits are approved.

The Conceptual Mitigation Plan gives a more detailed description of a potential restoration plan for portions of Clear Creek (Dial Cordy, 2004c). It is important to note that this Conceptual Mitigation Plan is part of the wetlands permit application for the DMPRC, which is not yet final and not yet approved by the proper regulatory authority. Fort Benning is in the process of having additional surveying and modeling done to prepare the site-specific Clear Creek Mitigation Plan, which will have all required details for establishing and monitoring the restoration site, for approval of the COE Regulatory. That approval probably will not occur until after the DMPRC Environmental Impact Statement and associated Record of Decision is final. A brief synopsis of the Conceptual Mitigation Plan is included here for exemplary purposes only. Restoration of the Clear Creek site will include the restoration of approximately 49 acres of bottomland hardwood wetlands and 6,550 lf of stream. Specific tasks required to be implemented include stabilizing a portion of the erodable soils upslope from the wetlands (2.0 acres), draining of the impoundment through modification or replacement of the box culvert on Pine Tree Road (37- acres), removal of all beaver dams and debris during initial construction and the monitoring period, excavating the soils that have deposited into the lake and downstream wetlands (11.0 acres), and stabilizing all stream bank slopes with geotextiles, check dams and/or planted vegetation (6,550 lf).

The Conceptual Mitigation Plan provides a description of the existing conditions on the Clear Creek site, proposed restoration treatments and measures, a proposed monitoring and maintenance plan, and success criteria for release of the credits generated from the restoration. The monitoring of the restoration site is proposed for 5 years after establishment or when the COE Regulatory agrees that restoration has been achieved to compensate for the DMPRC. Since the site is located on a federal military installation, preparation of restrictive covenants or conservation easements is not proposed. Land use restrictions will be placed on the Clear Creek restoration area so that no incompatible land use that would negatively impact the restoration is authorized. The land-use designation will be changed to reflect its restricted use via real property and management. Restrictions will include the use of "Sensitive Area" signs to identify the site boundary Detailed technical data, and to prohibit vehicular access and digging. hydrologic/hydraulic modeling results, and restoration design and specifications, will be provided as part of the site-specific Clear Creek Mitigation Plan to the COE Regulatory in early June for review and concurrence prior to issuance of the Section 404 Individual permit (Dial Cordy, 2004c).

Monitoring

The Contracting Officers for the timber harvest, range construction and target and equipment installation, and establishment of the Clear Creek restorations area, have responsibilities to ensure the contractors conducting that work comply with the wetland mitigation described in the wetlands permit and supporting documents, as well as this Mitigation and Monitoring Plan. The Environmental Monitor and the EMD staff will assist the Contracting Officers by making independent quality control monitoring efforts. Prior to timber harvest or any ground disturbing activity, EMD and ACOE will ensure that all wetlands and stream buffers to remain relatively undisturbed are marked with paint, flags or preferably stakes to indicate the sensitivity of these areas and signal the necessity of low impact clearing methods in these areas. The Environmental Monitor will check these areas at least weekly and ensure that low impact methods are being utilized in designated areas. Tree and vegetation removal may be conducted in phases, so the Contracting Officer should inform the Environmental Monitor when timber removal in wetlands and stream buffers is anticipated. Throughout this process, the Environmental Monitor will coordinate all actions with the EMD Land Management Branch, the appropriate Contracting Officer(s), Range Division, and other pertinent Ft Benning staff.

After timber harvest, wetland and streambank areas may have to be remarked because the timber operations will likely destroy flags, stakes, and other marking devices. This refreshed demarcation is necessary to ensure no incidental disturbance by construction machinery. During construction, no machinery or other vehicles should enter wetland areas except the designated construction impact areas. The construction contractor must install designated pre-construction erosion controls prior to entry into impacted wetlands and other construction actions. See the Soils and Vegetation category above for more details regarding soil erosion control.

The Clear Creek restoration effort will probably be done with contract assistance to establish and conduct initial monitoring, then EMD or other Fort Benning staff will take over long-term monitoring and maintenance. Several factors of the Clear Creek Mitigation site will be monitored for at least five years after the project is completed to ensure COE Regulatory success criteria are met. Until the final details of the mitigation are known, this monitoring scheme may vary in accordance with restoration parameters. Vegetative monitoring will be conducted once during the fall of 2004, and annually during late summer, for five years following completion of construction (Dial Cordy, 2004c). Hydrological monitoring will be conducted by automated monitoring wells and the data collected downloaded bimonthly. Stream channel monitoring would occur via annual collection of geomorphology field data. Maintenance within the restoration area will include periodic cleaning of culverts, clearing of snags and beaver dams, and potentially beaver trapping.

d. Unique Ecological Areas (UEA)

The northwestern corner of the proposed range may impact the Pine Knot Creek Blackwaters Unique Ecological Area. Unique hydrologic characteristics of a Coastal Plain blackwater stream include relatively constant flow and temperature, high acidity, low sediment load, and low fish diversity. Vegetation is typical of a hardwood bottom in the sandhills. Species of conservation concern that are present include the southern brook lamprey (*Ichthyomyzon gagei*), broadstripe shiner (*Pteronotropis euryzonus*) and bog sneezeweed (*Helenium brevifolium*).

Potential impacts to the UEA are detailed in the FEIS and are summarized here for the purposes of describing appropriate mitigation. Some of the UEA overstory trees that are in the footprint of the range will have to be cut for LOS and range construction and some species may be injured or killed by logging operations. Erosion from adjacent upland target sites and access trails may increase sedimentation in the UEA, lower the water quality, and adversely impact habitat These potential effects may impact on the hydrology of the area and may degrade habitat, increase water temperature, and change and/or reduce aquatic populations.

Mitigation

During the design process, it was possible to avoid construction of tank trails through the UEA, and only several small target locations of the UEA are proposed for fill, resulting in fewer impacts to UEAs. Mitigation for UEAs would consist of adhering to requirements in the NPDES permit, Section 404 permit, and ESPCP for this project, as indicated above. Trees felled along the stream buffers, which make up a large portion of the UEA, will be removed by low impact methods. If removal is not feasible then trees will be hand felled and left in place with stem parallel to stream channel. Trees removed during the timber harvest and slash removal for LOS would be felled so the stem is parallel with the run of the stream, therefore reducing the obstruction effect. Installation management polices for UEAs would be utilized to the fullest extent possible to reduce the amount of erosion that would occur. All upland areas should be stabilized with erosion control "blankets," vegetation, and/or mulch. Operations and maintenance would be mitigated as discussed under Section 4.c, "Wetlands and Streambanks."

Monitoring

Implementation of the preferred alternative would result overall in potential minor adverse effects to approximately seven percent of the entire areas of the UEA but would not impede function of the UEA as an ecosystem. Monitoring to ensure this situation is essential and would be conducted by the Environmental Monitor during the construction phase (especially timber harvest and slash removal), and other phases of the project as appropriate. The Pine Knot Creek Blackwaters UEA should be demarcated prior to timber harvest to indicate the sensitive nature of the area by the construction contractor in the manner described in his Environmental Protection Plan (required by contract specification 01355A). Before construction, the contracting officer and/or Environmental Monitor or EMD personnel shall inform the construction contractor of the susceptible nature of the area, and any marking mechanisms damaged by timber operations should be repaired to keep construction activities only in designated areas.

Operation and maintenance activities may result in additional potential effects to the UEA due to soil erosion; this would be mitigated as discussed under Section 4.c, "Wetlands and Streambanks." Erosion control at low water crossings will be managed by the Land Rehabilitation and Maintenance component and is monitored by Land Condition Trend analysis component of ITAM. Range Division will provide any LRAM reports regarding any monitoring or erosions problems at the low water crossings to Chief, EMD or designee. If ITAM funding is not available to correct an erosion problem related to the low water crossings, then Fort Benning will need to request other funding. Current strategies to minimize disturbance and siltation are being developed and are planned for implementation. Management activities are expected to be passive in nature, unless significant problems are uncovered (INRMP, 2001).

Optional monitoring of the UEA may occur after the construction phase has ended. This will include periodic visual inspections by Range maintenance and inspection personnel as well as Conservation Branch personnel when they are at the DMPRC and in conjunction with other inspections on and near the DMPRC. Ideally, additional monitoring of environmental parameters of the UEA would be conducted, but there are no plans in place at this time. Any UEA monitoring results required by the INRMP implementation will be forwarded to the Chief, EMD or designee for use in evaluating the DMPRC mitigation strategies as appropriate.

e. Federally Protected Species

Fort Benning presently contains five federally listed threatened or endangered species. They are the red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW), wood stork, relict trillium, bald eagle, and American alligator. The RCW is the only one of these species in proximity to the preferred alternative of the proposed DMPRC; therefore, it is the only federally listed species requiring mitigation. Potential habitat may exist for the relict trillium in the DMPRC area; however surveys conducted during the spring of 2004 when relict trillium is in flower indicated no species present in the DMPRC area. If populations are discovered in an area that will be disturbed by the DMPRC, the plants will be relocated. Relocation sites will be selected either on Fort Benning or within public garden areas that are suitable for the species (BA, 2004). Further consultation with USFWS would be required prior to any relocation of relict trillium to determine a suitable location.

The impact to RCWs resulting from construction of the DMPRC at the preferred site is the subject of a biological assessment (BA) performed by Fort Benning(Fort Benning, 2004). The BA details the background of RCW management on Fort Benning and provides scientific analysis to determine the potential effects to RCWs which are only summarized here for the purpose of providing information on related mitigation . The affected RCW area extends beyond the boundary of the proposed DMPRC due to indirect impacts resulting from construction, range operations, and other factors.

Some background information derived from the BA that will aid in the understanding of the impacts of this project is included within this section for ease of reading. Groups of RCWs nest in an aggregation of cavity trees called a cluster that is surrounded by contiguous foraging habitat. Foraging habitat is coarsely described as having some large old pines, low densities of small and medium pines, sparse or no hardwood midstory, and a bunchgrass and forb groundcover (US Fish and Wildlife Service, RCW Recovery Plan, 2003). Since 1994, 13 known RCW dispersal (movement of individuals from natal to first breeding location "natal dispersal", or between consecutive breeding locations "breeding dispersal") flyways have been documented across the proposed DMPRC footprint. There is also one active cluster (K15-01) downrange in the K15 impact area that is not considered in this mitigation analysis because this cluster has already been accounted for (i.e. incidental take) in the Biological Opinion for the Fort Benning Endangered Species Management Plan (available upon request).

The potential effects of implementation of the proposed DMPRC will be categorized into two classes. Direct effects are those that are likely to occur as evidenced by a large body of scientific substantiation and/or practical explanations. Indirect effects are those that are supposed to occur based on biological assessment but cannot be confirmed with direct evidence because research has indicated that either specific behavioral patterns may vary by group or that effects of certain activities are unknown. Further, these effects are separated by their occurrence in either the construction or operations/maintenance phases of the project.

Direct effects of construction activities include:

- Timber clearing for the range will directly impact four active RCW clusters (D14-04, D13-02, D3-02, and J6-1)
- Four planned recruitment sites will be displaced due to the timber clearing
- Within 0.50 mile of the range clearing, several clusters are significantly vulnerable to adverse impacts due to the effects from habitat fragmentation -
- Loss of 714 acres of RCW habitat
- Potential cluster abandonment due to the scale and magnitude of this action
- Loss of potential cavity trees (trees 60 years and older) within the range footprint
- Sediment loading on RCW cavity tree roots for clusters D14-04 and D3-02 respectively, potentially causing tree mortality

Indirect effects of construction activities include:

- Potential for delayed cluster abandonment due to construction activities
- Seven clusters impacted by proximity to range clearing
- Potential for breeding vacancies to go unoccupied due to a dispersal impediment and therefore limiting the number of potential breeding groups.
- Potential for group fitness to be reduced due to isolation of impacted groups
- Potential for delayed mortality of trees adjacent to construction activities and staging areas (e.g. root compaction, inadvertently scaring tree boles, etc.)
- Potential for delayed sediment loading on RCW cavity tree roots

Because of the more complex nature of effects to RCWs resulting from operations and maintenance activities, brief descriptions of these effects are included for clarification. Direct and indirect effects of maintenance and operations activities include:

- As a result of DMPRC operations and maintenance, there are three active clusters (<u>Clusters D3-02</u>, <u>K22-03</u>, <u>K12-01</u> that may be negatively impacted (assumes no protective actions)
- <u>Live-Fire through Foraging Areas</u> Trees outside of the range footprint should remain in their present structure and density (excludes support areas) to act as a buffer for the surrounding area. Over time, trees surrounding the range footprint will incur some degree of mortality from fired ammunition either directly, or from ricochets as impacts occur not only between the firing points and the targets, but also in the area beyond the targets that ordnance will travel before resting.
- Increased Noise Levels –

- <u>Establishment of New Surface Danger Zones (SDZ)</u> a SDZ is that segment of the range area which has restricted access during range usage to provide a safety buffer. Although this proposed range would require a new SDZ fan, existing fans from surrounding firing points traditionally cover all RCW clusters within the area. However, the proximity of adjacent RCW clusters to the proposed DMPRC will be considerably closer and receive more intense noise events than from those firing points historically in the area. For this project the concern related to the SDZ will mainly be impacts to RCWs and area wide access.
- Loss of potential cavity trees
- <u>Impacts to Other Training Areas -</u> During operation of the DMPRC a segment of Buena Vista Road, all of Resaca Road, and a portion of Underwood Road will be temporarily blocked. These roads and others within the DMPRC SDZ would be available for use when training is not in process on the DMPRC and any time there is need for emergency access (i.e. wildfires) (personal communication, F. Weekley, 2004). Attending to wildfires will be hindered (i.e. potential mortality to RCW cavity trees and potential cavity trees) as well as standard RCW monitoring and management activities (Figure 12).
- Disturbance may limit potential for occupation and reoccupation of otherwise suitable inactive clusters. However, birds have been known to reoccupy disturbed territories.
- Loss of RCW foraging habitat from live fire sheering trees and killing trees adjacent to the range clearing
- Although highly improbable, RCW mortality due to firing may occur. Over the last 10 years Fort Benning has no recorded incidences of RCW mortality of this type.

Fort Benning will identify the requirement for incidental take of RCW clusters and/or trees that fall below minimum standards for habitat in the Biological Assessment. Incidental take is defined as take of a Federally listed species that results from, but is not the purpose of, carrying out an otherwise lawful activity conducted by a Federal agency or applicant [50 CFR §402.02]. Incidental take <u>may</u> occur in at least three active RCW clusters due to habitat loss and fragmentation from timber clearing, range construction, and maintenance, live fire through foraging habitat from range operations (before minimization efforts), live fire through nesting habitat from range operations (before minimization efforts), and wildfires from military training.

Mitigation

During evaluation of the optimal standard design, efforts were made to avoid potential RCW impacts due to tree/vegetation removal; however, vegetation removal cannot be avoided on the portions of the range complex needed for construction of support facilities, roads, trails, targets, and berms. Tree clearing for construction purposes will be kept to a minimum and will be addressed in the Section 404 Wetlands Permit and Timber Harvest Plan as part of the Environmental Impact Statement for the project. Prior to any tree clearing activities at the site, the boundaries of work would be established and marked. Various aspects of the range were modified from the original design to avoid additional RCW impacts. For instance a calibration point was designed to project from the southeastern part of the range complex and jutting northeastern, which would have caused potential impacts to cluster D13-02 because of habitat loss due to the related tank trail and maintenance road construction, plus the fragmentation of a considerable amount of RCW habitat. This calibration point was removed as of the March 2004 design due to environmental and cost concerns. Another example is that the support facility locations were revised to reduce the potential impacts to RCWs and the habitat.

Some basic minimization strategies have been devised by Fort Benning in consultation with the USFWS, and the applicable requirements and policies are detailed and explained in the BA.

Potential minimization strategies listed in the BA include:

- Work closely with project design team and construction contractor to moderate size and location of proposed clearings for infrastructure development (e.g. contractor staging areas)
- Cut timber outside of the RCW breeding season, which is April-July
- Intensively monitor appropriate clusters and respond to early warning signs that could lead to negative impacts
- Optional: Accelerate population growth and/or management strategies to include intrapopulation translocations for unoccupied recruitment sites that are otherwise suitable for RCWs

As compensatory mitigation for the 3 directly affected clusters and the 4 recruitment sites, Fort Benning proposes reclaiming 7 RCW clusters in the A20 ordnance impact area. Further consultation with USFWS is required to concur with this proposal. Access to the previously inaccessible active clusters (i.e., those clusters that are on the borders of the A20 ordnance impact area that are not currently counted as part of Fort Benning's population and towards the Installation's recovery goal for the RCW) would be required. Fort Benning must also conduct UXO clearance of portions of the A20 ordnance impact area. These are RCW clusters previously not under management due to UXO and range activities. Mitigation should also include augmenting the seven clusters in the A20 area with cavity inserts or drilled cavities if signs of cluster abandonment begins, which would be detected via monitoring. Internal (Fort Benning) translocation efforts for the ten clusters in the A20 area may also be conducted if cluster demographics indicate decline or abandonment. These actions may also be needed for the clusters in the vicinity of the range footprint.

Access to the RCW clusters and habitat remaining in the Alternative III area would also be required. This mitigation option requires that Range Division and EMD personnel create agreements to establish specific management opportunities/days and procedures . Protecting lands off the Installation that could sustain RCWs is an option that was considered; however, it was deemed infeasible due to the lack of existing lands proximate to the Installation that would provide the needed quality habitat; also timing and funding limitations entered into the decision.

Because current manpower is not sufficient to accomplish the additional management and monitoring required by the RCW minimization proposal, additional

mandatory mitigation includes staffing at least two (2) new positions for RCW monitoring/management (with at least 7-year terms), to include management of the newly-available clusters in the A20 ordnance impact area and monitoring the clusters within the construction area and, when completed, the area surrounding the newly constructed DMPRC during its routine operations and maintenance. Two or more staff members dedicated to concentrated management and monitoring for the RCW clusters in A20 and the clusters surrounding the Alternative III footprint, as well as contributing to management and to monitoring at the population level, could be instrumental in ensuring that Fort Benning continues to move towards its recovery goal for the RCW. The optional mitigation of obtaining supplemental funding to accelerate and support projects associated with population growth strategies, including funding for longleaf pine underplanting and restoration, forest plan modeling, landscape scale fertilization plan, etc., would also be important for achieving this goal.

Indications are that rounds would land in the DMPRC target and firing area or the K15 impact area. However, if range design or targetry changes, protective berms would be constructed to prevent rounds leaving the target and firing area or impact area to protect related clusters. Other mitigative measures include supplementing adversely impacted active RCW clusters with cavity inserts or drilled cavities and the translocation of birds if detrimental trends are observed. Training compartments within the SDZ should be burned at a minimum every three years to reduce potential for RCW and RCW cavity tree loss due to training related wildfires. Optional mitigation for consideration is the initiation of research on the potential effects of range operations on the area of influence on RCWs and their habitat. For example, research on the impacts related to RCW clusters and habitat in the SDZ would be beneficial.

f. State-Protected Species

Construction of the DMPRC and its associated support facilities at the Alternative III site may potentially impact approximately 249 Gopher Tortoise burrows due to the use of heavy equipment and the construction of new structures (targetry, roads, and buildings). Auburn University (AU) has surveyed a large portion of the preferred alternative and has visited all of the known burrow locations within the area. They are now estimating that there are at this time only 20 to 30 tortoises still inside the construction/tree removal area. In addition, 1,176 acres of Gopher Tortoise habitat will be lost due to ground disturbances, timber harvest, target installations, and road construction, resulting in potential minor adverse effects to State protected species. Commensal species that are dependent on gopher tortoise burrows for refuge will also be potentially adversely affected due to the loss of burrows. Gopher Tortoise populations may also become isolated from each other due to the construction of impassable structures, thereby fragmenting the ecosystem, reducing the quality and quantity of the appropriate habitat, and resulting in damage or mortality. Incidental loss of Gopher Tortoises and other state protected species may also continue to take place as these animals attempt to re-colonize the newly constructed training area.

Mitigation

Adherence to existing Installation management practices, as described in the INRMP, would help to minimize the potential adverse effects; however, some additional mitigation would be required. Mitigation would include a contract for relocating potentially affected gopher tortoises within the range and target firing area to another location on Fort Benning prior to tree clearing or construction. Auburn University may assist or implement this mitigation in conjunction with their research and with oversight of EMD personnel. The first step is to survey the construction area and establish where and how many tortoises will need to be removed. Auburn University (AU) has surveyed a large portion of the preferred alternative and is now estimating that there are at this time only 20 to 30 tortoises still inside the construction/tree removal area. Tortoises will be removed during the summer of 2004 by AU. The relocation sites have been selected based on habitat quality and the presence or absence of resident gopher tortoises, with preference given to those sites with suitable habitat and no resident gopher tortoises. Tortoises that are excavated will then have blood samples taken and checked for the presence of respiratory disease, and held in a suitable containment pen until the results of the blood tests are received (usually about one week). The tortoises will then be relocated to holding pens that have been constructed in training compartments F3 and D6. Tortoises that are released may need to be provided with a start-burrow (dug by hand approximately 3 feet long) or an abandoned burrow to prevent the tortoise from being exposed to predation and the elements until they can excavate a new burrow. Tortoises will be placed into pens based on their respiratory disease status and the habitat quality from which they were removed. At the completion of the AU study, the pens will be removed and the tortoises will be allowed to disperse into the surrounding habitat if that habitat is considered suitable for release. Tortoises that test positive for respiratory disease will not be relocated into areas with tortoises that tested negative for the disease. For those tortoises that are not in a good quality habitat, a new relocation site will be selected.

In addition to the survey conducted by AU, a complete survey of the area is now underway by a contractor to look for any burrows that might have been missed by AU. Once the survey is completed all burrow locations will be verified and any burrows not already discovered will be checked for to see if they are active burrows. A contractor will remove any tortoises that cannot be removed by Auburn University. If a contract is deemed necessary then the contractor will be provided with the coordinates to all of the tortoise burrows that require excavation. Each burrow will be scoped using a tortoise burrow camera to verify the presence of the tortoise prior to excavation. Once the tortoises has been excavated it will be delivered to Fort Benning's conservation personnel who will then send it to Auburn for respiratory disease testing. Once status has been verified the tortoise will become part of the Auburn University research project on Fort Benning and will be released as stated earlier in this section.

After the construction phase, gopher tortoises may reinhabit the DMPRC and persist during operation and maintenance phase. Many other ranges on Fort Benning coexist with gopher tortoises, therefore the only operation and maintenance mitigation proposed is coordination with EMD prior to any activities that could disturb gopher tortoises or their burrows.

g. Land Use

While the category of land use will remain training, which has in the past included tank and BFV maneuvering and training, the use would involve establishment of a long-term training asset with the DMPRC. This would restrict use by recreation and other non-compatible uses at least during training events, and no mitigation is proposed because training is an important mission of Fort Benning.

For encroachment monitoring, the Chief, EMD or the Environmental Monitor should routinely verify that community projects near the installation boundary have been properly coordinated with Fort Benning per the Georgia legal requirement. Coordination between the Real Estate Branch of the Engineering Division of DPW will be required for this verification. Also, Fort Benning and the community are planning to participate in a Joint Land Use Study (JLUS), which could identify further measures to address encroachment concerns in the future, however initiation of JLUS is not considered mitigation for the DMPRC action.

The sustainable design criteria include measures to incorporate into the design that would mitigate some environmental concerns, such as efficient land use and construction of facilities in an environmentally friendly manner. Sustainable design may also be used to help develop a sustainable range land use, although the ACOE would oversee the implementation of the sustainable design efforts, which are mostly focused on facility rather than range design

The Sustainable Project Rating Tool (SPiRiT) v. 1.4.1 was used to evaluate the proposed DMPRC design of September 2003. This evaluation was conducted to assess the sustainable elements that would be incorporated into the project.

There are seven categories of evaluation under SPiRiT :

- Sustainable Sites
- Water Efficiency
- Energy and Atmosphere
- Materials and Resources
- Indoor Environmental Quality
- Facility Delivery Process
- Mission

This Sustainable Design Evaluation (SDE) found that the proposed project would receive 35 SPiRiT points if the construction contractor implements the SPiRiT criteria. That would make the proposed DMPRC support facilities eligible for a Silver SPiRiT rating, exceeding the Army goal of Bronze SPiRiT level of sustainable design. This level of sustainable design represents a positive long-term environmental product and would represent a positive precedent for future construction at Fort Benning and, perhaps, in the Columbus area. See the FEIS Appendix L regarding the DMPRC SDE for a summary of the SPiRiT evaluation based on the current design. The final SPiRiT rating cannot be quantified until after construction has been completed and various components described in the Appendix have been verified. The DMPRC contracting officer(s) and the ACOE will provide all monitoring and assessments of the sustainable design efforts that relate to environmental concerns to the Environmental Monitor or appropriate Fort Benning personnel.

h. Cultural Resources

Two sites within the footprint of the preferred alternative were declared eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and one site is currently being evaluated for eligibility; these sites are considered Euro-American sites. Three cultural resources sites, though not directly affected by construction, are within the approach zone for the proposed helipad for the DMPRC. These sites near the helipad have prehistoric Native American Indian components that are potentially eligible for the NRHP. One eligible and three potentially eligible cultural resources sites are sufficiently close to and within the area of potential impacts of rounds from the planned firing points of the range to warrant consideration.

Mitigation

The proposed mitigation measures will eliminate adverse effects to the historic properties, thereby resulting in a determination of no adverse effects to cultural resources sites for Alternative III. The proposed mitigation measures for historically eligible or potentially eligible cultural resources within the preferred alternative consist of avoiding direct effects to the resources. During the design process, the helipad was relocated to avoid construction impacts on one site with American Indian cultural components that are potentially eligible for the NRHP. Additionally, impacts to the potentially eligible sites outside the footprint were avoided by realignment of shots to ensure rounds will not land outside of the footprint or the K15 dudded impact area. Careful target placement in combination with construction of berms to backstop both the rounds fired and the laser range finders will guarantee no impact to these sites outside of the range and target firing area.

The required mitigation measures for the historically eligible and potentially eligible sites consist of avoiding direct effects to the resources by prohibiting ground disturbing activities at the site and using cut-to-length method of timber harvest in the boundaries of the eligible and potentially eligible sites. Because 2 eligible and one potentially eligible site are within the range and target firing area and may be impacted by operations of the range, berms are required around the 2 eligible sites. The potentially eligible site is undergoing phase 2 evaluation and if eligible, mitigation will be determined and incorporated into the construction specifications and design plans. If it is determined ineligible, and after coordination with the appropriate stakeholders, no mitigation will be required in the ineligible site. Any and all artifacts found on the DMPRC area remain the property of the Army at Fort Benning and, if found, should be turned over to the Environmental Monitor and delivered to Fort Benning's Cultural Resource Manager (CRM) for placement in Fort Benning's curation facility. Construction specifications and site plans identify areas off limits to ground disturbance and placement of berm or earthen screen. The construction contractor's Environmental Protection Plan should include a cultural resources management plan. That plan would be reviewed and approved by the Chief of EMD or designee and the CRM before construction begins and should incorporate relevant Standard Operating Procedures from the Installation draft ICRMP.

Monitoring

The cultural resources will be demarcated prior to timber harvest to indicate the sensitive nature of the area and the requirement for specialized timber harvest procedures. Before construction, the demarcations will be reviewed and the construction contractor will be made aware of the susceptible nature of the area and any marking mechanisms damaged by timber operations should be repaired to keep construction activities only in designated areas. Any demarcations will be generic rather than identify the locations as cultural resource, to protect against damage while also preventing information release that could facilitate looting. At least monthly when not in the construction phase and weekly during the construction phase, the Environmental Monitor will inspect the construction process to ensure procedures to protect specified cultural resources are being followed and report any discrepancies to the Chief, EMD. Operation and maintenance activities may result in additional potential effects to the cultural resources. To avoid this, Range Control must maintain the berms in a manner to ensure continued protection of the sites. Annual surveillance of sites outside of the footprint should be initiated by the CRM to ensure that actual impacts do not vary significantly from those anticipated.

If unknown cultural resources sites are discovered during the construction, or the operation and maintenance phase at the DMPRC site, the finding entity must notify the CRM immediately for further action. The CRM will make an eligibility determination after consulting with consulting parties, and eligible sites will require either (1) avoidance of impacts to the site's integrity through purposeful design of the DMPRC via movement of targets or construction of berms; (2) excavation to acquire the scientific and historic information inherent within its archeological and historical context; or (3) other mitigation as determined through consultation.

i. Noise

Fort Benning is preparing the Installation Environmental Noise Management Plan (ENMP) with USACHPPM assistance. When available, the IENMP will be available for public review. Also Fort Benning has installed four noise monitors and is beginning to monitor noise near the Installation eastern and northeastern boundaries. The Installation and community are planning to participate in a Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) that would provide some funds to assist local communities in their land use planning to help ensure compatible land uses are located near military training and weapons firing areas. Also see Land Use above for information about encroachment.

Mitigation

No new mitigation is planned because implementation of Alternative III would reduce noise off- Post when compared to current conditions. The preferred alternative location was proposed in part to reduce noise impacts. Whenever possible, PAO provides advance public notification through the local news media of any training operations that could cause undesirable noise impacts off-Post.

Monitoring

The noise monitors will record excessive noise impacts due to range operations nearby, including the new DMPRC. No increase in noise impacts are expected due to the DMPRC, however the EMD and Range Division will monitor the noise readings as needed to determine if the DMPRC is contributing to off-post noise concerns that were unexpected in the FEIS analysis. If additional noise impacts are found, mitigation will be considered in the ENMP or via the JLUS.

j. Air Quality

Efforts were made to avoid unnecessary air polluting activities during development of this project. Current EMD recommendations advise that burning of slash is not a preferred activity and should be avoided if possible. There are also Installation prohibitions on burning during ozone season.

Mitigation

Adherence to existing requirements to minimize effects to air quality includes spraying disturbed soils with water to control fugitive dust and/or PM emissions. During construction of the DMPRC, disturbed soils would be sprayed with water when necessary to control fugitive dust and/or PM emissions. This mitigation measure would also be effective for unpaved roads in the area. Opacity of fugitive dust cannot exceed 20% during the construction phases, so the construction contractor will periodically make readings of the opacity to document compliance, and provide those to the Environmental Monitor. When feasible, tank trails and access roads should have either a graveled or paved surface, to further reduce fugitive dust and PM emissions. Covering truck beds carrying materials with the potential to become airborne dust will also help reduce adverse effects on air quality.

Prior to the initiation or construction on the site, a construction permit will have to pbtained from the GA EPD Air Protection Division, which will stipulate mitigation measures and/or BMPs that are needed for the project depending on the initiation of certain activities. For instance, certain requirements are inserted for concrete batch sites that may not otherwise be needed. The construction contractor must follow the requirements that apply to burning of slash vegetation, if that option is chosen. Open burning of vegetative material for the purpose of land clearing using an air curtain destructor may be possible provided the following conditions are met (from GA EPD, 2005):

- Authorization for such open burning is received from the fire department having jurisdiction over the open burning location prior to initiation of any open burning at such location
- The location of the air curtain destructor is at least 300 feet from any occupied structure or public road. Air curtain destructors used solely for utility line clearing or road clearing may be located at a lesser distance upon approval by the Division
- No more than one air curtain destructor is operated within a ten (10) acre area at one time or there must be at least 1000 feet between any two air curtain destructors
- Only wood waste consisting of trees, logs, large brush and stumps which are relatively free of soil are burned in the air curtain destructor
- The air curtain destructor is constructed, installed and operated in a manner consistent with good air pollution control practice for minimizing emissions of fly ash and smoke
- The cleaning out of the air curtain destructor pit is performed in a manner to prevent fugitive dust
- The air curtain destructor cannot be fired before 10:00 a.m. and the fire must be completely extinguished, using water or by covering with dirt, at least one hour before sunset

(c) Except for a reasonable period to get a fire started, no smoke the opacity of which is equal to or greater than 40 percent shall be emitted from any source of open burning listed in subsections (a) and (b) above, except as follows. Prescribed burning, slash burning, agricultural burning and acquired structure burning are not subject to the 40 percent opacity standard in this paragraph.

Monitoring

Opacity of fugitive dust cannot exceed 20% during the construction phases, so the construction contractor will periodically make readings of the opacity to document compliance, and provide those to the Environmental Monitor. = he contracting officer(s) will ensure the contractors are in compliance with the air quality requirements by inspections on a periodic basis. The Environmental Monitor will also monitor all aspects of the DMPRC project that could impact air quality, such as the execution of road watering and the covering of truck beds. If any deficiency arises, or for guidance on other aspects of air quality, both the contracting officer and the Environmental Monitor will consultant with the Air Quality Program Manager. Operations which cause emissions to be released into the atmosphere which may result in air pollution may be required to install, maintain, and use emission monitoring devices, to sample such specific emissions; to make periodic reports on the nature and amounts of emissions and provide such other information; and to maintain such records as the EPD may prescribe so as to determine whether emissions from such operations are in compliance with the provisions of the Act or any rules and regulations promulgated there under. Records of information requested shall be submitted on forms in a format acceptable to and in the permit. The information obtained shall be retained for a period and shall be reported at time intervals to be specified in the permit. Records shall be kept current and be available for inspection (Georgia EPD, 2004).

k. Utilities

Fort Benning proposed routes for electric utilities that would minimize or avoid disturbance of sensitive environmental resources, but still must meet safety concerns, such as burying the electric line underground in areas where parachuters practice landings or other training operations. Fort Benning has considered using innovative methods to reduce utility infrastructure requirements to comply with Army Bronze sustainable design goals. No other mitigation is required to reduce utility infrastructure requirements to comply with Army sustainable design goals. The construction contractor would submit a SPiRiT Compliance Plan to the contracting officer that addresses how energy efficiency and/or renewable energy are used in construction of DMPRC support buildings.

Optional mitigation under consideration includes innovative energy efficiency solutions that provide the greatest potential for achieving the highest sustainable design values. Each 2.5% reduction in design energy usage provides one SPiRiT point (up to 20 points maximum). The Installation would also consider use of on-site renewable energy and/or purchase of off-site green power (FEIS Appendix L).

I. Hazardous Materials

Efforts were made during the design process to avoid the use of hazardous materials if substitute materials were available. For instance, the use of concrete rather than creosote treated wood for use in berm construction was considered but discarded due to cost and maintenance concerns. No contractors or non-Federal entities will be authorized to store, use or dispose of hazardous wastes on Fort Benning.

Support facilities where hazardous materials would be stored or used must be designed to meet Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan requirements to prevent or to minimize soil contamination. The SPCC will include the procedures, instructions, and reports to be used in the event of an unforeseen spill of a regulated substance. Monitoring of POL areas is described under Water Quality Monitoring. Additional information which should be included is detailed in the project specifications.

5. Enforcement

The proponent, Army and Fort Benning, is ultimately responsible for implementing all mitigation requirements, but other entities carrying out the mitigation also have responsibilities. Contracting Officers are responsible for monitoring contractor compliance with all mitigation requirements for timber harvest, construction, etc. He/she would inform Chief, EMD and the Environmental Law Specialist, OSJA of any noncompliance with mitigation commitments. The Contracting Officers would use all contractual mechanisms to ensure that the contractors' conducts mitigation and monitoring as required. During operation and maintenance phases of the proposed DMPRC, any noncompliance with mitigation requirements or regulations would be coordinated with Chief, EMD and coordinated with the Chief, Range Division for resolution. Actions to resolve noncompliance will be taken in a timely manner and may include: supplemental NEPA analysis; adjustment to range operations; notice to SERO and/or regulators; investigation; administrative or disciplinary actions if military or civil service personnel are involved; civil or criminal actions; and other actions as appropriate to the situation.

The EPA has three potential courses of action if a violation of NPDES is cited. Under administrative orders, EPA can impose fines and penalties without court action. In a civil action, EPA may bring suit without an administrative order. Finally, the EPA may refer the case to the Department of Justice for criminal prosecution. Violations may include failure to maintain proper records, failure to implement BMPs, etc.

Environmental Monitoring Report

Fort Benning will prepare an environmental monitoring report in accordance with 32 CFR 651.15(l) to help determine the accuracy of impact assessment and make any necessary adjustments in the mitigation measures and/or military operations as practicable. The Installation may integrate this DMPRC environmental monitoring report with any EMS monitoring report if feasible and useful. Otherwise, EMD would prepare a separate monitoring report at least annually for as long as mitigation is required. This environmental monitoring report will be provided to DOT and will also be available upon request to the public and stakeholders to provide status.

References

Dial Cordy and Associates Inc. 2004a. Wetland and Stream Impact Assessment Report

for the Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex, Fort Benning, Georgia. Prepared for

Savannah District Army Corps of Engineers, Savannah Georgia.

Dial Cordy and Associates Inc. 2004b. Wetland Mitigation Siting Analysis

for the Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex, Fort Benning, Georgia. Prepared for

Savannah District Army Corps of Engineers, Savannah Georgia.

Dial Cordy and Associates Inc. 2004c. Clear Creek Conceptual Mitigation Plan, Fort Benning, Georgia. Prepared for Savannah District Army Corps of Engineers, Savannah Georgia.

Doresky, J.K. 2004. Biological Assessment for the proposed Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex, Fort Benning, Georgia. 61pp. Fort Benning Army Installation, Department of Public Works, Environmental Management Division, Conservation Branch, Fort Benning, Georgia.

Fifield, Jerald S. 2001. Designing For Effective Sediment and Erosion Control on Construction Sites, Forester Communications, Santa Barbara, CA.

General Permit -No. GAR100001: Authorization To Discharge Under The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Water Discharges Associated With Construction Activity For Stand Alone Construction Projects

<u>www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/sspp/otherforms.html</u> Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division, Air Protection Branch, February 2004. Polyengineering, Inc., 60% Submittal, Specifications, Digital Multipurpose Range Complex, Fort Benning Georgia, July 2003.

Polyengineering, Inc., Submittal & Specifications, Digital Multipurpose Range Complex, Fort Benning Georgia, March 2004.

APPENDIX K

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF THE DEIS AND ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTS

Hearing on Fort Benning ranges set

Fort Benning will hold a public hearing Thursday to discuss the possible impact of new shooting ranges being established on the reservation and the possible noise they could generate in surrounding communities.

The two-hour hearing starts at 6 p.m. at Marion County Middle School in Buena Vista.

From staff reports

AYONET

The USDA's Dietary Guidelines encourage consumers to limit intake of beverages and foods high in added sugars that may crowd out other healthy foods from their daily diet. The agency identifies soft drinks as a major source of added sugar.

Americans drank more than 53 gallons of soft drinks — per person — in 2000. This amount surpassed all other beverages including milk, beer, coffee and water.

One of every four beverages consumed in America today is a soft drink and it is clear that soft drinks have displaced other between meals and, when snacking, give preference to nutritious foods.

 Be mindful of the effects of frequent consumption of sugary beverages and non-nutritious snack foods.

 Brush twice a day, floss or use another interdental cleaner once a day.

 Schedule regular dental check-ups.

For more information, visit the American Dental Association's Web site, www.ada.org and the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Web site at www.usda.gov/cnpp. The credit may also be claim person who is physically or men incapable of caring for themselv maximum day care credit a taxps claim is \$3,000 for one qualifyin dependent or \$6,000 if two or m involved.

Earned Income Credit:

The earned income credit is a refundable credit. It provides ta: lower income taxpayers who are employed. Taxpayers without qu children must:

have earned income

be between the ages of 25-6

 not be claimed as a depende another return

· live in the U.S. for more that

Availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex at Fort Benning, GA

The Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC) would provide gunnery training facilities for the Bradley Fighting Vehicle (BFV) and the Abrams M1A1 Tank System (Tank), providing the capability for both active and reserve components to train to required standards under realistic conditions.

Fort Benning proposes to construct, operate, and maintain a DMPRC. The DMPRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for soldiers to conduct gunnery courses in a realistic training environment by expanding the Installation's training capacity. The current ranges on Fort Benning do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full gunnery training and qualifications, requiring training to modified standards. The project would include construction of the firing and target area, installation of fiber optics, construction of support facilities, upgrading and construction of associated roadways, installation of utilities to support the site, construction of a helipad, construction of other related equipment and facilities, and operation and maintenance of the DMPRC. DATES: Comments: To be considered in preparation for the

Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), comments must be received not later 45 days after publication of this notice by the EPA in the federal register by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Meetings: March 2, 2004, 6 p.m., at the Elizabeth Bradley Turner Center, Columbus State University, 4225 University Avenue, Columbus, GA, and March 4, 2004, 6 p.m., at the Marion Middle School Gymnasium, 100 East Burkhalter Avenue, Buena Vista, GA.

ADDRESSES: Please direct written comments or requests for copies of the Draft EIS (DEIS) to Richard McDowell, Public Affairs Officer, U.S. Army Infantry Center, ATTN: ATZB-PO, Fort Benning, GA, 31905-5122 or e-mail to mcdowellr@benning.army.mil. e-mail your issu





LIKE A GOOD NEIGHBO

Sale Fare Japanese Companies



1

2

2

いのいちのろう

1

2116

1

z

The Avery process, is control, operating, and complete a pulsation of the action advantations. Action and a base of the action advantations in a sould be based on a source and 100 her the control pulsation of control and 100 her the control pulsation of control and 100 her the control pulsation of control and the action with and pulsation of control and control and the control pulsation of control and control actions.

be Anter - Capital & Capital and the second se

 Preferrir allumatics - Condinat, application and manifold to Datified in Enabling Comparitient DLE on Fort Bostonic with the same exercisions dimensions and facilities as described for Aller writes the same sectors.

We arrent the second of the pro-

al resources borrers allegations to region from languing we should be it for AEC, and born allegating we should find a few restor & the state of the Second Second

Scoping and Comments: Fort Bensing Into We tribund a series, of neoesistics that are also "control on the Fort Bensing whethe and mary Be-"control and the Fort Bensing Argy, mil/SBM/ "control and the fort Bensing Argy, mil/SBM/ is and Statements participation," All roughneometrizes, polices of sections, and other the is and Statements participation, controlled will also be posted on this website. Continents of gaustical may also be substituted on this setids. Fort Bensing profess individual and ungagtification for articles in the IATS inview popular try substitute welfam constants in the Addition based shows will be answering the Constants. "Date and March 2, 2004 (see DATES), addtoged and March 2, 2004 (see DATES), add-Toged and March 2, 2004 (see DATES), add-Toged and March 3, 2004 (see DATES), add-Toged and March 3, 2004 (see DATES), addtoged and March 3, 2004 (see DATES), addtoged and March 4, 2004 (see DATES).

Surject, on the Fort Bending motils (F285) shows, and by nations of spectra sont to parties on the distribution for.

A/ MICHAEL G. FERMA Public Works Disystem Installation Management Agency Southeast Project Public Project (2019) (Logal Notices 000

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE Department of the Army

Analightity of the Graft Environmental Impact Statement for the Digital Multi-Parpose Range Complex at Feet Renative, CA

ADDRESS: Department of the Armic Doc

SUBMARY: "The digital lastic-function thanges Complete (DMPRC) would provide passage traning lastitude for the bracky function velocity (DVV) and the directly provide transfer (Tark), providing the papability for both active and reaging completion in train in regard functions defer (subject constitute).

For thereing proposes to christenct, upos an, and maintaine of DAPIC. The DAPIC work of provide a statis-of-the alt range facility to swert the Artery's training meets for facility to swert the Artery's results in a realistic training converty. The current ranges on Fort Benning up and pasifiction guessry standards and are inadequals to seport full puncery training and qualificfone, requiring the installation of the diing and target area, installation of the diing and target area, installation of the region of differs to support facility, and the optics, construction of support facility, upstallation of differs to support facility, upstallation of the facility of support facility, installation of differs to support the site, operativation of a helionic, construction of the related explorated mainter, and isoention and maintenance of the DatesC.

DATES: Comments: To be considered in propertion for the Fital Environmental impact Statement (US), comments must be received and later (INSERT DATE & DAYS AFTER PUBLICATION OF THIS MOTICE IN THE PEDERAL RECOTTR) by the U.S. Environmental involution Agence.

Several and the several states of the severa

Added and the second state of the second sec

Construction of the second sec

SUPPLINGNETARY MICORATIONE Fact measure is the "testents of the (charged satisfy threads onto, Task and MY green must train and automust train and MY green must train and and by at giftware dail sevels and test the preficiency, are thispoid to develop and test the preficiency, and thispoid to develop and test the preficiency of testings fracts the saturation of the preficnets and attractive, the scenars, to the installation boundary restrict training due to relate at the lack of defaul tompowerby on the catility tenergy. ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 04, 2003 (68 FR 16511).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-AFS-J65397-WY Rating LO, Woodrock Project, Proposal for Timber Sale, Travel Management and Watershed Restoration, Implementation, Bighorn National Forest, Tongue Ranger District, Sheridan County, WY.

Summary: EPA has lack of objections to the proposed action based on the predicted overall improvement of forest resource conditions. EPA suggests that the final EIS provide quatification sediment from erosion estimates and monitor water quality and habitat quality in streams.

ERP No. D-AFS-K65265-AZ Rating LO, Bar T Bar Anderson Springs Allotment Management Plans to Authorize Permitted Livestock Grazing for a 10-Year Period, Coconino National Forest, Mogollon Rim and Mormon Lake Ranger District, Coconino County, AZ.

Summary: EPA has no objections to the Preferred Alternative but EPA requested more detailed information for monitoring, specifically impacts to vegetation.

ERP No. D-AFS-L85444-OR Rating LO, Eyerly Fire Salvage Project, Burned and Damaged Trees Salvage, Reforestation and Fuels Treatment, Implementation, Deschutes National Forest, Sisters Ranger District, Jefferson County, OR.

Summary: While EPA has no objection to the proposed action it did request clarification on consultation with Tribes, Environmental Justice and measures to protect workers from health risks associated with the use of fire rotardants.

ERP No. D-DOE-E09014-KY Rating ECI, Paducah, Kentucky, Site Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Conversion Facility, Construction and Operation, McCraken County, KY.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding the capability and capacity of the two disposal facilities to accept the proposed waste products from the Paducah conversion facility. EPA requested that DOE include this information in the final EIS.

ERP No. D-NPS-E81078-00 Rating LO, Low Country Gullah Culture Special Resource Study, Gullah Culture Preservation and Protection Analysis to Consider the Suitability and Feasibility for Inclusion in the National Park Service System, SC, NC, GA and FL.

Summary: EPA expressed lack of objections. Dated: February 10, 2004. Ken Mittleholtz,

Environmental Specialist, Office of Federal Activities. [FR Doc. 04–3232 Filed 2–12–04; 8:45 am] BLUNG COPE 5550-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6648-3]

Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564–7167 or http://www.epa.gov/ compliance/nepa/.

- Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements
- Filed February 2, 2004 Through February 6, 2004
- Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.
- ElS No. 040055, Final Supplement, AFS, OR, Deep Vegetation Management Project, Implementation, Preferred Alternative C was Selected, Ochoo National Forest, Paulina Ranger District, Crook and Wheeler Counties, OR, Wait Period Ends: March 15, 2004, Contact: Mike Lawrence (541) 477–6900.

This document is available on the Internet at: http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/ centraloregon

EIS No. 040056, Draft EIS, FRA, CA, California High-Speed Train System, Proposes a High-Speed Train (HST) System for Intercity Travel, Extending from Sacramento and the San Francisco Bay Area in the north, through Central Valley, to Los Angeles and San Diego in the south. Orange County, CA, Comment Period Ends: May 14, 2004, Contact: David Valenstein (202) 493-6368.

This document is available on the Internet at: http://

www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov.

- EIS No. 040057, Final EIS, NPS, NJ, Morristown National Historical Park General Management Plan, Implementation, Morris and Somerset Counties, NJ, Wait Period Ends: March 15, 2004, Contact: Brian Aviles (617) 223–5319.
- EIS No. 040058, Final EIS, DOE, Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Program, New Information on Waste Management Alternatives, Waste Management Practices Enhancement for Low-Level Radioactive Waste, Mixed Low-Level Radioactive Waste and Transuranic Waste, Richland, Benton County, WA, Wait Period Ends: March 15, 2004,

Contact: Michael S. Collins (509) 376-6536.

EIS No. 040059, Draft EIS, AFS, AZ, Arizona Snowbowl Facilities Improvements, Proposal to Provide a Consistent/Reliable Operating Season, Coconino National Forest, Coconino County, AZ, Comment Period Ends: March 29, 2004, Contact: Ken Jacobs (928) 774–1147. This decument is available on the

This document is available on the Internet at: http://

- www.nws.usace.army.mil.
- EIS No. 040060, Draft EIS, USA, GA, Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex at Fort Benning, Construction, Operation and Maintenance, Gunnery Training Facilities for the Bradley Fighting Vehicle (BFV) and the Abrams M1A1 Tank System (Tank), Fort Benning, GA, Comment Period Ends: March 29, 2004, Contact: Richard McDowell (706) 545–2211.

This document is available on the Internet at: http://

www.benning.army.mil/EMD/

- Legal@PublicNotices.htm.
- ElS No. 640061, Draft EIS, BIA, UT, Tekoi Balefill Project on the Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians Reservation, Approval of Long-Term Lease of Indian Land for a Commercial Solid Waste Disposal Facility, Salt Lake City, Tocele County, UT, Comment Period Ends: March 29, 2004, Contact: Amy Heuslein (802) 379–6750.
- EIS No. 040062, Draft Supplement, NOA, Proposed Rule to Implement Management Measures for the Reduction of Sea Turtle Bycatch and Bycatch Mortality in the Atlantic Pelagic Longline Fishery, Comment Period Ends: March 15, 2004, Contact: Christophor Roger (301) 713–2347. Under Section 1502.0(c)(4) the CEQ has Approved Alternative Procedures for the above project by Granting a 31day Public Comment Period.
- EIS No. 040063, Draft EIS, AFS, AK, Couverden Timber Sales, Harvesting Timber, NPDES, Coast Guard Bridge Permit, U.S. Army COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, Tongass National Forest, Juneau Ranger District, Chilkat Peninsula, AK, Comment Period Ends: March 29, 2004, Contact: Dave Carr (907) 586–8800.
- EIS No. 040064, Draft Supplement, EPA, MS, FL, AL, Eastern Gulf of Mexico Offshore Oil and Gas Extraction, Updated Information on Issuance of New National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit and the Ocean Discharge Criteria Evaluation, MS, AL and FL, Comment Period Ends: April 13, 2004, Contact: Lena Scott (404) 562–9607.

struct, operate and maintain a DMPRC in Training Compartment D13 on Fort Benning with the same approximate dimensions and facilities as described for Alternative-ff.

Preferred Alternative - Con-

Both Alternatives 2 and 3 would also include changes in training on other ranges (Ruth; Cactus, Carmouche, and Hastings) to incorporate the new DMPRC into the training regime.

The DMRPC DEIS includes analyses of the potential environmental consequences, including cumulative impacts that each alternative may have on many environmental and socioeconomic resources or topics, including: soils and vegetation, water quality, wetlands and streambanks, unique ecological areas, Federally and state listed species, migratorybirds, socioeconomics, land as6. cultural resources, attituds, noise air quality, public health and satisfy, hazardous materials and wastes, and transmitation. The findings indicate that the No Action alternative has the least amount of potential impacts becadse no construction is proposed; however, noise concerns will continue and the needed improvement in range facilities would not be achieved. Alternatives 2 and 3 would have some potential adverse impacts to several of the studied resources; however, mitigations to reduce those impacts are identified in the DEIS, and both alternatives would result in less noise disturbance from BFV and tank weaponry firing.

10. The Tri-County Journ

al & Chattahoochee Chronicle, Buena Vista, GA, Wednerday, February 18, 2005

00

a)

Notices

Scoping and Comments: Fort Benning has distributed a series of newsletters that are also posted on the Fort Benning website and may be viewed at .wwwbenning.army:mil/EMD/ dmprci.egal&PublicNotices.htm. All future newsletters, notices of meetings, and other public and stakeholder participation opportunities will also be posted on this website. Comments or questions may also be submitted on this website. Fort Benning invites individuals and organizations to participate in the DEIS review process by submitting written comments to the address listed above and by attending public meetings. Public meetings have been scheduled for March 2, 2004 and March 4, 2004 4, 2004, 6 p.m., at the Marion Middle School Gymnasium, 100 East Burkhalter Avenue, Buena Vista, GA.

ADDRESSES: Please direct written comments or requests for coples of the Draft EIS (DEIS) to Mr. Richard McDowell, Public Affairs Officer, U.S. Army Infantry Center, ATTN: ATZB-PO, Fort Benning, GA. 31905-5122 or email to mcdowellr@benning.army.mit. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Richard McDowell, Public Affairs Officer, U.S. Army Infantry Center, ATTN: ATZB-PO, Fort Benning, GA, 31905-5122, (706) 545-2211; or email to mcdowellr@benning.army.mit.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMA-TION: Fort Benning is the "Home of the Infantry" and conducts training for elements of Mechanized Infantry Division units. Tank and BFV crews must train and qualify at different skill levels (gunnery tables) that are designed to develop and test the proficiency level of individuals, crews, and platoons. Existing facilities at Fort Benning do not currently meet training standards for advanced gunnery gualification. Specifically, the existing range targetry is antiquated; the natural terrain features of Hastings Range hampers training effectiveness and efficiency; the nearness to the installation boundary restricts training due to noise; and the lack of digital components on the existing range delays the analysis of the training exercise.

The Army proposes to construct, operate, and maintain a DMPRC. The DEIS analyzes the No Action/ Status Quo and two action alternatives. The notice of intent to prepare an EIS for the DMPRC included another alternative, Transport to Fort Stewart, however further analysis indicated that alternative was not reasonable. Alternatives considered in detail in the DEIS are:

 No Action - Continue to conduct modified advanced gunnery training at Hastings Range on Fort. Benning.

2. Construct, operate and maintain a DMPRC in Training Compartment K21 on Fort Benning. The range dimensions would be approximately 1,500 meters by 4,500 meters and cover about 1,800 acres plus support facilities; however these dimensions would be subject to site-specific design requirements and may be modified. The DMRPC would include a firing and target area with 3 course larges. numerous stationary and moving targets, trenches and berms, maintenance roads; a helipad; utilities and communication systems; and support facilities on about 25 acres

Department of Defense

Department of the Army Availability of the Draft Enviromental impact Statement for the Digital Multi-Purpose Rang Complex at Fort Benning, GA AGENCY: Department of the Army, DOD.

ACTION: Notice of Availability SUMMARY: The Digital Mu Purpose Range Compl (DMPRC) would provide gunntraining facilities for the Brad Flighting Vehicle (BFV) and 1 Abrams M1A1 Tank System (Tar providing the capability for b active and reserve components train to required standards un realistic conditions.

Fort Benning proposes to c struct, operate, and maintai DMPRC. The DMPRC would | vide a state-of-the-art range fi ity to meet the Army's train needs for soldiers to conduct (nery courses in a realistic train environment by expanding Installation's training capacity. current ranges on Fort Bennin not meet modern gunnery s dards and are inadequate to port full gunnery training and c fications, requiring training to n fied standards. The project v include construction of the and target area, installation of optics, construction of suppc cilities, upgrading and constru of associated roadways, instal of utilities to support the site. struction of a helipad, constru of other related equipment a cilities, and operation and m nance of the DMPRC.

DATES: Comments: To be sidered in preparation for 1 nel Environmental Impact ment (EIS), comments mil received not later than 45 after publication of the N the Federal Register by th Environmental Prote Agency.

Meetings: March 2, 2 p.m., at the Elizabeth B Turner Center, Columbus University, 4225 Univers enue, Columbus, GA, and

Permit

Permit 1408 was issued to DWR on December 23, 2003. The permit authorizes incidental take (by long-line gear) and release of ESA-listed juvenile and adult Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, Central Valley springrun Chinook salmon, and Central Valley steelhead from San Pablo Bay, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, and the Sacramento River to River Mile 220. The project exclusively targets collection of migrating adult white sturgeon to study sturgeon swimming performance and behavior. Permit 1408 expires June 30, 2008. NMFS has determined that take levels authorized in the modified permit will not jeopardize listed salmon and steelhead nor result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat where described.

Issuance of this permit, as required by the ESA, was based on a finding that the permit: (1) was applied for in good faith; (2) will not operate to the disadvantage of the listed species which are the subject of the permit; and (3) is consistent with the purposes and policies set forth in section 2 of the ESA. This permit was issued in accordance with, and is subject to, 50 CFR part 222, the NMFS regulations governing listed species permits.

Dated: February 5, 2004.

David O'Brien,

Acting Chief, Endangered Species Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 04–3278 Filed 2–12–04; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–22–S

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Notice of Meeting

The next meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts is scheduled for 19 February 2004 at 10 a.m. in the Commission's offices at the National Building Museum, Suite 312, Judiciary Square, 401 F Street, NW., Washington, DC 20001–2728. Items of discussion affecting the appearance of Washington, DC may include buildings, parks and memorials.

Draft agendas and additional information regarding the Commission are available on our Web site: *http:// www.cfa.gov.* Inquiries regarding the agenda and requests to submit written or oral statements should be addressed to Charles H. Atherton, Secretary, Commission of Fine Arts, at the above address or call 202–504–2200. Individuals requiring sign language interpretation for the hearing impaired should contact the Secretary at least 10 days before the meeting time.

Dated in Washington, DC, January 28, 2004.

Charles H. Atherton,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 04–3155 Filed 2–12–04; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6330–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Air Force

HQ USAF Scientific Advisory Board

AGENCY: Department of the Air Force, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Pub. L. 92–463, notice is hereby given of the forthcoming meeting of the 2nd ACC Advisory Panel Meeting. The purpose of the meeting is to allow the SAB leadership to give consensus advice to the commander of the 2nd ACC Advisory Panel. Because classified and contractor-proprietary information will be discussed, this meeting will be closed to the public.

DATES: February 26-28, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Bldg 205 Dodd Blvd, Langley AFB, VA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maj Tim Kelly, Air Force Scientific Advisory Board Secretariat, 1180 Air Force Pentagon, Rm 5D982, Washington, DC 20330–1180, (703) 697–4811.

Pamela D. Fitzgerald,

Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer. [FR Doc. 04–3156 Filed 2–12–04; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 5001–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Air Force

HQ USAF Scientific Advisory Board

AGENCY: Department of the Air Force, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Pub. L. 92–463, notice is hereby given of the forthcoming meeting of the AFC2ISRC Advisory Group. The purpose of the meeting is to brief the Commander of the AFC2ISR Center. This meeting will be closed to the public.

DATES: February 19, 2004.

ADDRESSES: AFC2ISRC, Langley AFB, VA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maj Chris Berg, Air Force Scientific Advisory Board Secretariat, 1180 Air Force Pentagon, Rm 5D982, Washington, DC 20330–1180, (703) 697– 4811.

Pamela D. Fitzgerald,

Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer. [FR Doc. 04–3157 Filed 2–12–04; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 5001–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex at Fort Benning, GA

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DOD. **ACTION:** Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC) would provide gunnery training facilities for the Bradley Fighting Vehicle (BFV) and the Abrams M1A1 Tank System (Tank), providing the capability for both active and reserve components to train to required standards under realistic conditions.

Fort Benning proposes to construct, operate, and maintain a DMPRC. The DMPRC would provide a state-of-the-art range facility to meet the Army's training needs for soldiers to conduct gunnery courses in a realistic training environment by expanding the Installation's training capacity. The current ranges on Fort Benning do not meet modern gunnery standards and are inadequate to support full gunnery training and qualifications, requiring training to modified standards. The project would include construction of the firing and target area, installation of fiber optics, construction of support facilities, upgrading and construction of associated roadways, installation of utilities to support the site, construction of a helipad, construction of other related equipment and facilities, and operation and maintenance of the DMPRC.

DATES: *Comments:* To be considered in preparation for the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), comments must be received not later than March 29, 2004, by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Meetings: March 2, 2004, 6 p.m., at the Elizabeth Bradley Turner Center, Columbus State University, 4225 University Avenue, Columbus, GA, and March 4, 2004, 6 p.m., at the Marion Middle School Gymnasium, 100 East Burkhalter Avenue, Buena Vista, GA. **ADDRESSES:** Please direct written comments or requests for copies of the Draft EIS (DEIS) to Mr. Richard McDowell, Public Affairs Officer, U.S. Army Infantry Center, ATTN: ATZB– PO, Fort Benning, GA 31905–5122 or email to *mcdowellr@benning. army. mil.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Richard McDowell, Public Affairs Officer, U.S. Army Infantry Center, ATTN: ATZB–PO, Fort Benning, GA, 31905–5122, (706) 545–2211, or e-mail to mcdowellr@benning.army.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Fort Benning is the "Home of the Infantry" and conducts training for elements of Mechanized Infantry Division units. Tank and BFV crews must train and qualify at different skill levels (gunnery tables) that are designed to develop and test the proficiency level of individuals, crews, and platoons. Existing facilities at Fort Benning do not currently meet training standards for advanced gunnerv qualification. Specifically, the existing range targetry is antiquated; the natural terrain features of Hastings Range hampers training effectiveness and efficiency; the nearness to the Installation boundary restricts training due to noise; and the lack of digital components on the existing range delays the analysis of the training exercise.

The Army proposes to construct, operate, and maintain a DMPRC. The DEIS analyzes the No Action/Status Quo and two action alternatives. The notice of intent to prepare an EIS for the DMPRC included another alternative, Transport to Fort Stewart, however further analysis indicated that alternative was not reasonable. Alternatives considered in detail in the DEIS are:

1. No Action—Continue to conduct modified advanced gunnery training at Hastings Range on Fort Benning.

2. Construct, operate and maintain a DMPRC in Training Compartment K21 on Fort Benning. The range dimensions would be approximately 1,500 meters by 4,500 meters and cover about 1,800 acres plus support facilities; however these dimensions would be subject to site-specific design requirements and may be modified. The DMRPC would include a firing and target area with 3 course lanes, numerous stationary and moving targets, trenches and berms, maintenance roads; a helipad; utilities and communication systems; and support facilities on about 25 acres including control and instruction buildings, maintenance and storage buildings. The DMPRC would include a safety zone that is inaccessible during operation of the range.

3. Preferred Alternative—Construct, operate and maintain a DMPRC in Training Compartment D13 on Fort Benning with the same approximate dimensions and facilities as described for Alternative II.

Both Alternatives 2 and 3 would also include changes in training on other ranges (Ruth, Cactus, Carmouche, and Hastings) to incorporate the new DMPRC into the training regime.

The DMPRC DEIS includes analyses of the potential environmental consequences, including cumulative impacts that each alternative may have on many environmental and socioeconomic resources or topics, including: soils and vegetation, water quality, wetlands and streambanks, unique ecological areas, Federally and state listed species, migratory birds, socioeconomics, land use, cultural resources, utilities, noise, air quality, public health and safety, hazardous materials and wastes. and transportation. The findings indicate that the No Action alternative has the least amount of potential impacts because no construction is proposed; however, noise concerns will continue and the needed improvement in range facilities would not be achieved. Alternatives 2 and 3 would have some potential adverse impacts to several of the studied resources; however, mitigations to reduce those impacts are identified in the DEIS, and both alternatives would result in less noise disturbance from BFV and tank weaponry firing.

Scoping and Comments: Fort Benning has distributed a series of newsletters that are also posted on the Fort Benning Web site and may be viewed at www.benning.army.mil/EMD/ dmprcLegal&PublicNotices.htm. All future newsletters, notices of meetings, and other public and stakeholder participation opportunities will also be posted on this Web site. Comments or questions may also be submitted on this Web site. Fort Benning invites individuals and organizations to participate in the DEIS review process by submitting written comments to the address listed above and by attending public meetings. Public meetings have been scheduled for March 2, 2004 and March 2, 2004 (see DATES); additional notices will be announced in the Columbus Ledger Enquirer, the Tri-County Journal, The Bayonet, on the Fort Benning Web site (listed above), and by notices of meeting sent to parties on the distribution list.

Michael Q. Frnka,

Public Works Director, Installation Management Agency, Southeast Region. [FR Doc. 04–2848 Filed 2–12–04; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Availability of Government-Owned Invention; Available for Licensing

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DOD. **ACTION:** Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Navy hereby gives notice of the general availability of exclusive or partially exclusive licenses under the following pending patent.

U.S. Patent application Serial Number 60/525,842 entitled ''Bowel Preparation for Virtual Colonoscopy" filed 1 December 2003. The present invention relates to a unique approach to colonic preparation for virtual colonoscopy (VC) examination involving a specific combination of sodium phosphate, barium sulfate, and water-soluble iodinated contrast, each taken orally in two evenly divided doses. This improved colonic preparation results in VC that are comparable to the accepted "gold standard" conventional colonoscopy for detecting clinically relevant polyps.

DATES: Applications for an exclusive or partially exclusive license may be submitted at any time from the date of this notice.

ADDRESSES: Submit applications to the Office of Technology Transfer, Naval Medical Research Center, 503 Robert Grant Ave, Silver Spring, MD 20910–7500.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Charles Schlagel, Director, Office of Technology Transfer, Naval Medical Research Center, 503 Robert Grant Ave, Silver Spring, MD 20910–7500, telephone (301) 319–7428 or e-mail at: *schlagelc@nmrc.navy.mil*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Any license granted shall comply with 35 U.S.C. 209 and 37 CFR part 404. Applications will be evaluated utilizing the following criteria: (1) Ability to manufacture and market the technology; (2) manufacturing and marketing ability; (3) time required to bring technology to market and production rate; (4) royalties; (5) technical capabilities; and (6) small business status.

Dated: February 3, 2004.

J.T. Baltimore,

Lieutenant Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–3158 Filed 2–12–04; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

APPENDIX L

SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT RATING FOR THE DMPRC

Sustainable Design Evaluation

The Sustainable Project Rating Tool (SPiRiT) v. 1.4.1 was used to evaluate the proposed Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC) at Fort Benning. This evaluation was conducted to assess the sustainable elements that would be incorporated into the project.

There are seven categories of evaluation under SPiRiT and each category is discussed for Alternatives 2 and 3:

- Sustainable Sites
- Water Efficiency
- Energy and Atmosphere
- Materials and Resources
- Indoor Environmental Quality
- Facility Delivery Process
- Mission

The Sustainable Design Evaluation (SDE) found that each of the occupied facilities in the proposed project would receive 35 SPiRiT points if the construction contractor implements the SPiRiT criteria. Therefore, the proposed DMPRC support facilities may be eligible for a Silver SPiRiT rating, exceeding the Army goal of Bronze SPiRiT level of sustainable design. This level of sustainable design represents a positive long-term environmental effect and would represent a positive precedent for future construction at Fort Benning and, perhaps, in the Columbus area. This Appendix details the SPiRiT evaluation based on proposed design. The March 2004 design does not incorporate all SPiRiT points listed; however, conversation with the design contractor has indicated their intent to include sustainable design specifications in the corrected final submittal expected to be released on 30 April 2004 (pers. com. Cooper, 2004). The final SPiRiT rating cannot be quantified until after construction has been completed and various components described below have been verified.

Sustainable Sites—4 points out of 20

The proposed project qualifies for very few sustainable site points because SPiRiT criteria are based on building construction and not on large land-consuming range projects. There still is an opportunity to earn points for reducing heat islands by including shade trees over the impervious surfaces (roofs, parking lots, walkways) and another point for developing a site environmental and mitigation plan as proposed in the current design specifications. A light colored roofing material that meets Energy Star standards is another way to achieve a point within budget.

Water Efficiency—3 points out of 5

This project would achieve points by eliminating the use of potable water for landscape irrigation. Low flow plumbing fixtures would achieve water use reduction goals.

Energy and Atmosphere—0 points out of 28

A commissioning authority must be hired by the Army in order to fulfill the requirement for this section. This project has a great potential to earn points in this section by optimizing energy performance. One point (up to 20) would be awarded for every reduction in design energy usage of 2.5%. Engaging in a two-year contract with the current utility provider for green power is one method of achieving a credit. Use of renewable energy, additional commissioning, and ongoing measurement and verification of energy performance are also strategies to achieve additional points towards a sustainable development.

Materials and Resources—6 points out of 13

This project would achieve points, with proper contracts with contractors, for recycling construction, demolition, and land clearing waste. Using recycled content materials (e.g., steel) from local and regional sources would gain additional points for this project. There is additional potential for points by using rapidly renewable materials (e.g., cork and linoleum) and certified wood.

Indoor Environmental Quality—11 points out of 17

With proper contracting with subcontractors, this project would achieve indoor air quality points for utilizing low-emitting materials including adhesives, paints, coagulants, and carpets. No added urea-formaldehyde resin would be used in order to achieve an additional point. Use of daylighting would help to maximize available points and additional benefits can be expected including user satisfaction, lower energy usage, lower absenteeism and increased productivity.

Facility Delivery Process —4 points out of 7

The design team is multi-disciplinary and tradeoffs are being considered and documented as they relate to sustainability, first costs, life cycle costs and mission requirements through a collaborative process. A training point will only be achieved if the entire team is trained in the sustainable design delivery process (i.e., SPiRiT). A contractor has been tasked with providing the required SPiRiT training to the design team.

Current Mission –4 points out of 6

Points would be achieved by providing a healthy, safe and functional work environment and for providing surfaces, furnishings and equipment that are selected according to a life cycle cost analysis.

Future Mission – 3 points out of 4

Points would be achieved by identifying future uses, as well as how long the designed function is expected to occupy the facility and how long the systems will last before upgrades or replacements are necessary.

The detailed Sustainable Design Evaluation (SDE) is a continuous review of the design and construction specifications. The current detailed SDE is a working spreadsheet and is available from EMD upon request.